Local Plan for Derby Regulation 18 Responses Part 2

Derby City Council

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
466	474	Community Facilities, Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I would like to raise my objection to the proposed plan to build on Locko road which is green belt land and further builds proposed to the rear of stoney Lane. Spondon as already seen developments that have added further strains on the current infrastructure. Spondon village is practically impassible during rush hour traffic and recent road works have brought traffic to a standstill. The village can not withstand further homes being built and could not sustain additional traffic this would bring with it. Our green belt areas should be fiercely protected and this land should not be built.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
366	414	Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I'd like to register my opposition for the proposed change of land usage for the Wilmorton recreational green space. I've lived at [Redacted]. Over the years we've experienced a lot of change in the area with the city Point estate and many properties being turned into HMOs. The extra residents are causing further strain on the local resources with parking, rubbish and traffic volumes increasing significantly. There are few green spaces within the city urban areas and many people use the back fields for walking dogs and playing games during the warmer months. We have a big rubbish issue within this area as well with a lack of emptying highly used street bins provided by the council and despite frequent reporting of overflowing bins and rubbish blowing onto the paths and into gardens, no change has been made. Local services are already stretched and funding could be used for supporting improvements in the area rather than increasing the pressures on residents with additional temporary caravans. Utilising this valuable land intended for local residents for temporary travelling communities is only going to compound these issues further. The streets are not capable of the current traffic, let alone mobile homes being taken onto the estate to enter this area. There are existing safety risks and hazards presented with the football traffic and local business using our side streets for parking. It's only a matter of time before an accident occurs or emergency services can't access streets due to the volume of parked cars. I strongly oppose this proposal and alternate sites should be considered as better solutions based on the local infrastructure. [Redacted], the value of my property and access to parking on the side streets will be negatively impacted however my main concern is removing green space that is beneficial to our local community and general well being.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
313	361	Stoney Lane	Oppose	Stoney Lane, Spondon (Policy HA7) Dear Sir/Madam, I wish to register my objection to the proposed housing allocation on land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon under Policy HA7 of the draft Local Plan.

433	477	Stoney Lane, Housing, Green Belt, Infrastructure, Transport	Oppose	We strongly object to the policy proposal HA7 for development of Stoney Lane for a minimum of 400 new houses on the following grounds. The single Access which is shown to the site would be a disaster waiting to happen. The A52 is already a fast flowing road with the potential of an increase in serious accidents particularly at pinch points such as the access to Stoney Lane and further along to the Borrowash flyover entry/exits both east and west bound. An additional 400 houses with a potential of at least one car per household will put an enormous strain on the road network. There is no adequate slip road onto or off the A52 at the junction with Stoney Lane and there is no indication in this proposal to suggest any changes are planned. Spondon has already given way to Greenbelt being redesignated as grey belt and if the government continue this invasion into the countryside settlements will soon be merging without any of the necessary infrastructure in place i.e. new schools, Doctors, hospitals, new road networks et cetera. Derby City Council says it prioritises the redevelopment of previously developed Brownfield and to meet housing needs aiming to reduce reliance on Greenfield land. This is obviously not the case. As an example of this is the assembly rooms in Derby which has been an eyesore for many years with little or no attempt to redevelop the site. High rise development must be the key to providing affordable houses with integral parking and being a lot closer to amenities, including hospitals shopping, et cetera. This policy proposal cannot be looked at in isolation. There are only four exits and entrances into and out of Spondon. Dale Road, Locko Road, Willow croft Road/Asda Island and Stoney Lane. Development is already taking place on Dale Road with a potential of 250 more houses/vehicles. Planning permission has already been agreed on Royal Hill Road for a further 90 houses/vehicles. Furthermore there are proposals for

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Acorn Way for potentially 200 more houses/vehicles and also on Locko Road for 240 house/vehicles. The current road network will not cope. High volumes of large vehicles passing through the village all causes considerable damage to the structure of the road network and the extra volume of vehicles which will undoubtedly occur will result in traffic build up within the Village.

400	446	Flood Risk, Green Wedge, Infrastructure, Environment, Housing	Oppose	I would like to add my voice and opinion on the potential proposed planning inclusion for this area. I fear that the Green Wedges around Oakwood are being plundered and diminished too frequently. There are Brownfield and Industrial sites that should be considered first. Similar to what was done at Celanese plant in Spondon. This area backs on to our Nature Reserve. It's flourishing. We have Red Kite re established in our area, after decades. If the area is built on my fears are flooding, the drainage ditch at the bottom of Lime Tree Rise don't inspire my confidence. The road is now liable to flooding, freezing due to run off. This slowly flows down into Breadsall Village and adds to their flooding. The road surface freezing causes degradation and need for more frequent resurfacing and repairs. The road to Heanor is 40mph and extremely busy. There's a now dangerous, staggered cross road. Negotiating it already took care. With Lime Tree and Durose traffic and the Estate at Morley but is on the edge of Heanor, it's increasing and if AV plan goes ahead more houses will be added adjacent to Lowes Lane. Lime Lane has no pavements, is 60mph has beautiful trees which are touching now and centuries old. This causes surface water to freeze and can cause flickering sunlight which can be distracting. But we need established trees environmentally and for the nature inhabitants. There's only statutory Country Lighting. The road is narrow and unsuitable for Lorries, which despite any Builders claims would happen because of inappropriate sineage and Car Sat Navs being used. There's only one bus covers that area being Trent/Barton H1. Unless Arriva could be persuaded to include the 3 Estates, comprising Durose, Lime Tree and this future one into the 22/24 route and or the 26. There are no Schools within walking distance at all. Accessing Secondary Schools will require transport, be it parents or bus pass or buses

				specifically for them, which many have been reduced. No Schools will be included in the plans, they never are. Doctors? We have again major transport issues to get people to them. Reliance on cars and taxis. Oakwood has one Doctors Surgery and people in Chaddesden are already extremely unhappy that the 26 Bus route was changed due to The Park Medical Centre withdrawing our Satellite surgery, therefore elderly and none drivers and Disabled need transport to that surgery, without long walks. There are 4 medical practices covering this area, 2 in Spondon with Chaddesden Satellite and 1 Chaddesden with Borrowash Satellite and 1 Oakwood with City Centre Satellite and Revive. Non easy to access. We don't even have a Bus to Spondon!! The logistics of getting to Supermarkets will require Cars and Taxis. Otherwise 2 buses will be required for most. Gone are the days of the Asda bus driving around Chaddesden to take people there and back. Disabled people and elderly will struggle and be disadvantaged. Discriminated against to be honest, because of no planning inclusion of Transport or close by infrastructure. Dentists? Again non included at all. The nearest Dentists that are NHS taking Adults are City Centre and maybe one in Erewash, Amber Valley. Unless you can go privately. Shopping is frankly fraught on Oakwood due to increase in cars per family. As adult children can't afford to leave home or have to return. Lots of complaints of lack of parking at our Two tiny supermarkets for an estate our size, Biggest In Europe!! We then get to traffic issues. An Accident each week or every other week on Lime Lane/Morley Rd junction. Again staggered Crossroads and narrow roads, no calming measures for anyone going to Breadsall Junction from Stanley Village and vice versa. The calming island lamp has been completely destroyed and all that remains is the Concrete Island it stood on. 60mph for straight through traffic is too high at that junction. It needs Yellow raised strips on the road. Warnings on that road. Or flashing signs at each side! [Redacted]. Kings Corner has got steadily more dangerous since around 2019. But even more dangerous since 2021. Steadily more deaths at that junction. As bad is exiting Smalley Drive. Sovereign Way has a Keep Clear, we don't and we will need one even more with Acorn Way plan, Bloors Spondon Wood and Royal Hill Road and Morley Rd developments. There will be more lorries and delivery

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				vans using Morley Rd as a 'cut through'. It's horrendous all day. But exponentially worse from 2:30pm to 4pm. Then builds again at 4:30 to 5:30. Term time being worse because parents are travelling to;St Andrews Stanley, Morley, Spondon all the schools there and Chaddesden all the Schools, due to the reliance on filling places! Not thinking how to reduce travel. The whole point of Park View was to encourage parents to Walk their children because I was at the meetings. I'm sorry but they don't. Instead they fill up the bus stop which is now needed with the 26 re route. They block the chicane that's there to slow traffic down but makes drivers ignore it and speed through. It's Cat and Mouse around the whole estate at School times. We have no Double Yellow lines on the Estate. Junctions are hazardous at best. I'm sorry but your Planning people that sign these builds off need to come and see the issues first hand at the right times. Not quiet times as has happened before! I was nearly killed trying to get to Chaddesden for a Doctors appointment at 4:30 purely because of rush hour on Morley Rd. This is only going to get worse.

467	493	Transport	Oppose	2.1.5, para 26 Accessing Moorways without a car is virtually impossible: from a suburb it needs two buses each way, if there is indeed a bus to Moorways from the city centre. As buses are not reliable, and one has to book a time, for people like me this isn't viable. When Queen's was open, it was possible to swim daily before work. Impossible now. There is vague but unspecific wording regarding improving public transport. How, and to which areas of Derby? Para 29 Active Travel Strategy Public transport doesn't encourage this. Walking to the city centre from Blagreaves takes too long and is too far for most elderly or children. Disabled can't often ride a bicycle. 29% recorded inactivity and 20% lack physical activity: but Moorways is inaccessible to many (see above) Evening activity for working people with no car is not possible from Blagreaves. Transport will be 'comprehensive', 'converging at Derby bus station'. Is this viable? At present some of it does: for the unlucky rest of us, we have to trek from the Spot, Osmaston Rd or outside Hunter's to get a connection at the bus station. Will that change? We've asked a number of times, but Arriva constantly refuses. Arriva also runs no bus from the city centre to Blagreaves after 20.00 cutting non-drivers off from any evening events in the city centre unless they can afford taxis. Will this change allowing residents to access the vibrant nightlife planned

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				for the city? Later, it states that transport will also be safe ‘for every generation’. If you are in the hands of private operators, how will this be enforced?
330	378	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I’ve received a small slip regarding the ‘ green space ‘ I’m confused as to what is happening. I don’t feel comfortable or safe with yourselves building a traveller/gypsy site near my home [Redacted]. Most of them are very untidy and I’ll constantly threat that my home will be broken into as some are bad people. The letter I received is from a concerned resident so, many others may feel the same.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
397	258	Transport	Neutral	I also support the proposals in Policy T1: Active and Sustainable Transport as a way of addressing issues of traffic volume, congestion and parking and improve health and wellbeing needs (Para. 29). However, this aspiration needs to be translated into specific actions in the rest of the document, rather than the vague statements currently included. For example, Para. 267 states "Ideally connections should be made into the existing built area of Chaddesden for pedestrians and cyclists..." where this should be mandatory. The document should define a mapped network of planned active travel routes linking residential, shopping and employment areas within Derby and a plan to construct these routes. The routes should be built to the standards prescribed in the Manual for Streets (already referenced in the document) and Cycle Infrastructure Design LTN 1/20 (which should be referenced). Similarly, the document should be more specific about delivery of bus services to the proposed new housing developments. Without definite commitments on active travel and public transport, the increase in private car use brought on by the planned level of new housing will be unsustainable.
396	258	Open Space, Transport, Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. I support the retention of the other Green Wedges proposed in the document as important corridors for wildlife and green spaces which break up the solid mass of urban development.

335	383	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure, Community Facilities	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
435	479	Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Kitchener Avenue, Housing, Open Space, Environment	Support	Hi, I live on [REDACTED] and have taken interest in the proposals for HA15. I regularly drive, walk and cycle past this space and find it an intriguing plot of land. I assume the school uses it for sports events and outdoor play but as I'm always as work during school hours, I never actually see it be used so I can't be certain of that. I notice the proposals still leave the school with a fair bit of green space to play in so I'm not against this patch being given another purpose. I also appreciate the need for more homes in the UK and in Derby as part of that. I appreciated that the proposal wanted it to keep green spaces and trees. I think this is really important for many reasons but mainly for our mental health. Everyday I cycle past a development on Cotton Lane, watching the progress. Recently, the trees in front of the block of flats were chopped down and suddenly the area looks far more dull and dreary. If HA15 is to be developed, please make sure that as much greenery is kept as possible. Secondly, I think it is a good place for houses as it's close to some local amenities. However, I am concerned that Village GP is already struggling with the number of patients it has, the road is already busy enough and the school is already huge. From the money that Derby gains from this sale, we need to make sure this is reinvested into the local healthcare, education and transport systems. In addition, the school currently benefits from this plot of land, I'd like a successful proposal to see the community still benefit.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
261	308	Green Wedge	Neutral	, I wish to emphasise the importance of keeping the Oakwood Green Wedge. In particular the need to retain a substantial green wedge connecting Chaddesden Wood northwards to open countryside and the Breadsall Cutting Nature Reserve.
262	309	Green Wedge	Support	In response to your consultation on the Chaddesden Woods development. I support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge.
263	310	Housing, Open Space	Oppose	Objection to HA15 - This space (along Kitchener Avenue from its intersection with Browning Street) has been preserved for community use for many years, once connected to Village Primary School but largely unused. However. since it's been fenced off for in excess of twenty years local people have been unable to make use of it and so it's sat redundant. We think it should be retained as a resource for the use of the local community. We would like to discuss how we as an organization can further serve the needs of the people of the Austin Estate through a multi-purpose facility on the site possibly incorporating sports facilities, biodiversity, meeting rooms, conference facilities, community café and other charitable ventures. We would hope that there would be employment and real economic benefit to this neglected and under-resourced corner of the city which would bless and serve people of all walks of life and ethnicities. We would like to ask that the 25 homes planned for the site be shelved while we conduct research, consultations and discussions locally to arrive at an alternative proposal which we could take forward with the support of local councillors and officers.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
265	313	Green Wedge	Support	I wish to register my support for the retention of the Chaddesden and Derwent Industrial Area Green Wedge and also the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as shown on the Green Wedge Map Pack and set out in draft Policy EN6. I strongly support the protection and enhancement of these green spaces and their biodiversity. It is important to protect these green wedges from inappropriate development. The open space in the green wedges serves a number of important functions which accentuate their value such as providing open space to residents for informal exercise and enabling connection with nature which improve health and well being. The Chaddesden and Derwent Industrial Area Green Wedge serves as an important 'buffer zone' between residential communities at Breadsall Hilltop and the neighbouring business and industrial uses on Sir Frank Whittle Way. The open space, with its woodland belts provides some protection from the visual, noise and pollution impacts of the nearby commercial uses and this is strongly valued by the immediate popultion. It also reduces the impression of urban sprawl and contributes to separation which assists in the neighbourhood identity. The green wedge preserves the residential identity of Breadsall Hilltop and should remain to be protected. The Great Northern Greenway which runs through this green wedge is a valuable recreational resource facilitating access to the wider countryside and it is important that inappropriate development should not further erode this corridor. I would strongly object to sites 0315 and 0406 coming forward as they would be detrimental to the purpose and functions of the green wedge and it would significantly erode the green wedge resulting in significant harm to the urban structure, biodiversity and residential amenity with a reduced separation between incompatible land uses. I support the long-term preservation of the Chaddesden and Derwent Industrial Area Green Wedge in full.

336	384	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to attend any future meetings or inquiries.
305	353	Green Wedge	Support	I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan! I am keen to see the land north of chaddesden wood be protected from development.
304	351	Open Space, Green Wedge	Support	Please accept this email in support of the Derby Local Plan. [Redacted]. I believe everyone should have access to green space to support their mental health. I fully support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge for both local residents and Derby as a whole to enjoy open green spaces,especially Chaddesden Wood for the local wildlife and link to the countryside.
296	344	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I would like to formally request my desire to oppose a gypsy site and the re designation of land for housing I believe there are better options available

271	319	Housing, Green Wedge	Oppose	I am writing to submit my objection to the proposals within the Draft Local Plan that would allow housing development within Derby's existing green wedges, in particular the allocation for housing east of Moorway Lane in Littleover. The draft plan proposes that this site should deliver a minimum of 335 homes. I strongly believe that development in this location would undermine the purpose of the Green Wedge designation, which exists to maintain open space, prevent the merging of settlements, and protect access to nature within the urban area. Firstly, the loss of natural habitat is a significant concern. The Green Wedge in this area provides important open space and wildlife habitat, as well as a valuable green corridor connecting local natural features. Developing this land would inevitably lead to habitat loss and fragmentation, which would negatively impact biodiversity and the character of the area. Secondly, the proposal would significantly increase traffic on Moorway Lane and surrounding roads, which are already under pressure, particularly during peak times and school runs. Additional housing on this scale would inevitably worsen congestion and reduce road safety for residents, cyclists and pedestrians. Thirdly, the development would place further strain on local amenities and services. Schools, GP surgeries, and other community facilities in Littleover and surrounding areas are already operating under considerable pressure. The plan does not convincingly demonstrate how the necessary infrastructure and services will be expanded to meet the needs of a substantial new housing development. Finally, I am concerned about the timing and appearance of this proposal, given that a housing developer has recently submitted plans for development covering essentially the same footprint. This raises questions about whether the Local Plan allocation is being used to retrospectively support or justify a specific developer-led proposal rather than being based on a balanced and transparent assessment of the city's planning needs.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				The proposal should be considered in the context of significant housing growth already delivered and planned within neighbouring South Derbyshire, particularly at Highfields Farm and other urban extensions to the south of Derby. When viewed cumulatively, development on both sides of the administrative boundary risks undermining the function of the Green Wedge by eroding the separation between communities and creating a continuous urban corridor. Green wedges are a defining feature of Derby's planning framework and play a vital role in maintaining the city's environmental quality and distinct communities. Once lost, these spaces cannot be meaningfully replaced. For these reasons, I urge Derby City Council to reconsider the inclusion of this site and to maintain the protection of the Green Wedge in this location.

272	321	Housing, Green Wedge, Environment, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am writing to submit my objection to the draft Local Plan for Derby which is currently under consultation. My objection is focused on the reduction in 'Green Wedge' land in the new Local Plan. These green wedges provide a vital role in maintaining the city's environmental quality and distinct community identities. In particular, I am especially concerned by the proposed **reduction in the green wedge land to the east of Moorway Lane, Littleover.** Firstly, It is notable that a housing developer has already submitted proposals for this exact site footprint. This raises concerns that the re-allocation is being shaped around developer interest rather than the plan's own evidence base, the long-established policy purpose of Green Wedges and the best interests of the City of Derby. The Local Plan should be led by strategic need and environmental principles—not by speculative development pressure. I.e. the tail should not wag the dog. Instead, the following concerns indicate that the green wedge land to the east of Moorway Lane should **not** be reduced in the forthcoming local plan: **1. Loss of natural habitat and biodiversity:** The Moorway Lane Green Wedge forms part of Derby's wider green infrastructure network, which the plan acknowledges provides essential ecosystem services, supports wildlife, and contributes to residents' wellbeing. Reduction of the wedge, in particular the proposed 'narrowing' of the wildlife corridors, means that development on this site would result in irreversible habitat loss and fragmentation, and loss of wildlife movement (corridors), directly undermining the environmental objectives of the plan. **2. Increased traffic and congestion:** Moorway Lane and the surrounding road network already experience significant peak-time congestion (gridlock), especially at school time. Additional housing in this location would place further pressure on local roads and risk road safety, contrary to the plan's aims to promote sustainable transport and reduce car

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				dependency. **3. Pressure on local services and amenities:** Littleover's schools, healthcare facilities, and community services are already under strain. The draft plan itself highlights the growing pressures on education and health infrastructure across the city. Littleover and Heatherton amenities (e.g. GP practices) are already severely overloaded. Adding further housing risks worsening service provision for existing residents.

274	322	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing to formally express my strong support for the retention of the North Oakwood Green Wedge within Derby's Local Plan. The North Oakwood Green Wedge plays a vital role in protecting an important area of green infrastructure that benefits both the natural environment and the local community. Retaining this designation will help safeguard valuable spaces including Chaddesden Wood, the North Field, Parkview Primary School's playing fields and Oakwood Park from potential development pressures in the future. These areas provide significant environmental value. In particular, Chaddesden Wood is an important woodland habitat supporting a wide range of wildlife and contributing to local biodiversity. Protecting green wedges such as this aligns with national and local priorities to preserve natural habitats and enhance ecological networks. Equally important are the health and wellbeing benefits these green spaces provide. Local parks and open areas are essential for recreation, exercise, and mental wellbeing. Spaces such as Oakwood Park provide opportunities for families, young people, and community groups to access safe outdoor environments close to home. There is also a strong educational and community benefit. The playing fields at Parkview Primary School are a crucial resource for children's physical development and outdoor learning. Protecting surrounding green space ensures that current and future pupils continue to have access to high-quality outdoor environments. Green wedges also play an important role in preventing urban sprawl, maintaining the character of local neighbourhoods, and preserving natural buffers between communities. Once these spaces are lost to development, they cannot easily be replaced. Retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge is therefore a vital long-term decision that protects Derby's environmental heritage and quality of life for residents. For these reasons, I strongly urge Derby City Council to retain the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the Local Plan and continue to protect these important natural and community assets.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
440	484	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I'm emailing regarding the information of the possible traveller site in the Willmorton area to express my deep concern regarding this issue. I'm curious to know whether there has been any consideration to the safety of local children/vunerable young people in the area. [Redacted]. I regret the proposal going forward for this. Can I be made aware of any community meetings that I may attend in relation to this proposal.
441	485	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please accept this email as my official objection letter to the proposed traveller site in Wilmorton Derby.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
276	324	Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Open Space	Oppose	I am writing to object to the proposal within the draft Local Plan to allocate land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon for a development of approximately 400 homes. A development of this size raises serious concerns regarding the capacity of local infrastructure. Schools in the area are already under considerable pressure, and many families experience difficulty securing places for their children at nearby schools. An increase of several hundred homes would inevitably bring a large number of additional families into the area and place further strain on education provision, as well as other local services. In addition, the land around Stoney Lane provides an important open area that contributes to the character of the village and provides accessible countryside for residents. Given the scale of the proposal and the existing pressures on local infrastructure, I believe this site is not suitable for development.

380	428	Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers, Infrastructure	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, [Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
350	397	Housing, Green Wedge, Open Space	Oppose	[Redacted] We chose Oakwood because we love the woods and feel that it makes Oakwood such a special and unique place. It would really be such a shame to lose that area and whilst I understand more housing is needed please do look for alternative solutions and don't let this special place be lost to us all.
393	441	Environment, Flood Risk, Green Wedge	Support	I am writing with regards to local planning for the Oakwood area and the green wedge around the woods. We need to protect this area from development for future generations. Protection ancient woodlands and having a nature corridor to connect to near by farm land. If we have not already learned we most start to acknowledge that we need to long term plan our nature and ability to product our own food to prevent flooding. The fast moving war in the Middle East and Ukraine must be warning signs. Every piece of green space counts even if it is not directly used for food production if is habit for pollinators and other wildlife. Food security flood prevention as well as health benefits both physical and for mental health.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
391	439	Green Wedge	Oppose	In your imminent review of our Local Plan, I am writing strongly to request that the area of land adjacent to Lime Lane – the “Green Wedge” - be preserved as an undeveloped open area. Breadsall Village has suffered from flooding, especially since the earlier development in this area and any further development would only exacerbate the problem. We were assured that Breadsall would not be adversely impacted by the first development on this site. This was not true then, and it is not true now. Also, further development of this area would have a great impact on road safety because of increased traffic at the exit / entrance onto Lime Lane – a narrow lane with a 60mph speed limit which would be very dangerous. In the Green Wedge Review Analysis 2.4, it was stated that “the Green Wedge provides vital flood storage & provides space for water to soak away naturally, reducing the need for engineered drainage”. It’s all too easy for Derby CC to ignore the consequential problems downstream in Breadsall Village. It has previously been said that the Green Wedge serves no meaningful purpose. However, this small important “Green Wedge” is a vital wildlife corridor to and from Chaddesden Wood. This is an ancient oak wood which must not be cut off and surrounded by houses. A previous application to build on this remaining area of Green Wedge was dismissed on the grounds that this land was not suitable for residential development. What has changed? It is still the same land. If it was not suitable then, it is not suitable now and its current status must be preserved in the Local Plan.

348	395	Open Space, Green Wedge, Green Belt, Housing, Transport	Oppose	I would like to make the following comments about the local plan. Paragraph 18 Derby is a compact and centrally oriented city where residential neighbourhoods radiate outwards from the City Centre. In some places, urban growth has progressed towards the city boundary with the addition of relatively new suburbs such as Oakwood and Heatherton. Due to this, the city's Green Belt is largely confined to the northern and eastern boundaries. Green Wedges create natural buffers between communities in the urban landscape to maintain local identities and provide outdoor space proximity. In the part of Littleover that we live we feel the green spaces are disappearing significantly. We had some housing added to the area off Havenbauk avenue/lane past the Leslie Close area. The growth of housing development on the South Derbyshire border - Highfields is impacting the environment and accessibility. Green spaces are not registered with Fields in Trust. Besides the King George V playing field so could be at risk of disappearing. We would like the council to address this. And stop thinking that increasing housing can be done to borders all the time. Paragraph 25 Derby boasts a well-connected railway station, with regular services to significant destinations along the Midlands Main Line (such as London, Nottingham, and Leicester) and beyond (Birmingham, Edinburgh, et cetera). The station also provides connections to smaller regional stations, making Derby a prime location for both commuters and long-distance travellers. East Midlands Airport is located 15 miles to the south-east of Derby, which serves as a gateway for domestic and international travel, as well as a major cargo hub.

				However the links from places like Littleover to the railway station aren't great. Our buses go from Littleover to Gower street or to Derby Bus staton if a V3. once an hour. Which isn't great if you have luggage in tow. So you end up getting an uber which defeats the idea of using public transport. Paragraph 26 Local bus services, operated by Trent Barton and Arriva, ensure connectivity across the city area and with neighbouring towns to converge at the Derby bus station. The city also has a network of designated cycle routes and footpaths. Some of these active travel corridors exist within existing green infrastructure areas, such as Derwent Valley. Some bus stops have automatic signage when the next bus is arriving. But not everyone on the route to the city. Paragraph 28 The 2021 Census This data is probably out of date as more migration happened during the pandemic with a lot of migrant workers from places like Nigeria working in both education, care homes and the local hospital. Paragraph 31 Housing These conditions must be balanced with the priorities of preserving the environment due to its integral role in fulfilling recreational, ecological and neighbourhood distinction features.

				It feels like the area has already been damaged by housing with a massive number of houses built over the last few years. One example is all the farm land on the border of Mickleover towards Etwall. We don't feel the area can cope with any more. Because no new green spaces are being built. The existing facilities are now expected to meet the needs of new dwellings. For example Highfields doesn't have its own green spaces . Whilst we hear that King George V playing fields are being improved when we walk from Littleover to our green spaces there are no toilet facilities. Such as Normanton park. Which should be addressed . Paragraph 37 The Green Belt to the northern and eastern edges of the city exist to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging through urban sprawl and is therefore protected greenfield land. There needs to be more protected greenfield land. We hear more houses are going to be built near Burnaston that will come as far as Staker lane. Where we have floods and lots of traffic chaos due to the local primary school at the hollow at Mickleover and trips to Tesco. Whilst the local government reorganisation isn't due to come into force until 2028. There needs to be things considered in terms of borders. Otherwise the protection of green spaces and traffic chaos won't be fully understood.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				It can be a danger to local residents if we needed an ambulance for an emergency because the area gets enclosed during school opening and closing times. Because Burton Road part of Littleover has 3 schools - Littleover community school, Derby High and Derby Grammar. And then the road up to Mickleover has Brockfield Primary School. We can't cope with any more buildings. Finally I would like to say that with busy lives residents need consultation processes that are easier to read and respond on. I haven't had the chance to fully read this and respond. But appreciate our Litttleover councillors reminding us of the deadline
420	465	Green Wedge	Support	Hi I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the local plan. Green spaces close to where I live are really important to me.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
327	375	Transport	Support	I would like to commend the 'sustainability benefits' of supporting the continuing efforts to reinstate the Derby Canal Route through Derby. In my experience it has been a frequent criticism of the City that it has not fully engaged with the potential of the magnificent River Derwent. The Local Plan should give more recognition to economic and environmental opportunities relating to the River. Derby is fortunate to have a thriving and passionate Canal Society with a multi skilled membership and an accountable ethos. Could the New Local Plan be more supportive please?
325	373	Housing	Oppose	As a local resident I feel that this area should be kept as a green space and made available for the area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
323	371	Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the planning application currently under consideration. Having reviewed the proposal, I do not believe the development is appropriate for this location and I urge the planning authority to refuse permission. My concerns are as follows: • Impact on the local area – The scale and nature of the proposal appears out of character with the surrounding environment and risks changing the character of the area in a way that is not consistent with existing development. • Traffic and access concerns – The proposal is likely to increase vehicle movements in an area that already experiences congestion. This may create additional pressure on local roads and raise safety concerns for residents and pedestrians. • Pressure on local infrastructure – Local services such as parking, public amenities and utilities already operate at capacity. Additional development risks placing further strain on these resources. • Loss of amenity for existing residents – The development may result in increased noise, disturbance, and reduced privacy for nearby properties. Planning decisions should balance development with the interests of existing communities. In this case, the proposal does not appear to provide sufficient benefit to justify the negative impact it may have on the surrounding area. For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

219	265	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
220	266	Green Wedge	Support	am writing to you pledge my support for **the North Oakwood Green Wedge being <u>retained</u> in the Local Plan.** We must protect and nurture these green spaces within our city areas and prevent any future developments from destroying these vital and essential green spaces.
321	369	Housing, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am a local resident and I oppose your plans to build 25+ homes on the above site. It would cause major problems to the local infrastructure which would not be able to cope with additional homes in this area. The site would be better suited for something that would be of benefit to the people who live there already. I hope you take heed to mine and I assume other people's opposition.
318	366	Green Wedge	Support	I support keeping the North Oakwood Greenwedge
317	365	Green Wedge	Support	Please can you make it known that I support the North Oakwood Green Space being retained in the Local Plan.
316	364	Green Wedge	Support	Please can you make it known that I support the North Oakwood Green Space being retained in the Local Plan.
369	417	Green Wedge	Support	I am mailing to say that I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan. Please can you ensure that my opinion and that of many others is represented in any further discussions.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
439	483	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please accept this email as my official objection letter to the proposed traveler's site in wilmorton Derby
345	392	Green Wedge, Housing	Support	Can I please register my objection to any further housing development in the north Oakwood green wedge. The facilities in Oakwood are inadequate already and cannot support further housing.
297	345	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing to inform you of my support for keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge retained in the Local Plan. Chaddesden Wood, the North Field, Parkview Primary's playing field and Oakwood Park must be protected for the benefit of all; both human and animal. Thank you.
410	455	Infrastructure, Transport, Rykneld Road, Housing	Oppose	Because of the house-building at the bottom of Rykneld Road and Pastures Hill the traffic situation is an absolute nightmare. [Redacted] the population has increased by thousands, but the main road through Littleover is still the same now as it was then. It is a dangerous road for school children, with 3 schools on Pastures Hill, and narrow pavements. Maybe you should consider the implications of your future plans, and improve the infrastructure accordingly. A despairing resident
310	358	Green Wedge	Support	I wish to register my support for the Derby City Council Local Plan, retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document.

437	482	Transport, Infrastructure, Environment, Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Hi there, I wish to formally object to the proposal to place a Gypsy/Traveller site near Pride Park, Wilmorton, for the following reasons: 1. Loss of Valuable Green Space The green space proposed for development is an important resource for the wellbeing of the local community. In an already heavily built-up and relatively deprived area, this space provides much-needed greenery and tree cover. The presence of green spaces is well known to have positive impacts on physical and mental wellbeing, particularly in urban environments. Removing this space would reduce the limited natural environment currently available to residents and would negatively affect both the wellbeing of the local community and the overall character and appearance of the area. Green spaces such as this, along with the nearby park, are vital in helping balance the density of surrounding development. 2. Impact on Local Regeneration The Pride Park side of Wilmorton and Alvaston has undergone significant regeneration in recent years, particularly with the development of new businesses, amenities on Pride Park, and the City Point estate. These developments have helped improve an area i.e towards alvaston and adjacent to omaston/allenton areas that has experienced higher levels of deprivation. Introducing this site in the proposed location risks undermining the positive progress that has been made and may negatively affect the continued improvement and perception of the local area. 3. Concerns Regarding Community Safety and Antisocial Behaviour

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Residents in this area already experience higher levels of crime and antisocial behaviour compared with some other parts of the city. There is understandable concern within the local community that the proposed development could potentially increase these issues further, and place additional strain on local resources and policing. 4. Impact on Property Value There is concern that the proposed development could have a negative impact on local property values. Residents who have invested in homes in this area may experience unfair financial loss as a result 5. Inadequate Community Notification and Consultation I do not believe that the local community has been adequately informed about this proposal or given a fair opportunity to respond. [Redacted], I did not receive any direct communication or notification of this proposal by post. I only became aware of the plan after seeing a brief article in the Derby newspaper online and through a local Facebook group. These methods cannot reasonably be considered sufficient for informing residents who will be directly affected by the proposal Local residents should have been properly notified and consulted so that they could fully understand the proposal and provide their views. For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to the proposed development and request that these concerns be fully considered during the decision-making process.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
309	357	Green Wedge	Support	I wish to register my support for the Derby City Council Local Plan, retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document.
376	424	Community Facilities, Transport, Housing	Oppose	I am emailing with my concerns about above development. • Impact of traffic on the local road, Spondon already suffers with heavy congestion at peak times. • Impact on local primary care, current GP surgeries need expanding. • Impact of primary and secondary school, current school need expanding. • Lack of direct bus service into Derby for this area of Spondon, new bus service needed or return of Spondon flyer. • Impact on wildlife, due to destruction of trees and hedge rows and loss of green belt land. • Increased risk of flooding due to building on green space. • Increased risk of general litter due poor human behaviour. Increased speeding of local roads due increased traffic. I objection to above development due to the above reasons.

436	481	Transport, Infrastructure, Environment, Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Hi, Further to my email yesterday, I realised I should put more reasons. Dear Planning Policy Team, Re: Subject: OBJECTION tor Allocation of Land West of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton for a Gypsy and Traveller Site I wish to formally object to the proposal to place a Gypsy/Traveller site near Pride Park, Wilmorton, for the following reasons: 1. Loss of Valuable Green Space The green space proposed for development is an important resource for the wellbeing of the local community. In an already heavily built-up and relatively deprived area, this space provides much-needed greenery and tree cover. The presence of green spaces is well known to have positive impacts on physical and mental wellbeing, particularly in urban environments. Removing this space would reduce the limited natural environment currently available to residents and would negatively affect both the wellbeing of the local community and the overall character and appearance of the area. Green spaces such as this, along with the nearby park, are vital in helping balance the density of surrounding development. 2. Impact on Local Regeneration The Pride Park side of Wilmorton and Alvaston has undergone significant regeneration in recent years, particularly with the development of new businesses, amenities on Pride Park, and the City Point estate. These developments have helped improve an area i.e towards alvaston and adjacent to osmaston/allenton areas that has experienced higher levels of deprivation. Introducing this site in the proposed location risks undermining the positive progress that has been made and may negatively affect the continued improvement and perception of the local area.

				3. Concerns Regarding Community Safety and Antisocial Behaviour Residents in this area already experience higher levels of crime and antisocial behaviour compared with some other parts of the city. There is understandable concern within the local community that the proposed development could potentially increase these issues further, and place additional strain on local resources and policing. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Additionally pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents. 4. Impact on Property Values There is concern that the proposed development could have a negative impact on local property values. Residents who have invested in homes in this area may experience unfair financial loss as a result. Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. 5. Impact on traffic and congestion will make the area more dangerous. Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. 6. Inadequate Community Notification and Consultation

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I do not believe that the local community has been adequately informed about this proposal or given a fair opportunity to respond. [Resident], I did not receive any direct communication or notification of this proposal by post. I only became aware of the plan after seeing a brief article in the Derby newspaper online and through a local Facebook group. These methods cannot reasonably be considered sufficient for informing residents who will be directly affected by the proposal. Local residents should have been properly notified and consulted so that they could fully understand the proposal and provide their views. For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to the proposed development and request that these concerns be fully considered during the decision-making process.
307	355	Green Wedge	Support	I believe today may be the last day for commenting on Derby's Local Plan. I hope you will accept this short email in support of the plan to keep the North Oakwood Green Wedge. [Redacted]. This will mean keeping the North Field free of husing development, as well as Parkview Primary School's Playing Fields and Oakwood Park from future development - great community assets for the people of Oakwood, Derby and beyond.
258	305	Green Wedge	Support	I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan! I am keen to see the land north of chaddesden wood be protected from development.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
259	306	Green Wedge	Support	I am very pleased to read that the green wedge on land north of Chaddesden Wood is not included as a development location and the green wedge status is proposed to remain. Therefore, I support the Derby City Council local plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
468	493	Housing	Oppose	Lots of words here and throughout the document about the importance of green space, green wedge, how pivotal they are for ecosystems, biodiversity, climate control, protected green space etc The Moorway Lane development: In the section towards the end re planning, with the maps, the 335 housing units for which planning permission has been applied, is clearly designated and marked as an 'allocation' for development, though it is acknowledged as green wedge/space/gap. That sounds like a done deal, and is news to Blagreaves residents. Has planning consent been granted? If so, what was the point of consulting us? There is no evidence at all of significantly improved infrastructure in the plans, apart from suggesting widening of Moorway Lane where the two yellow arrows are. I and others have submitted detailed considerations as to how this development will adversely affect traffic in the area, which is already gridlocked twice daily, especially during school terms. Has any councillor been on Blagreaves Lane/Moorway Lane/feeder roads to Blagreaves Lane at these times? Have these submissions been a waste of time, if this 'allocation' is already built into the plan, and assumed to be going ahead?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
469	493	Historic Environment	Oppose	The historic environment will be protected. Not much evidence of this to date, though I would hope it will be in future. The Hippodrome and the house at the top of Queen St, where Wright of Derby died and Smith's clocks used to be, both highly significant buildings in Derby's history, have been allowed to rot. The Assembly Rooms have also been allowed to deteriorate since the fire, and are now planned for demolition. Would the plan allow such buildings to be 'protected'?

470	493	City Centre	Oppose	3.2 City Centre specific vision 55 No – ref the Eagle Market and Guildhall Market. In the city centre there are too many nail bars, fast-food outlets and street food stalls (all countering the aim to make people healthy), barbers, coffee shops etc. No further planning permission should be granted for any of this type of premises. Former Eagle Market: padel/squash courts have only had 3-4 people playing on the whole lot every time I have walked past. A waste of space on what used to be a market. Where do you propose a market should go in the city? Markets always attract visitors. At present, for a decent market one has to go to Alvaston (two bus rides each way) or Burton, Loughborough, Chesterfield… Too many new buildings in Derby are straight up and down, unimaginatively symmetrical and bland, with no redeeming features and completely out of sympathy with Derby's 18th century heritage. An 8-year-old could be more imaginative with a Lego kit. The proposals for the Market Place are a case in point. Unimaginative, straight up-and-down. Same is true of the development where Debenham's used to be. The Market Place fountain was never attractive: it faces the wrong way, is ugly and clunky, doesn't work, gets in the way and should be demolished.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				The plan for a typically bland tower block in close proximity to the historic medieval Cathedral tower, Grade 1* listed, permission granted, is an act of cultural vandalism, and an absolute case in point. The Vaillant block is similar; and it is inaccessible/unsafe for elderly non-drivers in the evening: the Wardwick is not a place where one can feel safe on foot after dark. There is no really striking modern building in Derby apart from QUAD. The Council House and old magistrates' court buildings are impressive from an earlier era, as are the current magistrates' court on St Mary's Gate. But the University Law School and Cavendish Building designs are out of place in their surroundings, and in no way complement each other. The nearby student blocks on Agard St are likewise bland and boring architecturally. Planning seems to be granted for any number of these blocks regardless of their geographical context in the city. Friar Gate, on the other hand, is beautiful – Does the specific vision include making the pavements safe? I'm very fit and well, but have tripped on protruding paving stones and fallen over three times to date, damaging clothes, bruising badly, and the last time needing to go to A&E for an X-ray to check on a head injury and broken bones. In a fully inclusive city accessible to all generations and mobilities, this will need to be addressed as a basic, but pavements appear nowhere.

465	21	Policy EN 1	Neutral	I am dismayed that Saved Policy L9 of the City of Derby Local Plan Review is not carried forward to the draft Local Plan for Derby. Canals and active waterways have considerable environmental, social and economic benefits. A) Environmental & Climate Change- i) Canals provide enhanced biodiversity through the provision of a water-based habitat for wildlife and plants; water-based habitats capable of enhancement are scarce and a restored canal could be capable of compensation for aiding developments elsewhere. ii) They can contribute to mitigating climate change by their cooling effect, use for flood and surface water run off storage, and can provide low carbon emission energy through the thermal energy of the water and at new locks with hydro-electric power. B) Health and Well Being Iii) Access to blue spaces has been proven to reduce stress, improve moods and thereby benefit public health. Iv) They are good for encouraging physical activity in a pleasant, vibrant and flat space for walking, running, wheeling and cycling. V) They create good spaces for recreation including boating, fishing and volunteering and providing links to the countryside. C) Economic value

				Vi) Canals provide a traffic free sustainable Active Travel route for walking, cycling etc. Vii) Canals increase tourism with the corresponding boost to the local economy. Viii) Studies show that canals enhance property values and boost local business and can be a catalyst for urban regeneration. D) Cultural and Archaeology benefits Ix) Restoration preserves the historical, industrial and cultural aspects of canal archaeology. The restoration of the canal will contribute to many of the proposed policies. In more detail, In Policy EN1 (Green & Blue Infrastructure) I would request an inclusion to restoring blue infrastructure such as canals and the benefits to habitat creation and mitigating the effects of climate change, such as in energy creation and flood drainage. Also to promote and safeguard use of the river in addition to a restored canal for navigation purposes. This is important should the aspiration to remove weirs not allow for such navigation. A restored canal will add to biodiversity. Policy T4 (Protected Routes) refers to protecting the route of the Former Derby Canal for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. I would request in 'b' to add "Route of the Former and restored Derby Canal". This is important is considered important to protect the new section between Megaloughton Lane and the former canal route at Wilmorton. Policy E7 (Indurent Park) I would ask for an additional point in the supporting text that a route for the restored canal proposal has been protected. The planning permission for the development indicated such a route and consequently I

				understand it is suitable for inclusion. With respect to the City Centre and Riverside in particular, the canal trust has discussed proposals with the Council and in these it is supported by design groups at the University of Derby. The Trust is keen to progress the improvement of the Riverside to make it a more attractive and vibrant location similar to that in other cities rather than historically where the city has turned its back on the river. These proposals have included creating mooring for visiting boats, marinas and for semi-permanent mooring for boats offering tourism services such as food and drink outlets. The proposals also envisage creating a lock in the weir to enable boats from a restored canal to access the City Centre via the river. Suggested additions would include encouraging active use of the river for boating purposes and associated bankside activities. These aspects are considered relevant to encourage and stimulate an attractive and vibrant riverside. In association with this, policies CC5 (Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities) and CC12 (Derby Riverside) reference to the canal trust's intentions could be added. Policy CC5 could, I would request have a reference to riverside improvements. CC12 would benefit from a reference to creating a vibrant riverside frontage including proposals based on the use of the river and its banks for leisure, culture and tourism. Paragraph 749 could include a reference based on the Trust's and University's support for developing riverside facilities. Making the riverside more attractive for leisure and tourism can be assisted by the canal trust. In conclusion, I would request recreating CDLP Policy L9 in the new plan and for the recommendations indicated above. In terms of being capable of implementation, the Derby and Sandiacre Trust has credibilty in achieving projects such as the successful Derby Riverboat, canal cottages at Draycott, restoration of some sections of canal such as at Spondon and Draycott and with work being carried out other locations.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
450	487	City Centre	Support	City Centre In general, I support the city centre proposals especially with respect to increased residential uses, limited or no parking and promoting sustainable and active travel into the centre and promoting the vibrancy of a redefined centre.

471	493	Environment	Oppose	If developers are to contribute positively to the built environment, they must be legally obliged to build roads, footpaths, schools, community and social centres, medical centres and surgeries, worship buildings (like the Multi-Faith Centre in the University grounds at Kedleston Road, a building can be such as to accommodate all faiths), and not be allowed to get away with failing to do so either at the planning stage or by claiming unviability after building has begun. None of these is proposed for the Moorway Lane site as far as I can see. I'm not familiar with any other 'allocated' sites. Summary: My experience of living in Derby so far leads me to believe that though there are many fine words in this document they are unlikely to result in much improvement. Developers have deep pockets and much power. Profit is the motive: cities like Derby are very deprived of funds. Few Derby city centre developments in my time have been noteworthy. The steel rings at the Spot are a case in point – they are intrusive and pointless, adding nothing. The Castleward development is an excellent practical use of brownfield land, as is the London Road development on the old RDH site, but not architecturally arresting. Too many new housing estates such as Wragley Way are characterless, with the same few designs repeated with the same features and materials used throughout – and from estate to estate. It is now less than an hour to midnight on Monday March 9th. There is no time for more before the deadline.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
472	494	Housing, Stoney Lane, Green Belt, Flood Risk, Infrastructure	Oppose	The land gets extremely boggy and Spondon is prone to flooding. The traffic at this moment is unable to cope at peak times as is evident for residents heading to and from work in the mornings and evenings, this will cause much more congestion and pollution. Spondon is already losing green space to Erewash. Wildlife – especially Bats and Owls which have been observed. The infrastructure is already at breaking point with local GP surgeries struggling to offer appointments within a timely manner. Schools are oversubscribed and will struggle to accommodate more children. It is not possible at this time to get an NHS dentist in Spondon – this will result in more people needing additional – out of area – private services. The public transport service in Spondon hasd significantly diminished over th years meaning that more residents will need to rely on cars further polluting and adding to the congestion of the village. This is green belt land which is essential for wildlife and mental well being. What are the developers track records at delivering “Affordable Homes” Not Dwellings?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
449	487	Green Wedge	Oppose	Policy EN5 Green Belt and EN6 Green Wedge. I support the protection of the Green Belt and Green Wedge but disagree with and object to the loss of and reclassification of Gravel Pit Lane as Grey Belt.
448	487	Policy EN 1	Oppose	Environment Policy EN1 Green and Blue Infrastructure Insufficient attention has been paid in the past to the attractiveness of the river and other watercourses and its banks. Historically, the river was navigable, and I would like to see this reintroduced. Riverside walks are important to public health and quality of the city. There is a path along the west banks but not enough on the east banks. This could be added to the policies.

447	487	Housing	Oppose	Housing H1Housing Delivery & H2 General Criteria In general, new developments should be approved only based on sustainable transport and active travel provision rather than new road infrastructure. New developments should be built at higher densities, of say 50 dwellings per hectare and with a preponderance of three stories, where appropriate visually, with solar panels and other carbon neutral measures and with sustainable drainage. Preference in the policies should be given to the re-use of existing buildings, under-used buildings and brownfield sites. New housing should always include mitigation for climate change and if viability is argued, the development should not be approved. Policy H4 Affordable Housing The inclusion of 40% affordable housing in Green Belt would appear to imply acceptance of development in the Green Belt! Despite the Government's push on numbers of housing, affordable housing targets should be adhered to, in my opinion. With respect to the housing allocations within the city: Policy HA2 Brook Farm – I think the section east from the western boundary of the school is not appropriate for development for the reason that the site slopes down steeply away from the existing housing to its south to the brook and its visual impact in the Green Wedge is, therefore, more pronounced.

				Policy HA4 Royal Hill Road, Spondon In terms of the draft Local plan, I can only comment that the Council's decision to refuse planning permission on Green Wedge and traffic arguments was correct and that the Inspector's decision was misguided and influenced by unfortunate Government policy. Policy HA7 Stoney Lane, Spondon. I object to this proposal on the grounds that: The removal of this site from Green Belt is not acceptable in Green Belt terms because there is not a sufficient clear or sustainable demarcation between it and the rest of the Green Belt to the east. The City Council's boundary is not visually prominent at all here. Moreover, Erewash Borough Council is under extreme pressure to release sites since it withdrew its core strategy and land adjoining the western boundary of Ockbrook and Borrowash has already had planning proposals submitted. If these go ahead the gap between Spondon and Borrowash will be significantly reduced in this sensitive area. Secondly, in addition to the 400 dwellings proposed here, Spondon is already being besieged by housing proposals with 240 dwellings at Spondon Wood, 90 dwellings at Royal Hill Road, pressures on Locko Road for 250 dwellings and 200 dwellings at Acorn Way. Spondon has only one main access out to go towards Derby which is via a residential street which already suffers from excess traffic. There is also the impact on overstretched facilities such as doctors and schools, and the retail centre suffers environmentally from too much traffic. These developments will unacceptably make these aspects worse. Thirdly, the access out onto Stoney Lane is close to the exit from the A52 which has a short deceleration lane with vehicles travelling at a fast speed around the bend onto Stoney Lane. Access onto the A52 to go east will be more difficult with 400 odd houses discharging up to 800 vehicles (assuming two car usage per dwelling) onto Stoney Lane.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Fourthly, Stoney Lane is an unsuitable residential street not suited to the additional traffic from this development. The site is also not on a bus route and cycle links from the site are non-existent. HA12 North of Sinfin Moor Lane. A suitable addition could be “and the route of the Derby and Sandiacre Canal which is now a multi-user route and proposed canal restoration, to the west.”

463	490	Environment, Flood Risk, Green Wedge	Oppose	I wish to, again, formally & strongly object to the Oakwood "Green Wedge" being used for building. As per my earlier objections, I am objecting to any development of the "Green Wedge", permission having been refused or withdrawn in earlier years. Breadsall Village has continued to suffer from flooding since the last application in 2024 and any further development of this area will exacerbate the problem. We were assured that Breadsall would not be adversely impacted by the first development on this site. This was not true then, and it is not true now. Development of this area would have a great impact on road safety because of increased traffic at the exit / entrance onto Lime Lane – a narrow lane with a 60mph speed limit which would be very dangerous. In the Green Wedge Review Analysis 2.4, you state that "the Green Wedge provides vital flood storage & provides space for water to soak away naturally, reducing the need for engineered drainage". You then state that this Green Wedge is in EA Flood Zone 1 & is therefore at the lowest risk of flooding. True, but you omit to add that the planned discharge of water into a private, unnamed drain on Lime Lane plus the concreting over of the Green Wedge must increase the risk of flooding in Breadsall Village which seriously increased after 2016 and the first development. It's all too easy for Derby CC to ignore the consequential problems downstream in Breadsall Village. It has previously been said that the Green Wedge serves no meaningful purpose. However, this small important "Green Wedge" is a vital wildlife corridor to and from Chaddesden Wood. This is an ancient oak wood which must not be cut off and surrounded by houses.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				A previous application to build on this remaining area of Green Wedge was dismissed on the grounds that this land was not suitable for residential development. What has changed? It is still the same land. If it was not suitable then, it is not suitable now. A further application for development was refused by you in 2023. Again, what has changed? The Labour Government has stated that "grey" land should be built on first. I am sure that there are many areas of "grey" land in Derby City with amenities already there, which could be utilised first. Have you considered this? The building of houses on the Green Wedge will have a severe and negative impact on the Chaddesden Wood which is in a Conservation Area and must be protected. I therefore feel strongly that this Green Wedge area must be preserved.
460	328	Transport	Support	• I support the provision of facilities such as cycle stands and sheltered stores being built for pedal cyclists to travel and park across the city • I support any extension of the Nottingham Trams system being built towards and into parts of Derby City • I support the continued operation of the Red Arrow bus service between Derby and Nottingham, in particular the 24-hour provision on Fridays and Saturdays.

446	487	Transport	Neutral	Transport and Movement I support a shift to sustainable transport and away from car-borne dependency which is urgently needed. I support the greening of the Inner Ring Road and would like to see better cycling segregated paths within it even when that reduces carriageway width for motorised vehicles. I agree with the initiatives in Policy T2 on Transport Infrastructure except for the implementation of the A38 scheme in its current form. The creation of a motorway style and width through this part of Derby and especially in the Markeaton Park area will have disastrous environmental implications through the loss of valuable trees and wildlife, considerable disruption during the lengthy construction period and, as indicated in section 637, 'Traditional approaches that depend on expanding on car-centric infrastructure only serve to perpetuate car dependency, congestion, environmental and health harms…' Additionally, the costs have rocketed to £600 million which will not prove to be value for money. This funding would provide significant benefit for active travel, public transport and would be better directed to the electrification of the Midland Main Line. Whilst this scheme is not a Council scheme, reference to it should be omitted, especially as pressure should be put on the National Government to drop it. I agree with the restriction of parking for developments in the city centre and promoting alternative sustainable transport to the centre. As suggested elsewhere by me, the benefits of canal restoration are considerable and a reference to that in 'Protected Routes' in addition to walking, wheeling and cycling is requested.

475	497	Infrastructure	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] regarding the interaction between the emerging Local Plan and the National Grid Chesterfield to Willington 400kV transmission project, which is currently in Stage 2 consultation. Residents are concerned that the proposed development associated with Infinity Garden Village and the wider Southern Derby growth area may be constraining potential infrastructure corridors closer to the A50. This appears to be resulting in the transmission route being positioned closer to existing rural homes, heritage assets and farmland in the Lowes Lane area. The currently proposed alignment places pylons extremely close to a cluster of residential properties, including the Grade II listed Lowes Farmhouse and associated farm buildings, within a historic agricultural landscape that also includes recorded archaeological features and rural tourism uses such as Hill Farm Camping and Caravan Park. Residents have prepared a Route Optimisation Review which identifies potential alternatives that could reduce these impacts while remaining technically feasible. This document is currently in draft form but is being submitted to help illustrate the potential interaction between the emerging Local Plan and the National Grid consultation process. Given that the Local Plan consultation closes today and the National Grid Stage 2 consultation remains ongoing, residents considered it important to submit these observations at this stage to ensure that the potential planning interaction between the two processes is recognised. In particular, the draft review highlights the potential to align transmission infrastructure alongside the A50 transport corridor near the clay shooting ground and telecommunications mast, on the Derby side toward Sinfin and Infinity Park. This area already contains major transport and industrial infrastructure and may represent a more appropriate corridor for large scale electricity transmission infrastructure than the current alignment through a rural residential setting. Residents fully recognise the importance of delivering both housing growth and nationally significant electricity infrastructure. However, there is concern that the emerging Local Plan may unintentionally be displacing infrastructure into more sensitive rural locations. Residents would therefore welcome clarification from the Planning Policy team on the following points: • Whether the proposed Infinity Garden Village and wider Local Plan allocations are influencing infrastructure corridor considerations for the National Grid project. • • Whether Derby City Council is engaging with National Grid to ensure that housing growth and nationally significant energy infrastructure are being coordinated strategically. •

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				• Whether infrastructure corridors alongside existing transport and employment areas, such as the A50 corridor and Infinity Park industrial area, have been considered as part of this wider planning context. Residents would welcome reassurance that the Draft Local Plan and associated development proposals are being coordinated with nationally significant infrastructure projects in a way that minimises impacts on existing rural communities, heritage assets, agricultural land and local businesses. We recognise that the Infinity Garden Village and wider Southern Derby development proposals represent a significant and potentially prosperous investment for the city. However, where strategic housing growth and nationally significant infrastructure intersect, it may be appropriate to consider enhanced mitigation measures in particularly sensitive locations. In this context, residents would encourage consideration of solutions such as the use of modern T-pylon tower designs or selective underground cabling at key locations, where this could help ensure that both the Local Plan development objectives and the National Grid transmission project can be delivered while protecting existing rural landscapes, heritage assets and residential communities. Given the interaction between the emerging Local Plan allocations and the National Grid Chesterfield to Willington transmission project, residents would also welcome assurance that these matters are being considered in coordination with relevant infrastructure stakeholders.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
459	328	Housing	Support	• I support prioritisation of, and investment in, brownfield sites across the city being redeveloped for other use, including housing • I support town planning measures to ensure that all residential developments, particularly newly-and recently-built ones, have access to a bus stop
473	495	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I just want to raise my objection to the planned travellers site in Wilmorton, the area is already badly neglected and brought down by numerous rental properties and HOUSE. This will just be another nail in the coffin of what was once a lovely place to live
458	328	Green Wedge	Support	Please let it be recorded that, in relation to the Local Plan consultation in 2026 [Redacted]: • I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan
457	488	Transport	Neutral	T2 Given the massive increase in cost for the A38 scheme, the considerable and increasing local opposition, and the knowledge of the massive carbon emissions which will result, the Council should now, at last, oppose it and not incorporate it in the Plan. Its implementation is certainly at odds with the requirement to respond to the climate emergency. It will result inevitably in a great increase in traffic and emissions. T? More specific measures need to be found to reduce private vehicle mileage – a large cause of GHG emissions.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
456	488	Climate	Neutral	CL1 When developments are agreed, it isn't clear how issues of surface flooding affecting new builds will be identified and permission refused if necessary, with the increasing risks of storms, persistent heavy rain and resultant flooding. As I understand the Environment Agency only advises about flooding from natural water courses. Should householders have better guidance and enforcement on managing their land appropriately? CL3 and CL4 Here and elsewhere in the draft plan, there seems to be a big emphasis on 'heritage'. This is all very well BUT this priority should now be considerably down from that of climate. CL5 A lot of what developers ' should do' and 'be conscious of' but how do we ensure that they aren't much more aware of their profits than of the environmental quality of the finished product? On embodied carbon - bringing down the Assembly Rooms instead of repurposing the building will be a big carbon emitter.
455	488	Environment	Neutral	EN8 To help biodiversity can householders be strongly advised to manage their gardens with biodiversity and/or food growing in mind? (no artificial grass and too much paving!) EN22 Particularly poor Air quality from traffic congestion isn't featured – for example the school run issues, with engine idling and traffic jams, need to be dealt with. Safe Havens exist but only cover a small percentage of schools.
454	488	Housing	Neutral	H2 Can the Council adequately enforce the agreed conditions on the developers , especially in this fevered hasty creation of new builds? Or will there be plenty of new housing which isn't up to the sustainability/other standards because of lack of council staff resource? EN8 To help biodiversity can householders be strongly advised to manage their gardens with biodiversity and/or food growing in mind? (no artificial grass and too much paving!)

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
453	488	Environment	Neutral	**General overarching comments -** My comments all relate to and arise from my concern that everything possible should be done to both mitigate and adapt to the continually accelerating climate and nature crises. All scientific thinking on this is emphasising the extreme dangers which face us very soon. It is clear that many measures which will need to be taken will not be popular, mainly because the general population are not yet in possession of the full facts about these dangers. Because of this, I think that the role of communications by the Council to the public is going to be extremely important but this aspect of future planning doesn't feature largely within this draft plan. I note that there is a section to specifically address climate issues and that mention of climate issues does occur in other sections. However to show that the climate and nature crises must now be the chief considerations in all decision making at all levels of government and in all areas of policy, would it not be better to keep that focus throughout and not as a separate section? Why is transport not mentioned within the Climate section since transport is a very large percentage of the city's greenhouse gas emissions?
401	447	Green Wedge	Support	I would like to inform you that I strongly support the North Oakwood Green wedge being retained in the local plan.
399	445	Green Wedge	Support	This is an email to state I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan. [Redacted]. I would hate to see our ancient woodlands die off due to being boxed in with another housing estate.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
364	412	Environment, Housing, Community Facilities, Open Space	Oppose	[Redacted], I would implore the council to reconsider its proposal for 25+ new dwellings and to actively explore opportunities for adding and enhancing community facilities for the current community. The area is already densely populated and deprived. There is a distinct lack of community facilities and green space that is both accessible and safe. Attention to growing the current community, investing in local opportunities, increasing a sense of belonging and improving wellbeing are all vital for this area of Derby. Rather than further housing and population growth, this area would benefit from investment in facilities that are both affordable and locally available, and that strengthen the current local community, which includes multiple local schools. I strongly believe that a more positive and holistically beneficial use of this land ought to be considered more fully before current proposals move any further forward. The existing proposal offers minimal gain for the area, only serving to offer a small number of houses in an area already lacking in other vital community facilities and space. Many thanks in advance for your consideration of this. I would be glad to offer further construction contributions to aid discussions moving forward. Please find my details below.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
365	413	Housing, Stoney Lane, Transport, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am writing to register my objection to the proposed housing allocation on land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon. While I recognise the need for new housing, the scale of development proposed in this location appears disproportionate to the capacity of the village to accommodate it. Many residents commute daily and already experience significant congestion when travelling through Spondon and accessing main roads. Peak-time traffic can be extremely slow, and the addition of hundreds of new homes would inevitably worsen these problems. The land identified for development also forms an important part of the open landscape surrounding the village and is regularly used by residents for walking and recreation. The combination of increased traffic, pressure on infrastructure and the loss of open countryside raises serious concerns about the suitability of this site for such a large development. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reconsider this allocation.
367	415	Green Wedge	Support	Further to the consultation meeting held last year regarding the proposed development of Land North of Chaddesden Wood, I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. Please keep me informed of any developments.

352	399	Housing, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane, Green Wedge, Transport	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the planning application currently under consideration in relation to Policy HA7 at Stoney Lane, Spondon. My concerns are outlined below: **Traffic and Access Issues** The development is likely to generate additional vehicle movements in an area that already experiences congestion. This increase in traffic could place further pressure on local roads and raise safety concerns for residents, cyclists, and pedestrians. **Pressure on Local Infrastructure** Local infrastructure and services, including parking availability, public amenities, and utilities, already operate under significant demand. Additional development would risk placing further strain on these limited resources. **Loss of Amenity for Existing Residents** The proposed development may negatively affect nearby residents through increased noise, disturbance, and a potential reduction in privacy for neighbouring properties. Planning decisions should carefully balance the need for development with the interests and wellbeing of existing communities. In this instance, the proposal does not appear to provide sufficient benefit to outweigh the potential negative impacts on the surrounding area. Particularly when consideration is given to the other developments in spondon currently going through planning. For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that the planning application be refused.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
395	443	Green Wedge	Support	I would like to inform you that I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan.
394	442	Green Wedge	Support	Please take this as an objection for any future planning permission keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge. This is the heart of Oakwood and why it makes it so attractive to live in the first place. To even request planning permission on an ancient woodland area shows the true disregard for any understanding of what the residents want. This has been an integral part of Oakwood since built and should remain just that

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
392	440	Infrastructure, Green Belt, Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I would like to formally object to the proposal within the draft Local Plan to allocate land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon for a housing development of around 400 dwellings. The land identified forms part of the Green Belt and has historically been regarded as unsuitable for development. The purpose of the Green Belt is to protect open countryside and maintain clear boundaries between settlements. Allowing housing on this site would undermine those principles. The fields along Stoney Lane are an important part of the village landscape and contribute significantly to the character of Spondon. Developing them would represent a substantial expansion of the village and a permanent loss of open countryside. There are also understandable concerns about the ability of local infrastructure to cope with a development of this size. Increased traffic, pressure on schools and demands on healthcare services would all be likely consequences. In addition to these planning concerns, the land is widely used by residents as a place to walk and enjoy the outdoors. Losing this amenity would have a negative impact on the local community. For these reasons, I strongly urge the Council to reconsider this allocation and remove the site from the Local Plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
390	438	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I've read through the draft local plan for Derby and despite trying many times I have been unable to either login or create an account and have therefore been unable to send any comments. Whether this is too late for consideration or not I still want to express my opposition to the proposal to allocate land west of Pride Parkway as a gypsy and traveller site. We have had travellers setting up sites illegally around the Alvaston/Wilmorton area over recent years so we fully understand the detrimental effect they have on the surrounding area. You may think that if a designated site is set aside for them that they will instinctively look after the site but this is a naive view. Consider how much this will cost the Council in terms of clearing away all the rubbish that might be generated, dealing with any complaints that could arise, and alienating the local residents with the resultant loss of votes. Whether this decision is influenced by the Government or not, surely it's time for you to listen to the local people and and act accordingly.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
374	422	Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	I am writing to express my strong concerns about this proposed development. The loss of greenbelt land is deeply worrying. Spondon is steadily losing its natural boundaries and risks merging further into Borrowash and Ockbrook, just as it has with Chaddesden. This erosion of green space also threatens vital wildlife habitats that cannot be replaced once lost. Traffic and road safety are already significant issues on Stoney Lane and Sandringham Drive, with high volumes of cars, poor parking, and frequent speeding. Adding further housing will only intensify these problems. The proposed access point so close to the A52 raises additional safety concerns. Spondon's roads are already struggling with current traffic levels, even before considering the number of housing developments already approved. The area risks becoming completely gridlocked, increasing pollution, road rage, and daily disruption for residents. Local services are also under severe strain. It is already extremely difficult to get a GP appointment, with many residents being redirected to 111 or walk-in centres — a system that is not working. There are also no NHS dentists in the area accepting new patients. Adding hundreds more residents without expanding essential services will only worsen an already unsustainable situation. For these reasons, I strongly object to the development in its current form. I feel that this development needs to be looked at as part of the bigger picture taking the many already approved developments into account.
322	370	Green Wedge	Support	I support the North Oakwood Green wedge being retained in the Derby local plan. This is essential to help ensure the survival of the ancient woodland and also other green spaces in oakwood.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
320	368	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

389	437	Community Facilities, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries
230	277	Green Wedge	Support	I support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge
315	362	Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am emailing today to confirm that I do not support the planned houses at the rear of Stoney Lane, Spondon, re: Policy HA7: Stoney Lane, Spondon & Green Wedge/Green Belt Allocation I live at [Redacted], so these new houses will significantly impact the area I chose to live. When [Redacted], one thing that really sold it to me was having a wealth of fields nearby for me to walk in when I need to be in nature. [Redacted] since living here, I have spent many hours in them, and would be very sad to see them go. Recently, the earlier a52 junction was closed, and so everyone entering Spondon had to use the slip road at the end of Stoney Lane. The traffic and constant cars up and down this road was significantly increased, so much so it took a long time for everyone to leave their drives and move up and down the road. Having the estate at the bottom of the road would only increase this. Spondon cannot handle all of these new estates being built. We are a small village. We only have a few primary schools, one secondary school, two doctors surgeries and two dentists. We also only have two small areas of shops with very minimal parking. Where are the proposals for building more of these amenities for the people of Spondon? [Redacted], it makes me very anxious for the future if I needed to access the doctors or any other service with so many extra families living here. To reiterate, I am vehemently opposed to any houses being built at the rear of Stoney Lane in Spondon.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
233	280	Green Wedge	Support	I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local plan.
235	282	Green Wedge, Environment, Green Belt	Support	I write with regard to the the proposal to keep green wedge/belts and our wildlife protected. I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document Without this protection, the wood will end up completely surrounded by houses and the biodiversity would crumble. Derby exists surrounded by and containing so much beauty. Let's not lose what makes us special and become a concrete jungle.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
314	363	Open Space, Infrastructure, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to object to the proposal to allocate land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon for a large housing development under the draft Local Plan. This site lies within the Green Belt and has previously been identified as unsuitable for housing. The purpose of the Green Belt is to protect open countryside and maintain the character of settlements, and developing this land would undermine those objectives. There are also serious concerns about the ability of local infrastructure to support a development of this scale. Schools in the area are already heavily oversubscribed, and many families struggle to secure places for their children at local schools. The addition of hundreds of new homes would inevitably increase this pressure. The open land along Stoney Lane also provides an important recreational space for residents and helps preserve the rural setting of the village. For these reasons, I strongly believe that allocating this land for development would be a mistake and urge the Council to reconsider this proposal.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
312	360	Open Space, Infrastructure, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to object to the proposal to allocate land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon for a large housing development under the draft Local Plan. This site lies within the Green Belt and has previously been identified as unsuitable for housing. The purpose of the Green Belt is to protect open countryside and maintain the character of settlements, and developing this land would undermine those objectives. There are also serious concerns about the ability of local infrastructure to support a development of this scale. Schools in the area are already heavily oversubscribed, and many families struggle to secure places for their children at local schools. The addition of hundreds of new homes would inevitably increase this pressure. The open land along Stoney Lane also provides an important recreational space for residents and helps preserve the rural setting of the village. For these reasons, I strongly believe that allocating this land for development would be a mistake and urge the Council to reconsider this proposal.

241	288	Gypsies And Travellers, Community Facilities, Open Space, Infrastructure	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not

				demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
361	409	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing with regard to the local plan. I am strongly in support of retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge. This area is essential for the health and wellbeing of local residents. This is an area that is well used and greatly appreciated. Please ensure it is retained in the local plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
245	293	Stoney Lane, Housing, Green Belt, Infrastructure	Oppose	[Redacted] formally object to the proposed allocation of land east of Stoney Lane (site DER/0025) for a development of approximately 400 homes. The land in question sits within the Green Belt and has previously been identified as unsuitable for residential development. The purpose of the Green Belt is to protect open countryside and prevent urban sprawl, and it is difficult to understand why this protection is now being reconsidered without clear justification. The open fields along Stoney Lane form an important part of the landscape surrounding Spondon and provide a natural boundary between the village and the countryside. Losing this land would significantly change the character of the area and remove an important green space that residents value. I am also extremely concerned about the impact on traffic. Anyone who lives in Spondon knows how difficult it already is to get in and out of the village at peak times, particularly via Willowcroft Road, whereby in a morning it can take over 30 minutes to get out. Congestion on routes towards the A52 and surrounding roads is already significant, and adding hundreds of additional households would only make the situation worse. A development of this size would inevitably place further pressure on local infrastructure, roads and services that are already struggling to cope. For these reasons, I strongly urge the Council to remove this site from the draft Local Plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
246	291	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted]. I feel the work done by my local councillors [Redacted] is indeed great for the community and for local wildlife and that the greenbelt should be protected to allow the diversity of flora and forna, rare animals and plants should be given the opportunity to flourish. Please make efforts to put a plan forward to maintain the north field as a green belt without the possibility of property development that will put undue and unmanageable pressure on the wildlife and the overstretched local resources and amenities we all currently struggle to access.
248	295	Green Wedge	Support	Having reviewed the Draft Local Plan for Derby I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document
249	296	Stoney Lane, Housing, Infrastructure	Oppose	Where to start the whole ideas are absolutely ludicrous,I mean how the hell are we going to accommodate all the extra residents, traffic etc in this village especially after Spondon Wood and now Acorn way just what sort of qualifications do you need to be on the council and make decisions like this. I think it's stupid and dangerous. You really are putting strains on Schools, Medical Health and local resources, which are already at their maximum capacity and no provision for any added resources. I really ask that you reconsider these applications, proposals very very carefully and reject them.
308	356	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
306	354	Community Facilities, Infrastructure, Green Belt, Open Space, Stoney Lane	Oppose	[Redacted]. The proposal raises a number of concerns. First and foremost, the site lies within the Green Belt and previous planning assessments have indicated that it is not suitable for residential use. The protection of Green Belt land is an important part of national planning policy and should not be set aside lightly. Secondly, the development would significantly alter the landscape at the eastern edge of Spondon. The open land currently provides a clear boundary between the village and the countryside. Losing this space would diminish the rural character that many residents value. There are also practical concerns regarding infrastructure. A development of 400 homes would inevitably increase traffic and place additional pressure on schools, healthcare services and other local facilities. Finally, the land around Stoney Lane provides an important amenity for the community. It is regularly used by residents for walking and outdoor recreation and contributes positively to quality of life in the area. For these reasons, I respectfully request that this site be removed from the draft Local Plan.
252	299	Green Wedge	Support	As the consultation period on Derby's Local Plan ends on Monday 9 March. I would like to state I support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge.
253	300	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please be aware that as this potential site is on the old rubbish tip, there is a danger of gases and a fire risk, as previously advised by the council.

255	302	Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing regarding the proposed overall plans for housing in the Spondon area and in particular the Stoney Lane development. While I can see the need for a greater number of houses in the Derby area I believe the 4 proposed developments in and around Spondon (Stoney Lane, Locko Road, Royal Hill Road, Spondon Wood) are not in the best interests of this area of the city. [Redacted] I am acutely aware of the issues with the local infrastructure. There are a shortage of doctors, dentists and school places, and the access from the village towards the city is woefully lacking with Willowcroft Road being the only easy exit. There has been no mention in the plans of a relief road to give better access or egress for the village. The provision of the planned new homes will stretch these resources even further. The HGV traffic from the construction would damage the existing route even further and lead to ongoing roadworks and delays. Spondon has always had a local plan that included a surrounding green belt that kept it separate from Chaddesden to the west and Ockbrook to the east. These housing plans remove large chunks of these green belt areas and threaten the diversity of the nature in these areas. Also, with plans being submitted for the land next to Derby Road/Acorn Way, there will also be further reductions to this green belt area. There are many derelict buildings/areas in the city that could be redeveloped to provide a large amount of the housing requirement rather than removing green spaces. I, like many others, regularly walk my dogs over the land covered by the Stoney Lane development and find the open areas calming and good for my mental health. The removal of this area will be detrimental to the wellbeing of many people.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I am hoping that the review of the plans put forward will be considered with all these points in mind and the right decisions are made.
260	307	Housing	Oppose	I have seen the proposed development plan for Chaddesden Wood, and understand there might be potential future use of existing school grounds and open areas in Oakwood. I am writing to say I object to this land being used for future housing developments or similar projects. These open areas should be maintained to ensure the environment in Oakwood remains sustainable to the existing population. Maintaining open access to the wood from the open countryside is essential to maintain environmental diversity for future generations to enjoy and nurture. Furthermore the open playing areas are essential for both school activities and recreational benefits and mental wellbeing to the already local population. Also any additional development in these areas will bring traffic problems and unsustainable resource issues such as access to GP and dental services, which may already be stretched.
268	316	Green Wedge	Support	I wish my support for the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the local plan to be acknowledged. [Redacted] I appreciate the value of the ancient oak woodland from both the flora,fauna & historic aspects that I truly hope will be continued for future generations to enjoy despite the changing global climate & environment.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
301	349	Green Belt, Green Wedge	Oppose	As I'm not a resident under the banner of Derby City Council I have not previously been aware of this Local Plan consultation. [Redacted]. I consider Derby to be my home and would like to be kept informed of developments. I don't know if it's also because I'm not a resident of the Council but I couldn't seem to be able to respond directly to the consultation from your portal. I don't know whether you will be able to take feedback from here? Including in the hope that you can. It's nothing that I'm sure you've not already factored in and heard from others but it felt important for me to express my views. Please can you protect the Green Wedge/Belt so that Derby continues to have spaces for nature to thrive which in turns allows us to thrive. So much has been eroded and we have no idea what the implications of that will be. I appreciate that you've got to allow building but there are so many derelict and empty spaces throughout Derby and suburbs that it would be great if they could be utilised instead of encroaching ever more on nature. Can you imagine if Derby were able to lead the way in this and show the rest of the country how to work alongside nature instead of destroying it?
303	350	Open Space, Housing	Oppose	Furthermore I do not support the building of any residential properties on any parcel of green land with the Derby City Council Boundaries. We need to utilise any brownfield belts left before eroding into green land on the outside of our city. Planning targets forced upon us by the government should not be used to hold the city council to ransom!
270	318	Green Wedge	Support	I would like to register my support in the creation of the North Oakwood Green Wedge, including Chaddesden Wood.
302	350	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
388	436	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Planning for traveler's site in Wilmorton, l strongly object to this [Redacted]. I do not want my property to be dropped in price. [Redacted] and feel this purposel will distroy the community.

222	268	Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	Ref: HA7 Stoney Lane Spondon I would like to object to the above proposed development under changes to the draft local plan. My main objections are in relation to the impact it will have on the current infrastructure of Spondon and its residents. I wish this area would remain undeveloped. The traffic and roads are already of concern. There are too few exits routes out of Spondon that are extremely congested especially at peak times. There are also ongoing issues with the high number of HGV's travelling through the village, some of which have caused accidents and damage. The proposed development and construction traffic would put further stress on an already difficult situation. Increased domestic and service vehicles would undoubtedly impact on the already busy roads. Spondon already has challenges in relation to services provided to the current residents. Health care and education provision is insufficient for people living in Spondon. The proposed increase in homes and therefore residents will seriously impact the ability to get doctors appointments and school places. I live in an area with two primary and one secondary school within ½ mile of each other. Increasing the number of pupils attending these schools will make an already difficult situation even worse. Local amenities such as parks and recreation spaces are part of having a healthy and happy community. The impact on these of an increased population and development on nearby land will be negative and unrecoverable. In relation to the proposed housing and changes to the local plan on Stoney Lane. My concern is the impact on the main eastbound access to the A52. During the construction phase and beyond I believe there is the potential for further accidents and incidents on this already very busy route. Spondon is lucky to have green space surrounding it. This attracts native wildlife and this benefits us all. If this is developed and eroded, it will be lost forever.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				See attached
300	348	Environment, Green Wedge	Support	I have seen the proposed development plan for Chaddesden Wood plus the possible potential future use of existing school grounds and open areas in Oakwood. I am writing to express my views that all these open areas should be maintained to ensure the environment in Oakwood remains sustainable to the existing population. Maintaining open access to the wood from the open countryside is essential to maintain environmental diversity. Maintaining the open playing areas are essential for both school activities and recreational benefits and mental wellbeing. Furthermore, any additional development in these areas will bring traffic problems and unsustainable resource issues such as access to GP and dental services.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
383	431	Environment, Green Wedge	Support	Dear Sirs, I am writing in support of maintaining, as a permanent feature, the wedge of undeveloped, natural land linking the heart of the Oakwood estate with the wider countryside beyond. This is a vital nature corridor that is essential for sustaining the biodiversity of the Chaddesden Wood nature reserve. Without that link, the nature reserve would become an isolated island surrounded by houses, hard impervious pavings and manicured gardens. The wood is a fantastic amenity for local resdents, not just those living on Oakwood. It provides a "forest school" right next to the local primary school. The fields to the north of the wood retain mature trees and hedges planted at least 200 years ago.(maps in the local archives show that). These cannot simply be re created as a minor part of a new building development, despite claims to the contrary. I urge officers and councillors to preserve this vital green wedge.
299	347	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

298	346	Health, Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Green Belt, Housing	Oppose	My primary concern is the loss of Green Belt land and Green spaces off Stoney Lane. These areas provide significant environmental value and play an important role in supporting residents' physical and mental wellbeing. Access to nearby open green spaces encourages outdoor activity and contributes to the character of the area. These spaces also help maintain the separation between settlements and protect the rural character of Spondon. Once lost to development, these benefits cannot be replaced. There are also serious highway safety concerns regarding the proposed access close to the A52. This is already a heavily used road with a history of traffic incidents. Additional junctions and increased traffic risk vehicles queuing back onto the A52, while also increasing the number of vehicles attempting to join the road. This raises significant safety concerns and risks worsening congestion on an already busy route. Local infrastructure also appears insufficient to support development on this scale. Local schools are already under pressure and rely on volunteers to help with classroom support. Some schools have requested to reduce intake numbers from 2027 which means there are less school places. Even if they put the places back up it is unlikely to be sufficient to accommodate the number of children hundreds of new houses would bring. Financial contributions alone do not guarantee that schools have the physical space, staffing capacity, or available places to accommodate the number of children likely to result from hundreds of additional homes. Healthcare provision is another major concern. GP services in the area are already under significant strain. While financial contributions may be proposed, this does not guarantee improved access to healthcare. There is a national shortage of GPs and many existing practices lack the physical space to expand their clinical teams or patient capacity. A development of this size would place additional pressure on already stretched healthcare services. Childcare provision within Spondon is also limited. There are currently only two nurseries locally and the existing preschool sites are relatively small. These settings are unlikely to be able to accommodate the increased number of children that would result from developments of this scale.

				Traffic within and around Spondon is already a concern for residents. Congestion regularly occurs on routes in and out of the area, particularly at peak times, and a significant increase in housing will inevitably worsen these issues and place additional strain on the local road network. There are also concerns regarding drainage and flood risk. Development on large areas of currently undeveloped land can significantly increase surface water runoff, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall. Without substantial and carefully planned drainage infrastructure, this could increase the risk of localised flooding and put additional pressure on existing drainage systems. Air quality is another important consideration, particularly given the proximity to the A52. Increased traffic volumes in and around the development could worsen air pollution levels, which has potential health implications for residents and children attending nearby schools. The proposed development would also result in the loss of habitat for local wildlife. The surrounding fields and green spaces form part of an important local wildlife corridor supporting birds, small mammals, and other species. Development and increased human activity can fragment these habitats and disrupt wildlife movement and biodiversity within the area. Finally, developments of this scale risk altering the character of Spondon as a village community. Large housing expansions without the necessary infrastructure and services in place may undermine the sustainability and quality of life for existing and future residents. The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises that development should be sustainable and supported by adequate infrastructure, while also protecting Green Belt land except in very special circumstances. Based on the concerns outlined above regarding infrastructure capacity, highway safety, environmental impact, and the loss of Green Belt land, it is difficult to see how these proposals would meet those principles.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				For these reasons, I urge the Council to carefully reconsider the suitability and scale of development in these locations.
281	329	Green Wedge, Open Space	Support	I am writing to express my support for retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge within Derby's Local Plan. This green space is extremely important to the local community. I regularly use the area for walks, usually starting from Wood Road, walking through Springwood and continuing into Chaddesden Wood. It provides a peaceful place to walk, enjoy nature and get fresh air, and it is one of the few nearby areas where residents can access open countryside and woodland. Spaces like this are vital not only for people's physical and mental wellbeing, but also for local wildlife and the natural character of the area. Losing or reducing this green wedge would have a significant impact on both the environment and the quality of life for people living nearby. I strongly support protecting the North Oakwood Green Wedge from development and ensuring it remains part of Derby's green infrastructure for future generations.
285	333	Green Wedge	Support	I support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
284	332	Gypsies And Travellers, Infrastructure	Oppose	I write to complain about the proposed plan for a traveller/gypsy caravan site on the recreation area in Wilmorton. [Redacted] and I'm against this proposal for the reasons given below: • An influx of residents will put additional strain on schools, doctors and other services. The area has already absorbed the City Point development and the increase in HMOs. It will be harder for all residents to access the services they need. • Access to the site will increase traffic through narrow streets increasing the risk of accidents to pedestrians and road users. The area already suffers from congestion especially on DCFC match days. This site isn't suitable due to the increased risk to residents safety. • The proposed site is the only green area in Wilmorton and if the caravan site is built it is likely to prevent residents who are unable to use Alvaston Park (such as the elderly or parents/children) from exercising or walking dogs. People would feel less inclined to use the remaining green area for recreation due to traffic, noise from the site. There would be a negative impact on the quality of life of these residents. • The site will have a negative impact on the local area. People will not want to live near to this site, their wellbeing will be affected and the quality of life in the area will be reduced. The area will become a less pleasant place to live. • The site will damage the local housing and rental markets as property prices are sure to fall and Wilmorton will become a less desirable area to buy or rent a property. The proposed location is not suitable for a caravan site and I urge you to consider alternative solutions.
286	334	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted] I am writing in support of keeping the north Oakwood green wedge in the local plan. As it is vital to protect the ancient woodland .
287	335	Green Wedge	Oppose	I support the North Oakwood Green wedge being retained in the Derby local plan. This is essential to help ensure the survival of the ancient woodland and also other green spaces in oakwood.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
288	336	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Environment, Community Facilities	Oppose	I wish to strongly object to the proposed permanent traveller and gypsy site that has selected Wilmorton green as its location. Myself and my family live on city point and have only just had this brought to our attention by the efforts of concerned local residents, with a close date for initial consultation being Monday the 9th of March. We have received absolutely nothing communication wise from the local authority/council and considering that the city point estate is just a roads width from the potential site, I can't believe that no communication/canvassing has been sent out to the large estate. The potential site would completely and forever change the immediate and surrounding areas. This type of proposal to place a highly controversial and frankly potentially hugely detrimental change to an area which can have such massively negative effects on so much of the surrounding area including loss of another green space, traffic issues, anti social behaviour, reduction of housing prices, and potential impact on local services most importantly the local school [Redacted] that is concerningly close in distance to the proposed site. It is with my six year olds future welfare in mind that I send this email. Any further information regarding the process and advice going forward can be sent to my email and would be greatly appreciated.

289	338	Gypsies And Travellers, Community Facilities, Infrastructure, Environment, Open Space	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 1. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 1. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 1. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 1. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
291	339	Housing, Flood Risk, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to object to the proposed allocation of land east of Stoney Lane, Spondon (site DER/0025) for the construction of approximately 400 homes within the draft Local Plan. This proposal is deeply concerning given that the land in question forms part of the Green Belt and has historically been identified as unsuitable for residential development. Green Belt designation exists to protect open countryside and prevent the outward spread of urban areas. Removing this protection should only occur where exceptional circumstances clearly justify it, and it is not apparent that such circumstances exist in this case. Developing this land would significantly alter the eastern edge of Spondon and would result in the loss of the open landscape that currently separates the village from surrounding countryside. The fields along Stoney Lane form an important buffer that helps preserve the distinct identity of the area. There are also serious concerns about the impact a development of this size would have on local infrastructure. Traffic levels on surrounding roads are already high, particularly near the A52/Brian Clough Way. Local services such as schools and healthcare facilities are also under pressure. In addition, the land proposed for development is valued by residents as accessible countryside used for walking and recreation. Losing this space would represent a significant loss to the community. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reconsider this allocation and remove the site from the draft Local Plan.
293	341	Green Wedge	Support	I've recently seen the plan for north Derby local plan (attached) and wish to make it know that I support the Norh Oakwood Green wedge being retained and maintained as part of the plan for the North end of the city as a vital link for wildlife and the residents of Oakwood .

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
372	420	Gypsies And Travellers, Green Belt, Environment	Oppose	We are writing as concerned residents of Wilmorton regarding the proposed traveller/ gypsy site on our recreation ground. [Redacted] Removing or reducing our green space when there are many other more remote and unused areas around particularly for a gypsy / traveller site would more than likely reduce the value of our homes, increase our insurances and limit resale value after all, who would want to buy a home in the area. It is our growing concern regarding the anti social behaviour in our area, the drug dealing, abandoned cars and neglected common spaces, a permanent gypsy site would only serve to exacerbate this issue not reduce it. We have spent years working to prevent travellers and gypsies from staying on our green space, and fought to remove them, why would we actively want to invite them? We already deal with the issues from several MPO properties, YMCA antisocial behaviour, the cygnet hospital, do you not think we havd enough to live with?? Time and money should be spent addressing the above and rectifying graffiti and the fastly degrading empty buildings rather than adding to our issues. Time and money needs to be spent supporting the area not degrading it further.

347	394	Infrastructure, Housing, Green Wedge	Oppose	I wish to register my concern on aspects of the proposed Derby City Local Plan (2025–2042). [Redacted]. I object to the proposal to redesignate the Littleover/Mickleover Green Wedge to being a Green Gap. This area has previously been recognised as essential for allowing wildlife/plants into the city parks. That requirement has not disappeared, only, it seems, the council's willingness to support it. I understand that there is concern with its current performance - that is not going to miraculously improve by making it smaller, with more pressure from additional building around it. I understand why this change has been proposed - the desire to build on part of the land. But what is the point of defining essential green wedges if they simply get discarded when someone wants to build? The wedge was needed then, it is needed now - even more so since the Highfields development. Please keep it and give it a chance to fulfil its purpose. Related to that, I also wish to object again to the proposed Moorway Lane housing development. My objections are principally: - Moorway Lane cannot cope with the additional traffic. It is already almost impassable at school start/finish times. The existing congestion and cars already present a danger to the children leaving school at the end of the day. The alternative route via Bakeacre Lane is narrow, has poor visibility and often gets flooded. - Millennium Wood will be almost encircled by housing which will impact the wildlife wellbeing and diversity of the area. It is also an important local resource for exercise and dog walking, which I would not want to see damaged. - The development will put significant extra pressure on the green wedge. - Facilities in the area are limited. There is no local entertainment/activities (other than walking round Millennium Wood), no local shop, no local pub and public transport is poor (limited destinations, very expensive and the bus stops

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				are far enough away from the development I would anticipate that few people would bother using them).

375	423	Housing, Transport, Green Wedge, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	[Redacted] The scale and location of this proposal raise serious concerns for many residents. It is difficult to understand why land that has previously been identified as unsuitable for residential development is now being considered for such a large housing scheme. Green Belt concerns The site lies within the Green Belt and previous planning evidence, including the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), states that it is not considered an appropriate location for residential development. Green Belt policy exists to protect the openness of the countryside and prevent the unchecked expansion of settlements. Any proposal to remove land from the Green Belt should only occur where exceptional circumstances clearly justify doing so, and it is not evident that such justification has been provided. Impact on the character of Spondon Development of this site would represent a major expansion of the village to the east and would fundamentally change the character of the area. The open fields along Stoney Lane currently form a natural boundary between Spondon and the surrounding countryside. Losing this land would erode that boundary and diminish the rural setting that is an important part of the village's identity. Previous planning position This site has historically remained unallocated in previous plans due to policy constraints. Given this history, the Council should clearly explain why it now considers the site suitable for development and what circumstances have changed to justify this reversal of position.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Pressure on infrastructure A development of more than 400 homes would inevitably place additional strain on local infrastructure. Roads in and around Spondon already experience congestion, particularly around the A52/Brian Clough Way. There are also concerns regarding the capacity of local schools, GP surgeries and other community services. Without significant improvements to infrastructure, it is difficult to see how the area could accommodate this level of growth. Loss of local green space The land around Stoney Lane is valued by many residents as an accessible open space used for walking, recreation and enjoying the surrounding countryside. These areas contribute positively to the health and wellbeing of the community. Replacing them with large-scale housing would represent a permanent loss of an important local asset. In light of these concerns, I strongly urge the Council to reconsider this proposal and remove site DER/0025 from the draft Local Plan. Future development should be directed towards locations that are more appropriate, sustainable and capable of supporting additional housing without causing significant harm to existing communities.

378	426	Housing, Transport, Green Wedge, Green Belt, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	[Redacted] I am directly concerned about the impact this development would have on the local community, surrounding infrastructure and the character of Spondon. While I recognise the need for additional housing, this proposal raises several significant concerns which suggest the development would not represent sustainable growth in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the principles of the Local Plan. **Cumulative development pressure** Spondon has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years, with additional schemes proposed in the surrounding area. The cumulative effect of these developments risks placing substantial pressure on local infrastructure, services and the road network. It is important that these combined impacts are fully considered rather than assessing this proposal in isolation. **Traffic congestion and highway safety** Traffic congestion is already a well-known issue in Spondon, particularly at peak commuting times. Key routes connecting to the A52 and surrounding local roads regularly experience delays. Additional housing will inevitably increase vehicle movements, potentially worsening congestion and raising safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists. The suitability of the proposed access arrangements and junction visibility should also be carefully assessed. **Pressure on schools, healthcare and local services** Local infrastructure already operates under strain. Residents frequently experience difficulty accessing GP appointments and other healthcare services, and local schools operate close to capacity. Further residential development will inevitably increase demand on these services, and it is unclear how this additional pressure would be accommodated. **Parking and local road capacity** On-street parking is already common in parts of Spondon due to limited provision in older residential streets. If parking within the development is insufficient, overspill parking may increase congestion and create safety concerns on surrounding roads.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Drainage and environmental impact Development of previously undeveloped land can increase surface water runoff and place pressure on existing drainage systems. Without robust sustainable drainage measures, there is potential for increased localised flooding. The proposal may also result in the loss of green space and biodiversity that currently contributes to the environmental quality of the area. **Impact on residential amenity** The development may result in increased noise, disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties, as well as a general intensification of activity within the area. Given the existing pressures on infrastructure, traffic and services within Spondon, the additional impacts arising from this proposal appear likely to outweigh the potential benefits. For these reasons, and particularly when considered alongside other recent and proposed developments in the area, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
349	396	Green Wedge	Oppose	I have seen the proposed development for Chaddesden Wood, and understand there might be future use of the local school grounds and existing open areas in Oakwood. I strongly object to this land and surrounding areas around Oakwood being used for more housing developments. At the moment the area is used by the local community who enjoy Chaddesden Wood and the other open areas. Further building work would put a strain on local resources, such as GP's, Dentists and Schools. It is important to make sure Chaddesden Wood has access to the open countryside so as to maintain environmental diversity for future generations to enjoy. Also the open playing areas are important for school activities, recreational benefits and mental wellbeing to the already existing population. Further development in this area will bring about further traffic congestion and possible accidents.

342	389	Community Facilities, Green Belt, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	[Redacted]. I am deeply concerned that a development of this scale is being considered on land that has historically been identified as unsuitable for residential development. The proposal appears to disregard both previous planning evidence and the significant impact such development would have on the character, infrastructure and wellbeing of the Spondon community. [Redacted], Spondon is already at capacity, from an infrastructure and amenities perspective and you will be condemning Spondon and the people of it should you proceed with this housing allocation proposal. 1. Green Belt designation Green Belt land exists to prevent urban sprawl, protect openness, and maintain the separation and character of settlements. Its release requires the demonstration of exceptional circumstances. It is not clear that such circumstances have been sufficiently justified in this case. Allocating this site would therefore undermine the long-established purpose of Green Belt policy and set a concerning precedent for future encroachment into protected countryside. 2. Impact on openness and settlement character The proposal describes the development as an “eastern urban extension to Spondon”. Such an expansion would significantly erode the open countryside that currently forms the natural boundary of the village. This land provides an important buffer that preserves the distinct identity of Spondon and prevents the gradual coalescence of neighbouring settlements. Losing this land would permanently alter the rural setting and character that residents value. 3. Inconsistency with previous planning assessments

				Historically, this site has not been considered deliverable or appropriate for development due to policy constraints, particularly its Green Belt status. Given this long-standing position, the Council should clearly explain what material circumstances have changed to justify the allocation of this land now. Without a clear explanation supported by robust evidence, the decision appears inconsistent with previous planning conclusions. 4. Infrastructure and sustainability concerns A development of more than 400 homes would place considerable additional pressure on local infrastructure. Residents already experience congestion on key routes such as the A52/Brian Clough Way and surrounding roads. Local schools, GP surgeries and community facilities are also under increasing pressure. The scale of development proposed raises significant questions about whether existing infrastructure could realistically accommodate such growth without negatively affecting current residents. 5. Loss of valued green space and community amenity The fields around Stoney Lane are widely used by residents for walking, recreation and access to open countryside. These spaces contribute greatly to the wellbeing, health and quality of life of people living in Spondon. The permanent loss of this landscape to housing would remove an important local amenity and diminish access to green space for the community. 6. Soundness of the Local Plan

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				For a Local Plan to be adopted it must be considered “sound”, meaning it must be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the Green Belt designation, infrastructure concerns and the lack of clarity around why the site is now considered suitable when it previously was not, it is difficult to see how the allocation of this land could be considered fully justified when compared with alternative development locations. 7. Deliverability and sustainability The scale and location of this development raise questions about whether it represents a sustainable pattern of growth. A development of this magnitude should only be allocated where infrastructure capacity, transport links and community services can demonstrably support it. At present it is not evident that such assurances exist. For all of these reasons, I strongly urge the Council to reconsider the proposed allocation and remove site DER/0025 from the draft Local Plan. Residents expect the Local Plan to strike a careful balance between meeting housing needs and protecting the character, infrastructure and environment of established communities. In its current form, this proposal risks undermining that balance and causing long-term harm to the village of Spondon.

438	252	Community Facilities, Transport, Infrastructure, Green Belt, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	Sirs, **Re: Policy HA7: Stoney Lane, Spondon & Green Wedge/Green Belt Allocation** I would like to submit the following comments, relating to the proposed site for housing development, off Stoney Lane in Spondon. While understanding the necessity to review Green Belt allocations, etc. and the need for additional housing in the Derby Draft Local plan, I have concerns regarding the overall strategy for housing proposals in the Spondon area. Namely, that the development off Stoney Lane is now only one of five housing developments proposed for Spondon and its immediate surrounding area. The total proposed increase in housing stock is around 1180 properties. In the early years of the developments, this could equate to 2,500 or more additional residents, and 1000 or more additional vehicles. I believe that the immediate pressure on local amenities, infrastructure and highways would be extreme and unsustainable. Also, in the first 5 years the Primary school places requirements could increase by more than 1000. The available capacity in Spondon Primary schools, at the time of writing, is 208 (GOV.UK figures). The Spondon Secondary school is currently over-subscribed. This additional requirement equates to two/three additional Primary schools after 5 years, and an additional Secondary school after 10/12 years. In my opinion, it is essential that the impact of the ***total*** housing increase, across all proposed developments, should be considered, and a suitable infrastructure strategy agreed, before any further development proposals are agreed.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				(N. B. I have also submitted a copy of this comment via the Derby Local Plan website)
434	478	Community Facilities, Transport, Infrastructure, Open Space, Green Belt, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to express my serious concern regarding the proposal to allocate land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon for a housing development of at least 400 dwellings. This land currently sits within the Green Belt and serves an important role in protecting the open countryside surrounding the village. The Green Belt is intended to safeguard areas like this from development and prevent the gradual expansion of urban areas into rural landscapes. The fields along Stoney Lane are also an important part of the local environment. They are frequently used by residents for walking and enjoying the countryside. Replacing this land with a large housing development would result in a permanent loss of a valued community space. In addition, there are legitimate concerns about whether the village infrastructure could support a development of this scale. Roads in the area already experience heavy traffic, and local services such as schools and GP surgeries are limited in capacity. Given these issues, I believe allocating this site for development would be inappropriate and potentially damaging to the character and sustainability of Spondon. I therefore urge the Council to reconsider this proposal and explore more suitable locations for future housing development.

430	473	Open Space, Flood Risk, Transport, Infrastructure, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	To whom it may concern. I am writing to formally object to the proposed traveller site development in Wilmorton. My objection is based on planning and infrastructure concerns relating to the suitability of this location for the proposed use. Firstly I am concerned about the impact on the local infrastructure including road access, traffic volume, drainage waste management and utilities. The surrounding road network is limited in capacity, and increased vehicle movements may create congestion, and safety risks for residents and pedestrians. The proposed site would only be accessible via either Bowmer Road or Warwick Street, this is already under strain with the local residents, football parking and local businesses who's workers and customers use the area to park and gain access. Secondly, the proposed development appears out of character with the existing residential nature of the area. The scale and layout raise concerns regarding visual impact, noise, and the overall effect on neighbouring amenities. I am also concerned about potential environmental impacts which include surface water run off, flood risks and effects on wildlife impacts. A comprehensive environmental and drainage assessment should be undertaken before any approval is considered. The area is currently the only green space we have within this area, this includes the community gardens, which is an allotment space the YMCA use as part of well being and therapy sessions. There is also a nature garden which was put together to house small wildlife and flora and fauna. Many thanks for your time. Could you please respond to this email to formally let me know my objection has been received.
428	471	Green Wedge	Support	Sir.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I object to any proposed plan to build on the areas green space and Support keeping Oakwood wood unaccessible to developers and available for our local families to enjoy, knowing it is the only accessable wall for many that is not built on. Please register the support.
427	256	Green Wedge	Support	Hi I have just completed a section of the Derby local plan but wanted to make sure my feelings about the areas green wedge have been taken into concern, in particular I want to state **I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan!** I have been watching other areas of the country overturn their green principles and allow planning on previously protected and valued areas of green wedge / green pockets of land. A planning application has already been turned down for the land north of Chaddesden Wood so I, like hundreds of other residents in Oakwood, hope that you will stick to your guns and keep this area free of further housing. We have already met out target in this area and the land could be better served as an extension to the wood which draws thousands of people every week to the area.
381	429	Green Wedge	Support	May I offer my full support of the North Oakwood Green Wedge

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
340	387	Housing, Green Wedge	Oppose	I also strongly oppose the removal of the Brook Farm Green Wedge status. The importance of green open spaces to mental health and wellbeing which was considered essential during the covid epidemic now seems to have been disregarded for easy profit. I understand the need for housing, but developers should be encouraged to develop brownfield and industrial sites which I appreciate is more costly but it can be achieved if there is the will to do so. Another consideration should be the continued development of sites with the City like the Nightingale Quarter and The Friar Gate Goods Yard, neither greenfield sites but proof that such sites can be developed successfully.
339	387	Green Wedge	Support	I support the creation of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the new proposed local plan. This will ensure that the existing ancient woodland at Chaddesden Wood is safeguarded and maintained especially as it is the only ancient oak woodland remaining in the city.
425	470	Green Wedge	Support	Hello, I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
424	469	Green Wedge	Support	Good evening I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
423	468	Green Wedge	Support	Good evening. I support the Derby city Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
422	467	Green Wedge	Support	Good evening, I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
421	466	Green Wedge	Support	I support the creation of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the new proposed local plan.

338	386	Environment, Infrastructure, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the proposed housing developments on **land off Locko Road** and the proposed allocation and development of land off **Stoney Lane** (Policy HA7) as referenced in the Draft Local Plan. **Land off Locko Road – Green Belt Protection** The land off Locko Road is located within Derby's designated Green Belt, and recent evidence clearly supports the need for it to remain protected. A comprehensive Green Belt review, commissioned by Derby City Council and undertaken by independent professional consultants, confirmed that the land surrounding Locko Road meets the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) criteria for Green Belt designation. This demonstrates that the site continues to fulfil the essential purposes of Green Belt land, including limiting urban expansion and preserving the surrounding countryside. Derby City Council's Local Plan includes a commitment to safeguarding Green Belt areas, and the findings of this review reinforce that stance. National planning policy establishes that the primary objective of Green Belt designation is to maintain land in a permanently open state. Development within the Green Belt is generally regarded as inappropriate. Allowing development on this site would contradict this principle and diminish the open countryside that currently provides a clear boundary between neighbouring communities. For these reasons, development on this site would result in a substantial and avoidable loss of protected land and would be inconsistent with the core objectives of Green Belt policy. **Stoney Lane Development (Approx. 400 Homes) – Infrastructure and Environmental Concerns** **Traffic** The development, comprising approximately 400 homes, would significantly increase traffic in the Spondon area. Access to and from Stoney Lane is already difficult during peak hours, and the additional vehicles would exacerbate congestion, creating long wait times for residents. This would not only increase commute times but also raise the risk of accidents. The surrounding road network is insufficient to support such a large influx of traffic.

				Pollution An increase in vehicles will inevitably lead to higher levels of air pollution and noise in the local area. Spondon is already affected by traffic-related pollution, and the development would worsen air quality, impacting the health and well-being of current and future residents. **Schools** Local schools are already oversubscribed and lack the capacity to accommodate the additional children that this development would bring. This could lead to increased class sizes and a decline in the quality of education, as well as forcing families to travel further for schooling. **Amenities** The proposed development does not include adequate amenities to support such a large number of residents. Without local shops, medical facilities, or recreational spaces, the area would become overburdened, and residents would be forced to rely on nearby towns for basic services. **Green Belt** The site is part of the green belt, which should be protected from large-scale development. Building on this land would result in the permanent loss of open, natural space that provides environmental, recreational, and aesthetic value to the community. Preservation of green belt land is essential for maintaining biodiversity and the character of the area. In conclusion, the proposed Stoney Lane development is not suitable due to the significant negative impacts on traffic, pollution, education, local amenities, and the green belt. I urge the council to reject this application to protect the wellbeing of existing residents and preserve the integrity of the local environment. In conclusion for the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge the Council to: ● Maintain the Green Belt designation and reject any development proposals for land off Locko Road.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				• Reconsider the allocation of Stoney Lane (Policy HA7) for large-scale housing due to infrastructure limitations, traffic concerns, environmental harm, drainage issues, and pressure on local services. Planning decisions must prioritise the protection of Green Belt land, the wellbeing and safety of residents, and the long-term sustainability of our communities.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
418	463	Green Wedge	Support	I support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge. I am a local resident who takes pride in the North Oakwood Green Wedge.
417	462	Health, Environment, Green Wedge	Support	Dear sir or madam I am writing to state my strong support for retention of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the local plan. It is vital for the health and survival of Chaddesden wood (and its surrounding associated eco system). Derby's only remaining ancient woodland is already under severe stress from development on three of its four sides. The city council's own environmental impact studies have shown that the woodland is drying out, due to surrounding existing development. Any further building would therefore see its slow demise. It would also close off the only vital wildlife corridor from the wood to the open countryside. The wood is well used and cared for by its community. It makes a strong contribution to the wellbeing of those who use it. The city council has a duty to protect Derby's environment. The North Oakwood green wedge is essential to the survival of Chaddesden wood for future generations.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
416	461	Environment, Green Wedge	Support	Hi I am writing to state my strong support for retention of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the local plan. It is vital for the health and survival of Chaddesden wood (and its surrounding associated eco system). Derby's only remaining ancient woodland is already under severe stress from development on three of its four sides. The city council's own environmental impact studies have shown that the woodland is drying out, due to surrounding existing development. Any further building would therefore see its slow demise. It would also close off the only vital wildlife corridor from the wood to the open countryside. The wood is well used and cared for by its community. It makes a strong contribution to the wellbeing of those who use it. The city council has a duty to protect Derby's environment. The North Oakwood green wedge is essential to the survival of Chaddesden wood for future generations.

337	385	Infrastructure, Flood Risk, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the proposed housing developments on **land off Locko Road** and the proposed allocation and development of land off **Stoney Lane** (Policy HA7) as referenced in the Draft Local Plan. **Land off Locko Road – Green Belt Protection** The land off Locko Road sits within Derby's designated Green Belt, and recent evidence strongly reinforces why it should remain protected. A full, comprehensive Green Belt review commissioned by Derby City Council and carried out by external professional consultants found that the land around Locko Road unquestionably meets the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) tests for Green Belt purposes. This means the site continues to perform the key functions expected of Green Belt land, such as preventing urban sprawl and safeguarding the countryside. Derby City Council's own Local Plan includes a commitment to protect Green Belt land, and the findings of the review support that policy position. National planning policy clearly states that the essential aim of Green Belt policy is to keep land permanently open. Development in the Green Belt is considered inappropriate, and Councils are expected to prioritise brownfield land before considering the release of Green Belt land. Development on this site would undermine this principle and reduce the open countryside that currently separates neighbouring areas. Protecting this land is also essential for safeguarding our farmland, which we watch from Longley Lane being used year on year for growing crops and harvesting animal feed. It is important we preserve the environmental and visual landscape that residents value. Once Green Belt land is lost to development, it cannot be easily restored Developing this site would therefore represent a significant and unnecessary loss of protected land and would conflict with the fundamental aims of Green Belt policy. **Stoney Lane Development (Approx. 400 Homes) – Infrastructure and Environmental Concerns**

				I strongly object to the proposed large-scale development at the rear of Stoney Lane for the following reasons: **Infrastructure Concerns** There is currently no clear evidence that local infrastructure can support a development of this scale. Roads in and around Spondon are already under significant pressure. Residents regularly experience congestion and delays when entering and exiting Spondon, particularly during rush hour. Introducing approximately 400 additional homes would further increase traffic levels, worsen congestion, and extend journey times. **Drainage and Flooding** Spondon's drainage system is ageing and already struggling to cope with demand. There have been ongoing issues including burst water pipes, road damage, lifted drain covers, and flooding caused by outdated sewage infrastructure. The system is frequently requiring repair work. Adding many new homes will place further strain on this already vulnerable network, increasing the risk of flooding and environmental damage. **Pressure on Local Services** A development of this size will place significant additional demand on already oversubscribed schools, GP surgeries, and other community services, many of which are already operating at or near capacity. **Green Belt Impact** The site is currently designated Green Belt. National planning policy restricts development in such areas, and inappropriate development should not be approved. Therefore, releasing this Green Belt land would be contrary to national policy objectives, including preventing urban sprawl and maintaining separation between settlements. The development would harm the rural character of the area, reduce the space between communities, and result in the permanent loss of farmland and natural habitats. The environmental impact of such a development would have significant impact on the surrounding area. **Conclusion**

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge the Council to: ● Maintain the Green Belt designation and reject any development proposals for land off Locko Road. ● Reconsider the allocation of Stoney Lane (Policy HA7) for large-scale housing due to infrastructure limitations, traffic concerns, environmental harm, drainage issues, and pressure on local services. Planning decisions must prioritise the protection of Green Belt land, the wellbeing and safety of residents, and the long-term sustainability of our communities.

413	458	Infrastructure, Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

412	457	Infrastructure, Transport, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	To whom it might concern. I am writing to formally object to the planning application currently under consideration. Having reviewed the proposal, I do not believe the development is appropriate for this location and I urge the planning authority to refuse permission. My concerns are as follows: •Traffic and access concerns – The proposal is likely to increase vehicle movements in an area that already experiences congestion. This may create additional pressure on local roads and raise safety concerns for residents and pedestrians. In particular with an already accident heavy exit off of the A52 at the proposed access site, adding an additional flow of traffic for a considerable housing plan seems unsafe. • Impact on the local area – The scale and nature of the proposal appears out of character with the surrounding environment and risks changing the character of the area in a way that is not consistent with existing development. • Pressure on local infrastructure – Local services such as parking, public amenities and utilities already operate at capacity. Additional development risks placing further strain on these resources. • Loss of amenity for existing residents – The development may result in increased noise, disturbance, and reduced privacy for nearby properties. Planning decisions should balance development with the interests of existing communities. In this case, the proposal does not appear to provide sufficient benefit to justify the negative impact it may have on the surrounding area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

411	456	Infrastructure, Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

353	400	Flood Risk, Infrastructure, Housing	Oppose	I am very concerned about the draft policy to develop 25 new dwellings on the site of the Green space at Kitchener Avenue and Browning Street. [Redacted], in close proximity to the area at Kitchener Avenue & Browning Street and I drive those roads many times per week. This area is already incredibly crowded with numerous schools, a medical Centre, preschools and many churches and mosques. To add extra houses here will cause traffic chaos on already narrow streets, endangering children - come and see for yourselves the state of Browning Street and Kitchener Avenue at any school drop off or pick up time. Your own document says : “A suitable highway access will be required which is set away from the crossroads junction of Browning Street and Kitchener Avenue." Again, come and observe the area and you will see how little space there is for such an access between the intersection of the two roads, the entrances to the Medical centre, the preschool, the school and the corner of Village Street. The addition of these houses will only put further pressure on the local infrastructure which is already well over subscribed. Both the Village Medical Centre and Village Primary Academy are adjacent to this land. Both are overstretched and may need this land for future expansion.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				However, I believe our community will be best served by this remaining a green space in an area that has precious little grass and very few trees. Your own document says : "Due to the greenfeld nature of the land, an appropriate net gain in biodiversity will be required." Surely the best way to maintain the biodiversity of the area is to leave it as it is rather than “attempting to leave the trees on the periphery where possible” This is a precious space which if developed into 25 houses will make the area even more of a concrete jungle. Comparing the size of the plot with the houses opposite, I wonder how anyone could even consider putting 25 houses there. I hope you will investigate and consider the problems associated with this proposed development and leave it as the green space our community, our city and our planet so desperately need.

354	401	Gypsies And Travellers, Community Facilities, Open Space, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am e mailing regarding the plan for a Travellor site on the Bowmer Road Rec Ground; although I believe this may be futile, as there has been no communication regarding this from the Council, to those who will be directly affected by these plans, of which I am one. This leads me to believe that this is already a foregone conclusion, regardless of the fear, anger & worry of the local residents. Can I start by saying that Bowmer Road is already under pressure from the amount of traffic that uses it to access Eton Street and the one-way system of Taylor Street, Gloster Street and Archer Street. This is not just from cars and vans, but also huge lorries carrying shipping containers using Bowmer Road & Taylor Street to access the rear of the School House Business Centre. All the roads around here are public roads, but they are used by residents for parking. With the explosion of HMOs and multi let properties on London Road & Eton Street, the pressure for street parking is one of the most contentious issues in this area, with Bowmer Road having to provide parking for those residents of 705 - 697 London Road, who are unable to park on London Road, due to cars parked to use School House Business Centre & the convenience store. Similarly those residents of 713 - 723 London Road park down Bowmer Road as they are near a bus stop & the roundabout. Residents from Taylor St also use Bowmer Rd for parking. Then there are the cars of the staff, delivery drivers and customers of the convenience store, pizza shop and dessert shop, who again all use Bowmer Road for parking, using Taylor St to do 3 point turns so they don't have to use the one way system. Then there is the parking for football that puts additional pressure for parking on Bowmer Road and the surrounding streets. I don't know where access to the Travellor site will be, whether it will be via the bottom of Bowmer Road or via Taylor St/Archer Street, either way this will result in large vehicles/even more traffic using our small side streets. With regards to the Travellor site itself, from what I have seen and heard of similar sites around the country, these are fenced in compounds with huge gates, making the whole area a no go zone. Pitches allegedly are rented out at a profit

				to non travellers and there can be up to double the number planned pitches. All this goes on, local residents are helpless, and council's seem unable to, or are unwilling to stop this happening. The Rec Ground, with the footpath running adjacent linking most of the streets to it, has been an area where people have exercised their dogs, children can ride their bikes and kick a football around, and for people to sit and enjoy the sunshine. There is Alvaston Park nearby but that should not be the reason why this small green space should be disregarded as once it is concreted over, it is gone forever. Following lockdown all green spaces, even small ones, were recognised as aiding mental health. [Redcated], with the explosion of the illegal migrant population changing the style of rental properties/living, in turn putting pressure on social services, parking, the number of cars on our roads, noise, pollution, rubbish & fly tipping. Having a Travellor site is going to be another fracture on the face of this community. [Redacted]. I also worry for my safety and that of my property. I feel the threat of this planning proposal is pushing me to sell my property - that's if I now can sell - at a time that isn't financially viable for me, and will also lead to me having to change employment as well. I have also heard that the old church, adjacent School House Business Centre, on London Road could be turned into a 30 bed multi let property. How many people are you trying to cram into Wilmorton? Hasn't there been enough change in this area to accommodate non-british born residents? In summary, my objections to the proposed Travellor site are: excess traffic, noise, pollution, pressure on social services and the police, other/future planned extensions to & changes of use to existing properties/buildings in the area, personal & property safety and the fact it will be another group of people who don't integrate or want to be here, but who bring intimidation, fear and a total disregard for any sense of community. Please keep me updated regarding the progress of this matter.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
359	407	Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I looked at the five proposals this weekend. Using info from the last census and Derby City Council website for things like average number of people per house, cars per house, age demographic, etc (all at Spondon levels, not Derby / Derbyshire / East Mids), we're looking at : 1 - 20% increase in Spondon population 2 - 25% increase in over 65s (most likely to need doctors, but already oversubscribed) 3 - 19% increase in school-age children (all our schools are already oversubscribed) 4 - extra 2,400 cars [Redacted] already turned down Erewash Council's attempt to buy places at West Park for the houses in Deer Park View. I hope the other schools did the same if they were approached in the same way. Erewash needs to provide schools, doctors, dentists, public transport, etc, for its residents, even if those new houses are conveniently attached to a Derby suburb. I simply don't see how the above can work in Spondon without extra facilities and a relief road (that preferably doesn't isolate our neighbours in Ockbrook and Borrowash).

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
360	408	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to build a Traveller site for a minimum of 17 caravans at the Wilmorton Recreation Area. This proposal is extremely concerning to local residents. The recreation area is one of the few green spaces available to the community and is widely used by families, children, and residents for recreation and wellbeing. Losing this land would permanently damage an important community asset. In addition, there are serious concerns about the potential impact on property values, safety, and the overall character of the neighbourhood. The surrounding roads, parking capacity, and local services are not designed to accommodate a development of this nature and scale. This proposal appears to have been brought forward with little awareness or consultation with the people who live here and will be most affected. It is unacceptable to remove valuable public green space and replace it with a development that raises such significant concerns for the local community. For these reasons, I strongly urge the council to reject this proposal and protect the Wilmorton Recreation Area for the benefit of current and future residents.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
362	410	Housing, Stoney Lane, Community Facilities	Oppose	I wish to submit my objection to the proposal within the draft Local Plan to allocate land east of Stoney Lane in Spondon for the construction of around 400 homes. This land forms part of the Green Belt and has historically been regarded as unsuitable for residential development. The protection of Green Belt land is an important planning principle intended to prevent the gradual expansion of settlements into surrounding countryside. In addition to the planning concerns, there are very real practical issues about whether Spondon has the capacity to support a development of this size. Local services are already stretched. For example, it is often extremely difficult to secure a GP appointment in the area, and residents frequently have to wait significant periods of time for routine healthcare. Adding hundreds of additional households to the village without clear and substantial improvements to local healthcare provision would place even more strain on services that are already under pressure. The fields around Stoney Lane are also valued by residents for walking and recreation, and their loss would remove a much-loved area of open countryside. For these reasons, I believe the site is not appropriate for development and should be removed from the Local Plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
363	411	Housing, Stoney Lane, Community Facilities	Oppose	Having looked at the proposed plans for the above reference I have concerns on the flow of traffic infrastructure with the potential of traffic congestion A52 junction/ slip road onto stoney lane with the proposed entry/exit for new housing and I would like to point out that opposite this entry there are some times vehicles parked and this part of the lane is used by parents dropping & pickups from Asterdale school which is also going to be a issue my opinion would be to double yellow line the road in both directions from the last properties either side of the lane .
403	449	Environment, Green Wedge	Support	Dear Sirs, I wish to register my support for the creation of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the new proposed local plan. Born and bred at [Redacted], I have very special memories of the area and farms before the Oakwood housing development. More recently, [Redacted] able to enjoy the natural space it offers, the views from it (albeit impeded to some extent by recent development) and knowing it has been under threat of development for many years. This Green Wedge proposal will secure the wood and neighbouring land for wildlife and future generations to enjoy. I fully support the North Oakwood Green Wedge proposal.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
332	380	Infrastructure, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to object to the housing project planned for Stoney Lane on the green belt land. I believe there are many other suitable places within the city for housing such as old derelict sites which could be used instead. Also, building more high rise housing in the inner city would be better than losing our lovely green belt land around the outer parts of Derby. This green belt land is used by so many Spondon residents and has been for some residents for all of their lives. I regularly use the land to walk on as my local access to nature and scenary, and see many other people from the Spondon area doing the same, some with children or dog walking. Taking this away from us is totally wrong. Also, there is not the infrastructure in place in Spondon to accommodate all of these new houses, especially since there is another plan to build a housing estate off of Acorn Way. Spondon does not have the schools, doctors or roads to accommodate all of these extra houses. Spondon is also increasing in size at the Deer Park site (part of Erewash Council but still geographically attached to Spondon). The road through Spondon is way too congested with cars and lorries as it is and all of these extra houses will only make things a lot worse.
402	448	Green Wedge	Support	This e-mail is to formally advise you that I strongly support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the local plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
518	425	Transport	Oppose	**T2, Transport Infrastructure** I note that the supporting text is lifted directly from text supporting CP24 in the current plan. However, that goes into much more detail about the A38 scheme and says: "*The Council will ensure that any land needed to implement these schemes will be protected.*" Like many, I've changed my mind about the A38 scheme since 2016 and now think that it isn't compatible with a climate emergency. While it would remover congestion at places in the city, it would overall encourage extra traffic through the city, in contrast with the A50 junction scheme, which would take traffic off unsuitable roads in the city. I suggest removing the word "support" from the second line – the policy would then read that the city council would help to deliver initiatives whether their own or other's. This wouldn't signify agreement with decisions imposed on the city by outside bodies.
499	425		N/A	N/A

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
524	425	City Centre	Oppose	**CC14, Railway Station Quarter** B) refers to "*a new, high quality multi modal hub on Pride Park*" whilst C) says "*...providing enhanced connectivity to Castleward Boulevard and the wider City Centre beyond. The creation of a new urban interchange provides opportunities to …. public transport and cycling facilities, through the creation of a new active travel hub*". I'm confused. [Redacted] scheme, around 20 years ago, to prioritise bus access to the station by removing short-stay parking from the front (Railway Terrace side) of the station and introducing the current bus stop and pedestrian area. Currently this stop is well served, with 10 regular service buses/hour daytime (1A, 1C and Skylink) to the bus station, plus the University service and the Royal Derby. In contrast, there are no public buses to the rear of the station, with the relatively infrequent 1B coming no nearer than Pride Parkway. I would hate to see any change to this – a split of services between the two sides of the station would confuse visitors for little advantage. Currently, the Pride Park entrance requires you to have a ticket in advance or use a machine, which is not very user-friendly. In 2006, in response to the Eastern Fringes consultation, I said "We welcome the proposal to create a multi-storey car park on the Pride Park side of the tracks for rail users and would prefer to see <u>all</u> parking for the station on this side. This would reduce traffic to the main station frontage, which should be restricted to drop-off, short-term (30 minute) parking, taxis, buses, cycles and pedestrians. Other traffic along Midland Road, and in the Conservation Area, should be restricted to "Access Only"." That remains my view.
523	425	City Centre	Support	I support policy **CC12, Riverside**

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
522	425	City Centre	Oppose	**CC6, Tall Buildings** I'm not in favour of very tall buildings in Derby city centre, as there never have been any. Some suggestions have been way out of scale. Given that this policy basically says "discuss it first", I think that this is a good way to avoid problems.
521	425	City Centre	Oppose	**CC4, Mixed Use** Is B, ground floor use on Full St, compatible with flood defences and Our City, Our River?
520	425	Transport	Support	**T6, Transport Hubs** I assume that this new policy incorporates the references to "Park and Ride" found in CP24, but allowing a wider range of solutions. I support that. I guess that the lack of specific sites is because the city no longer supports the P+R sites that were operational at the time of writing the existing plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
519	425	Transport	Support	**T4, Protected Routes** I support protecting land for routes proposed in ROWIP and LCWIP. The Mick/Mack route is currently protected as a public transport route as saved policy T2, and some of it is included in the recent proposals from LRTA for a tram network. Does this need to be spelled out in T4, or is it covered in T1 by "*Development will not be permitted where it would sever or prejudice the re-use of former railway lines and canals which have the potential to function as footpaths, cycleways, bridleways or where the need has been identified for a new public transport facility, freight connection or extension to an existing network."*? Given the ongoing house-building around Mackworth and Mickleover, use of this route for public transport should be re-investigated as part of EMCCA's new LTP.
517	425	Transport	Support	**T1, Active and Sustainable Transport** I strongly support this policy, especially the need to follow the transport hierarchy. I don't suppose that I'm the only one who doesn't know what "*micro mobility and adaptive cycles*" are. I'm not sure if "*400m from a bus stop*" should be spelled out in the policy - although it's a good standard, it doesn't mention frequency. I prefer "*locations that are well served by frequent high quality bus services*" as in the equivalent policy (CP23) in the current plan. I don't recall seeing any proposals to "tame" the Inner Ring Road elsewhere, so don't know what it would involve. I supported the road's completion, 20 years ago, as part of "Connecting Derby" to reduce traffic on unsuitable roads and in the city centre. It needs to remain a barrier to motor vehicles; rat-running in the city centre is not acceptable.
516	425	Climate	Support	I support policy **CL3**, in particular, the introductory paragraphs.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
515	425	Climate	Support	I support policy **CL1**, in particular, the introductory paragraphs.
514	425	Housing	Oppose	**HA9 Bramblebrook House** If this is all allocated to extra care living, it isn't really a housing development, more a social services re-alignment. It is very close to a frequent bus service. The area could do with a convenience store – the nearest shop is Aldi on the far side of the hospital roundabout.
513	425	Stoney Lane, Transport, Housing	Oppose	**HA7 Stoney Lane** I'm aware of local opposition, so will only comment on transport. The policy refers to pedestrian links for leisure, but not to reach bus stops. For the north and west of the site, these are on Sandringham Road (route 20) but there isn't a pedestrian route marked. For the south-east of the site, the nearest stop (with a more frequent service) is over the A52 footbridge to Milldale Road (route i4). Unless a good bus service is accessible, development here will dump more traffic onto Spondon's already inadequate road network.
512	425	Transport, Manor Kingsway, Housing	Oppose	**HA6 Kingsway Hospital** It's not clear from the map, and not mentioned in the text, but will there be pedestrian/cycle access from the site on to Kingsway? There needs to be to access the bus stops.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
511	425	The Hollow, Housing	Oppose	**HA5 The Hollow** This needs updating to say that planning permission for 96 houses was granted in December. [Redacted], with it being in the green wedge, adjacent to two noisy A roads and further than the recommended distance from the nearest bus route. I also thought that it was premature to consider that part of the proposed allocation in isolation. The remainder of the proposed allocation, west of Havenbalk Lane does not suffer from proximity to A38, but is even more remote from bus services on Uttoxeter and Burton roads. The plan is not coherent as this site doesn't meet the requirements of policy T1 (h). Given the proposed allocation by South Derbyshire DC, it is difficult to comment on HA5 as such. The area definitely needs a Masterplan, which might better be postponed until after local government re-organisation. The total number of homes proposed would probably make a bus service viable, which we know isn't the case just for HA5.
510	425	Moorway Lane, Housing	Oppose	N/A
508	425	Transport, Rykneld Road, Housing	Oppose	**HA1 Rykneld Road** I supported this site in the past and still do, though I think that there should be a mention of air pollution as well as noise from the A38 given that the prevailing wind is from the A38. I'm pleased to see a specific mention of improved bus services, which isn't in the existing plan. Though I'm told that the Harlequin is currently very unreliable, with buses frequently cancelled (or, at least, not tracking), so that needs to be dealt with first. With regard to para 260, the site will be attractive to people employed elsewhere wanting a home in Derby easily accessible to the A38 south of Markeaton.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
507	425	Housing	Support	I support proposal **H6**.
506	425	Housing	Support	I support proposal **H4.**
505	425	Housing	Oppose	N/A
504	425	Housing	Oppose	**H1 Housing Delivery** Is it possible for urban extensions to be sustainable? Are any junctions with the Outer Ring Road, that new traffic would use, not already over capacity or will be when permitted development is built out? Of the two sites mentioned in para 186, the Mickleover one would feed traffic onto the Burton and Uttoxeter Road, which have long queues at their A5111 junctions, while traffic towards the city from Infinity Garden Village would use Stenson Road or Sinfin Lane, which are both inadequate for current traffic levels.
503	425	General Development Principles	Oppose	I support proposals **GD1, GD3, GD5** (though regretting the need for it), **GD8 and GD9**. Re **GD7**: the west of the city suffers from ongoing developments either crossing (Hackwood Farm) or abutting the city boundary, which combine to have a significant effect on traffic and facilities within the city. There does need to be better co-ordination. The "Masterplan" proposed in the supporting text looks more suited to nearby cross-boundary sites, rather than a policy to refuse or delay a development until facilities have been improved to cope with developments that already have planning permission.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
502	425	Plan Objectives	Oppose	I see that these are lifted almost unchanged from the existing plan and I generally support them. **OBJ5** adds a support of tall buildings, which I don't agree should be an objective, though see further comment below under CC6. **OBJ6** is shorter than in the existing plan; the new version covers the same points more succinctly. **OBJ8** adds "strengthen" to " the role of Green Wedges", but much of the plan goes on to propose reducing them, so I don't see how this objective can remain in the plan. There isn't an **OBJ12**! Is this an oversight, given that 13-16 haven't been renumbered?
501	425	Historic Environment, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Para 56 shouldn't be in the city centre section, as it refers to "*The Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site is a historic feature of international importance and contains the Darley Abbey Mills complex….. It also contains a great diversity of listed and locally listed buildings and several Scheduled Monuments*".
500	425	Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Para 53 ought to mention that there are a large number of suppliers to the rail industry based in Derby (as is mentioned later in the plan)

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
355	402	Green Wedge	Support	With reference to the consultation on Derby's Local Plan - We support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge - we strongly wish to protect Chaddesden Wood and the North Field, but also Parkview Primary School's Playing Fields and Oakwood Park, from development in future. We support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan.
256	303	Green Wedge	Support	I wish you to note please that I fully support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan.
385	433	Green Wedge, Environment, Health	Support	Dear Sir/Madam, I am e-mailing as I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. This land is important in providing a food source for the birds in the local area. The existence of green spaces also benefits the general public in providing space for mental and physical well-being. I trust that the green wedge will be retained to benefit the generations to come.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
250	298	Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the planning application currently under consideration. Having reviewed the proposal, I do not believe the development is appropriate for this location and I urge the planning authority to refuse permission. My concerns are as follows:• Impact on the local area – The scale and nature of the proposal appears out of character with the surrounding environment and risks changing the character of the area in a way that is not consistent with existing development.• Traffic and access concerns – The proposal is likely to increase vehicle movements in an area that already experiences congestion. This may create additional pressure on local roads and raise safety concerns for residents and pedestrians.• Pressure on local infrastructure – Local services such as parking, public amenities and utilities already operate at capacity. Additional development risks placing further strain on these resources.• Loss of amenity for existing residents – The development may result in increased noise, disturbance, and reduced privacy for nearby properties. Planning decisions should balance development with the interests of existing communities. In this case, the proposal does not appear to provide sufficient benefit to justify the negative impact it may have on the surrounding area. For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.
283	331	Green Wedge	Support	I wish to express my support of the creation of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the new proposed local plan
244	292	Green Wedge	Support	I am emailing you to advise you that I support the creation of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the new proposed local plan.
386	434	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. The North Oakwood Green Wedge is really important to nature, wildlife and residents.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
238	285	Community Facilities, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I respectfully writing to strongly object to the proposal regarding build a Traveller site for a minimum of 17 caravans at the Wilmorton Recreation Area. This proposal is raises many concerns. The recreation area is one of the few green spaces available to the community and is widely used by mostly families, children, and residents for recreation and wellbeing. Losing this land would rearrange the community permanently. In addition, there are concerns about the potential impact on safety and the overall community life of the neighbourhood. I strongly request the council to reconsider and ultimately reject this proposal and protect the Wilmorton Recreation Area and residents.

387	435	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries
232	279	Green Wedge, Community Facilities	Support	This email is to state that I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan for the good of the local community and the wildlife that it attracts amongst other things. It would greatly affect the local community if it was not retained. From young families, right through to the elderly this green wedge provides such a lot to the local community especially for physical and mental health.
231	278	Green Wedge	Support	To whom it may concern, I FULLY support the north Oakwood green wedge being retained in the local plan. This must not change for the future of our children.
228	275	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
319	367	Green Wedge	Support	To whom it may concern. I wish to express my support for the halting of any development on North Oakwood Green Wedge.
221	267	Green Wedge	Support	I support keeping The North Oakwood Green Wedge. Keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge protects Chaddesden Wood and the North Field. Furthermore, I oppose any developers from building on Parkview Primary School's Playing Fields and Oakwood Park, in the future.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
324	372	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing to support keeping the Oakwood Green Wedge free from any threat of building or disruption. It is a haven to wildlife and of great benefit to the community. Supporting both mental health and improving air quality, reducing flooding etc. The area is used by many on a daily basis and is also looked after and maintained as a wildlife haven by the community. This ancient woodland and the green Wedge that surrounds it is vital to wildlife too. The surrounding area is needed for wildlife to survive. Owls, bats and deer are among the main species that live in this area and both woodland and pasture are needed. Keep it Green!

326	374	Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Green Belt	Oppose	We object to this planning application for Policy HA7: Stoney Lane, Spondon for the following reasons. The single point of access to the site at the end of Stoney Lane is located extremely close to the junction with the A52. This is a significant safety concern. Increased traffic to and from the development, particularly during peak times when the road is already busy, could cause vehicles to queue back onto the A52 slip road, creating a serious safety risk for road users. Furthermore, Spondon village already experiences a high volume of through traffic via Sitwell Street, which is frequently used as a route to Ilkeston. The additional residents from this development will inevitably increase congestion within the village. Traffic congestion is already a major issue in Spondon, and this development, along with others, will only worsen the situation. In addition, the increase in residents will place further pressure on Chapel Street Medical Centre, as the new housing will fall within its catchment area. It is already extremely difficult to obtain a timely appointment at this surgery. Additional demand will negatively impact existing residents who may struggle to access necessary medical care within a reasonable timeframe. As of now there is no information on how this increased pressure will be addressed. There will also be increased pressure on local schools. West Park School is already at its PAN, meaning that children living within the new development may not be able to access a place at a nearby school. This would have a negative impact on the quality of life for both new and existing residents. Additionally, the land designated for this development is Green Belt land. Currently, residents use this land as open space for walking and recreation. The loss of a significant portion of this land would negatively impact the wellbeing of the local community. There is also a new housing development, Fawndale Rise by Bloor Homes, already underway on Dale Road. This development will itself bring a significant increase in residents to Spondon, placing further demand on local schools, healthcare services and other amenities. It is worth noting that Derby City Council previously opposed this

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				development for many of the same reasons outlined above. There is also a consultation underway for a further 250 homes to be built on land off Locko Road. As this site is also on Green Belt land, we also oppose that proposal. The cumulative impact of all these housing developments would significantly exacerbate the issues outlined above. For these reasons, we urge the Council to refuse this development.
328	376	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted], I support the North Oakwood green wedge being retained in the local plan. Only building i would support is extension to parkview school which is only large enough for a small percentage if Oakwood children
329	377	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing in response to the consultation on Derby's local plan. [Redacted], I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan. The green space provides significant mental and physical health benefits for local residents as well as providing a thriving environment for nature, particularly in Chaddesden Wood Nature Reserve.
370	418	Green Wedge	Support	support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retaining in the local plan.
398	444	Green Wedge	Oppose	I object to any building on the green wedge there is not sufficient room for traffic on the road. It would cause flooding on Mansfield road.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
331	379	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted] I wish to express my support for the retention of the North Oakwood Green wedge. This area must be protected against future development.
404	450	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted] I support the creation of the north Oakwood green wedge in the new proposed local plan.
407	452	Green Wedge	Support	For your records can you please note that I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan.
408	453	Green Wedge	Support	I support keeping the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the local plan.
414	459	Green Wedge, Environment	Support	I would like to register my support for the City Council to keep the North Oakwood Green Wedge - with the minor amendments to the boundaries included. The Green Wedge provides an essential link between the city and the countryside. This enables residents to move between the city and the wider countryside. The Green Wedge encompasses historic Chaddesden Wood and Oakwood Park which provide essential open spaces and sports facilities. This provision of open spaces is well used by young families, older people and teenagers enabling them to enjoy what is becoming a rare facility in the built environment. It is good to see that the City Council is retaining this within it's local plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
415	460	Green Wedge, Environment	Support	I would like to register my support for the City Council to keep the North Oakwood Green Wedge - with the minor amendments to the boundaries included. The Green Wedge provides an essential link between the city and the countryside. This enables residents to move between the city and the wider countryside. The Green Wedge encompasses historic Chaddesden Wood and Oakwood Park which provide essential open spaces and sports facilities. This provision of open spaces is well used by young families, older people and teenagers enabling them to enjoy what is becoming a rare facility in the built environment. It is good to see that the City Council is retaining this within it's local plan.
419	464	Green Wedge	Support	I wish to state that I support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the Local Plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
426	170	Green Wedge, Transport, Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Open Space, Health	Support	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing to express my strong support for the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained within Derby's Local Plan. This area should remain protected from future development, not only because of its environmental importance, but also because of the increasing strain already being placed on local infrastructure and public services. Roads in and around Oakwood, Chaddesden and the surrounding areas are already heavily congested at peak times, and any further development would only add to existing traffic pressures and road safety concerns. There is also increasing pressure on local schools, amenities and community facilities. Most importantly, medical services are already under significant strain. We have already lost one local GP practice, meaning demand has had to be absorbed by surgeries in Oakwood, Chaddesden, Spondon and other surrounding areas. These practices are already serving large communities, and further housing development would place even greater pressure on access to GP appointments and other essential healthcare services. Retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge is therefore not only about protecting valuable green space such as Chaddesden Wood, the North Field, Parkview Primary School's playing fields and Oakwood Park, but also about recognising the limits of the current infrastructure and protecting the wellbeing of existing residents. I strongly urge Derby City Council to retain the North Oakwood Green Wedge within the Local Plan and to protect this important area from future development. Thank you for considering my submission.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
382	430	Green Wedge	Support	I support retention of the North Oakwood Green Wedge . I am against any development which encroaches onto this land in whole or part
429	472	Green Wedge	Support	I confirm my support for the north Oakwood green wedge being retained in the local plan.

373	421	Open Space, Environment, Infrastructure, Green Wedge, Housing	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the proposed housing developments on **land off Locko Road** and the proposed allocation and development of land off **Stoney Lane** (Policy HA7) as referenced in the Draft Local Plan. [Redacted]. I have previously supported efforts to stop the wonton destruction of Spondon Woods green belt, by Erewash Borough Council and Bloore Homes. I would like to offer objections to the proposed developments in Spondon as Green Belt Land is covered by a National Policy. National statistics show that there is more that enough available housing in England and I feel that the current drive to build on precious Green Belt land is driven by financial greed with little regard for the environment. The UK is loosing it's natural habitat and wildlife faster than any other country in the world. **Land off Locko Road – Green Belt Protection** The land off Locko Road sits within Derby's designated Green Belt, and recent evidence strongly reinforces why it should remain protected. A full, comprehensive Green Belt review commissioned by Derby City Council and carried out by external professional consultants found that the land around Locko Road unquestionably meets the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) tests for Green Belt purposes. This means the site continues to perform the key functions expected of Green Belt land, such as preventing urban sprawl and safeguarding the countryside. Derby City Council's own Local Plan includes a commitment to protect Green Belt land, and the findings of the review support that policy position. National planning policy clearly states that the essential aim of Green Belt policy is to keep land permanently open. Development in the Green Belt is considered inappropriate, and Councils are expected to prioritise brownfield land before considering the release of Green Belt land.

				Protecting this land is also essential for safeguarding our farmland, It is important we preserve the environmental and visual landscape that residents value. Developing this site would therefore represent a significant and unnecessary loss of protected land and would conflict with the fundamental aims of Green Belt policy. **Stoney Lane Development (Approx. 400 Homes) – Infrastructure and Environmental Concerns** I strongly object to the proposed large-scale development at the rear of Stoney Lane for the following reasons: **Infrastructure Concerns** There is currently no clear evidence that local infrastructure can support a development of this scale. Roads in and around Spondon are already under significant pressure. Residents regularly experience congestion and delays when entering and exiting Spondon, particularly during rush hour. Introducing approximately 400 additional homes would further increase traffic levels, worsen congestion, and extend journey times. **Drainage and Flooding** Spondon's drainage system is ageing and already struggling to cope with demand. There have been ongoing issues including burst water pipes, road damage, lifted drain covers, and flooding caused by outdated sewage infrastructure. The system is frequently requiring repair work. Adding many new homes will place further strain on this already vulnerable network, increasing the risk of flooding and environmental damage. **Pressure on Local Services** A development of this size will place significant additional demand on already oversubscribed schools, GP surgeries, and other community services, many of which are already operating at or near capacity. **Green Belt Impact**

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				The site is currently designated Green Belt. National planning policy restricts development in such areas, and inappropriate development should not be approved. Therefore, releasing this Green Belt land would be contrary to national policy objectives, including preventing urban sprawl and maintaining separation **Conclusion** For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge Derby City Council to: ● Maintain the Green Belt designation and reject any development proposals for land off Locko Road. ● Reconsider the allocation of Stoney Lane (Policy HA7) for large-scale housing due to infrastructure limitations, traffic concerns, environmental harm, drainage issues, and pressure on local services. Planning decisions must prioritise the protection of Green Belt land, the wellbeing and safety of residents, and the long-term sustainability of communities.

368	416	Open Space, Environment, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Allocation of Land West of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton for a Gypsy and Traveller Site (minimum 17 permanent caravan pitches) in the Draft Local Plan for Derby (Regulation 18 Consultation) Dear Planning Policy Team, [Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

351	398	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure	Oppose	[Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
358	405	Green Wedge	Support	I wanted to voice my support for the continued inclusion of the green wedge to the north of Chaddesden Wood. The wedge protecting the wood and field is important to preserve the wildlife and habitat in the wood, especially with buildings now in all other directions. My [Redacted] and I both strongly support the inclusion and maintenance of the current wedge in the plan.
357	404	Green Wedge	Support	please accept this email in response to the consultation, both myself and [Redacted] support keeping the **North Oakwood Green Wedge**
356	403	Green Wedge	Support	I'm writing to voice my support and the support of [Redacted] for the north Oakwood green wedge being retained in the local plan. We live locally to this area and It's critical that this land is protected from development to maintain the delicate ecological balance of the area around chaddesden wood. Surrounding fields provide critical flight paths for birds and bats into and out of the region. Development on this land would do irreversible damage to the protected chaddesden wood. The few green spaces left in Oakwood must be protected.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
294	342	Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	Having read and partially digested the Local Plan for Derby City I feel the continued strangulation of Spondon and its surrounding area are almost complete but refusal of this and other schemes may allow us to retain at least some of the long cherished "green belt status". [Redacted] The village is besieged by HGVs and through traffic and traffic causes regular grid locks in the centre. All of the essential services such as doctors, dentists and schools are over subscribed (though still able to function to a minimum level). The added pressure of traffic causes hazards for school children the elderly and those who once used the village infrastructure for shopping and leisure purposes. This extra slice of our village when added to the Locko Road, Dale Road and other infill building has turned a once desirable place to live into one that now resembles densely deserted dormitory tow or a densely populated inner ward. In closing I strongly oppose this and other proposals to further destroy Spondon's way of life by uncontrolled developments.
282	330	Green Belt, Green Wedge	Support	In reference to the above subject line, I wish to express my support of the creation of the North Oakwood Green Wedge in the new proposed local plan

269	317	Environment, Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Housing	Oppose	I live at [Redacted]. In recent times has anybody actually come off the A52 at the Spondon slip off. Im guessing not as its pretty dangerous and then deciding to put an entrance right 50m from it comical. Im pretty confident the barrier gets taken down on the opposite side ever few weeks. Does anybody from Derby city coucil/ house developers or even builders live in spondon? Im guessing not as have they tryed to get to work via Willocroft road or Dale road? From 7 till 8 the traffic in the morning is an absolute joke. Its stand still. Same as 5oclock trying to get home. And the best part is you also want to put up traffic lights at spondon round about where Looms and B&M is. Bit off topic, can you give me the name of the person who actually thinks putting traffic lights up at a free flowing roundabout is a good idea. Schools; what is there now, 4 developments want to go off in spondon/ edge of spondon. Where do you think these kids are going to get an education from? Because West park school said they wont be accepting the cash offered from the developer on Deer Park view. So where are they going from this development? They going to build a school? Doctors. We already know nobody and im sure you already know that just about anyone can not get an appointment. [Redacted]. So congratulations on trying to build 400 more homes and Derwent valley trying to accommodate probably 800 more people because thats not going to happen. I would like to end on who ever thinks building 400 houses on edge of spondon needs to be looked at. You obviously haven't actually took the time to look and check number and figures. You honestly think our small village can sustain this massive change. You want build 400 houses that going to be 800 people minimum. Thats 2 cars per house aswell because in this day and ages everyone has a car. Again traffic in the morning, though the village and at night. And this is just this development! There 3 more going off in spondon! Derby city Council you moan that there's no footfall in Derby and that we are a "city". Build in the city. Not on a greenbelt land. As you can tell I object to this development and the other 3 that are going on. You really need to sort this out and stop it.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
267	315	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted] i would like to support the North Oakwood Green Wedge being retained in the local plan. it would be a travesty to build on such great land. Please leave the land as it is
264	311	Green Wedge	Support	Further to your Draft Local Plan and its pending consultation, I am writing in support of the land to the north of Chaddesden Wood remaining in the green wedge.
462	489	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I do not agree with having a permanent site for Gypsies anywhere, never mind in Derby. Why should it be allowed ? They don't pay anything towards it, the taxpayer would have to pay for it, why should we ? We don't want them in our city. Apart from the financial aspect, then there's the hygiene issue. Everywhere they go, there's such an awful mess, they don't take any responsibility for keeping the area tidy & respectable. Then there's the social side, knocking on our door or stopping us in the street, asking us to buy stuff. [Redacted]. This is a definite objection to your proposed idea of putting a permanent gypsy site in Alvaston. NO THANK YOU.
443	486	Housing	Oppose	I currently live on [Redacted] and I am writing to say that there has been enough building on green belt land throughout Oakwood and the North Oakwood green wedge must be retained for wildlife, the people of Oakwood, and in order to not totally ruin Oakwood anymore than you already have. There is more than enough places to build on in Derby without ruining all the countryside views as you already have. If you feel you need to continue building on green belt land, do it somewhere else as you've done enough building on green belt in Oakwood!

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
464	491	Green Wedge	Support	I wish to express my opinion that the North Oakwood Green Wedge should be retained, as it is vital to keep green spaces for both nature and people.

295	343	Green Wedge, Environment, Stoney Lane, Community Facilities, Housing	Oppose	I am writing to object to the proposed allocation of an area of Green Belt land between the East side of Spondon and Ockbrook to 'Grey Belt' status and the housing development proposed for this area of land. Whilst it is appreciated there is a need to comply with the present government's policy for housing provision, I do not agree it is appropriate for an area of productive agricultural land which grows and harvests cereal crops to be downgraded to Grey Belt status. To lose this particular area of land to housing will impact Spondon's community. The quantity of housing proposed will lead to pressure on local amenities, schools, and increased traffic on local roads. The land between Spondon and Ockbrook has had the protection of Green Belt status for decades with the long established protected Public Rights of Way providing opportunity to access the countryside which for many residents will have been vital in maintaining their mental and physical well being. Traffic concerns: Local side roads in the vicinity of Stoney Lane and Sandringham Drive are well used particularly at commuter times of the day, there will inevitability be an increase in local traffic and pollution brought about through a new housing development. The proposed vehicle access planned from the housing development onto Stoney Lane makes no provision for the safe passage of pedestrians – the pavement which will be displaced is a main pedestrian route to Asterdale Primary & Nursery School and to West Park Secondary School as well as for pedestrians needing to access the bridge over the A52. Walking on the other side of Stoney Lane to cross over nearer the bridge will put lives in danger from traffic leaving the A52. Wildlife and its habitat:

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				There will be an inevitable and consequential loss to hedgerows, shrubs and trees, which have taken decades to evolve. Should the housing development proceed, land covered by concrete and tarmac will result in a loss of habitats supporting wild flowers, birds, small mammals, winged & ground insects. Trees planted to form a green wedge as mitigation to off-set pollution could take a number of years to become established, or struggle to thrive due to climate conditions. Established Public Right of Way: The Public Right of Way from Stoney Lane to Ockbrook provides a safe open passage across the area of land with views enjoyed across the South Derbyshire and Leicestershire countryside. It is unclear from the housing proposal how this established Public Right of Way in its present form will be retained and accessed in the midst of a housing estate – A fenced / boarded up alleyway signposted 'Public Right of Way' would be a poor substitute, the confines of a narrow passageway leading to safety concerns. I hope the City's planning authority will recognise there is long-term value in retaining the Green Belt status to cover the whole of the current area between to the East of Spondon and Ockbrook — not just for the well being of Spondon residents whose lives will be impacted by this development but also to safeguard the landscape and wildlife that depend on it. If the status of this area is changed and developed for housing the loss for present and future generations living in Spondon will be more than it gains.

346	393	Community Facilities, Open Space, Infrastructure, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries. 6. When they had travellers there before, the site was left in a right state, with lots of rubbish left behind and that was with only 4/6 caravans, when walking the dog around the area they were very intimidating.

290	337	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Subject: STRONG OBJECTION to Policy HA17 – Allocation of Land West of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton for a Gypsy and Traveller Site (minimum 17 permanent caravan pitches) in the Draft Local Plan for Derby (Regulation 18 Consultation) Dear Planning Policy Team, [Redacted]. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community

				Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential

				amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

279	327	Environment, Stoney Lane, Green Wedge, Green Belt, Housing	Oppose	I have already been on Bloor Homes and made my opinions clear on their website and consultation. Spondon is a beautiful village which amazing surrounding fields. [Redacted]. We are currently not overlooked, the Locko Road fields and vast views are behind us. The green spaces at incredible. There are many amazing walks in that direction. These places and walks have massively supported my mental health and others over the years, in particular in the Covid lock-down when we were allowed out for our ‘daily exercise’. Many people from locally and beyond use these walks and public footpaths. Spondon is already under great strains in terms of inferstructure of the roads. Unfortfunately the smaller village roads were not built for the capacity they have to deal today, so to add potentially another near 1000 homes with a minimum of (on average) of 2 cars per household. Adding to this already concerning infrastructure will massively impact getting out of and into Spondon and potentially surrounding villages. 3 major routes in and out: Locko Road from Ockwood to Spondon Dale Road from Ilkeston to Spondon Willowcroft taking to major routes such as A52 to Derby or Nottingham You only need an accident on the A52 or Football match traffic on a Saturday and Spondon is either really difficult to get out of or worse can grind to a halt. All 3 sites of ‘propsoals are all 3 of the routes into and out of Spondon. Affecting all 3 routes. The Senior school West Park is already oversubscribed.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
384	432	Housing, Stoney Lane, Transport, Open Space	Oppose	I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED SITE OF 400 HOMES AS THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC IT WILL CAUSE TO THE ROAD OUT OF SPONDON WILLOWCROFT ROAD AND SOUTH AVENUE WILL BE CONTINUALLY BUSY AND NOISEY AS THERE IS ALREADY TOO MUCH NOW. IT WILL RUIN THE LOOK OF SPONDON AS THERE ARE TO MANY HOUSES BEING PROPOSED IN OTHER AREAS WITHIN SPONDON, WE NEED SOME GREEN AREAS.

371	419	Open Space, Environment, Infrastructure, Gypsies And Travellers, Community Facilities	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

266	314	Open Space, Infrastructure, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Subject: STRONG OBJECTION to Policy HA17 – Allocation of Land West of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton for a Gypsy and Traveller Site (minimum 17 permanent caravan pitches) in the Draft Local Plan for Derby (Regulation 18 Consultation) Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community

				Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential

				amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation

184	227	Infrastructure, Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton /Crewton/Alvaston) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
406	242	Health, Open Space	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, These comments are addressed to: Policy GD6: Health and Wellbeing (p. 30) I'd like to see more emphasis on mental health in tandem with physical health. In particular, research will show that green spaces are essential to both mental and physical health, there needs to be greater stress on preserving them. Both physical and mental health are necessary to get people active again - including enabling them to participate in the workforce. This impacts on the plans for green spaces and although the higher authority [paragraph 645] excludes certain developments from national organizations from the remit of the local plan, it is necessary that the Council defend green spaces where possible - given their importance in the local plan. Without green spaces promoting physical and mental health (including places of tranquility) the local plan will fail in its aims regarding physical and mental health. It should also be noted that Brownfield sites vary enormously - some of them have contained the areas for wildlife in the city - remember the old Rowditch Tip?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
214	260	Housing, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	We have considered you draft plans in relation to your policy HA7: Stoney Lane Spondon, and wish to register our strong **OBJECTION** to the proposal to build 400 houses on this land. Our reasons for this objection are set out below, each with equal merit. 1. This land is designated as part of the green belt separating Derby and Nottingham cities. The land is used for agricultural purposes and has delivered a cereal crop for a number of years, thereby delivering on the nation's food security. 2. The fields act as a flood plain for the houses backing onto them thereby protecting existing properties from flood risks in a changing climate. 3. Given this is green belt land there are a number of established hedgerows, fine mature trees, and a plethora of wildlife that lives in this area. We are concerned that this would be jeopardised under the proposed development. 4. The local roads cannot handle additional traffic that new housing projects will bring, both in terms of construction traffic and ensuing private vehicles. The traffic from Dale Road to the east, through the narrow street in the village centre to the traffic lights at the junction of Willowcroft Road and Nottingham Road experiences regular congestion, and the ever increasing traffic flow creates constant difficulty turning out of the side streets for current residents, as well as danger for pedestrians in the village centre on the narrow pavements in the shopping area. We feel the village does not need more traffic. Plus attachment

409	454	Infrastructure, Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

223	269	Green Wedge, Infrastructure, Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

242	290	Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
479	498	Spatial Strategy, Housing	Oppose	It is obvious that Derby City Council must have responsibility for a significantly bigger area if there is any chance of meeting housing targets. A simple area ratio says that doubling the area would allow the population to double a) How do you get a quart into a pint pot? The answer is you don't. DCC represents 3% of Derbyshire and although there must be a lot of land available it just is not in the correct place. If Derby expanded to double its area there would be about 275,000 spaces for housing equating to perhaps 100,000 dwellings. The cost of doing this is the decimation of current transport policies which are not set by modern needs or standards. b) If we refuse to consider, and to make this change, we will be squeezed until all the pips are extracted.

478	498	Infrastructure, Housing, City Centre	Oppose	a) Derby has had the opportunity to develop the housing stock within Derby City Council boundaries but this has had to compete with business expansion and new developments in the engineering sector. Where housing re-development has occurred, it has been in the oldest and most deprived areas leading to a continuation of old ideas in that most housing development has been limited to 2 storey buildings. b) If the inner-city housing stock is to be increased significantly above 2 storeys, demolition of relatively recently developed housing will need to occur prior to re-building with the most modern standards making them very expensive to purchase or rent. If it is suggested that additions to the currently built housing could be achieved by up-grading buildings, say from 2 to 4 or 6 storeys, there must be a caution that many up-grades have gone wrong – buildings are built to a specification that cannot necessarily be amended part way through life. c) A way out of this conundrum would be to reserve all appropriate land within the city centre for future multi-storey housing development. This means the council takes a pro-active approach to planning – directing planning rather than just let it go where developers want. d) The city centre has more than sufficient shopping and leisure outlets because of the movement to out of town facilities. If shops go out-of-town, then housing has logically a right to become more in the city centre. e) These buildings would have best practice features i) Air sourced heat pump heating. If one looks at big new developments in, say, China and the far east, it becomes undesirable to install local smallish heat pumps to each unit as their aesthetic appeal can appear devastating. Increasing the number of users per unit ensures that failure of a unit wipes out the benefit to multiple persons.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				ii) Shared services are such as (1) Water (2) refuse / re-cycling (3) Communications including modern media and TV and security monitoring (4) Shared secure accessibility arrangements such as external doors and internal lifts (5) However, Gas should be eliminated because of the greater individual and societal risk. Energy (power) is least risky from a clean source fed into generators providing the electricity grid under the control of power experts

474	496	Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries
477	498	Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	The draft Local Plan appears to propose that Spondon should by filled to the brim with new housing on an undated timescale. – viz Policy HA4 Royal Hill Road, Policy HA7 Stoney Lane, and a new proposal on both sides of Locko Road. All these are intended to be buffer areas rather than continuous housing and should be resisted in the name of a new planning approach.

476	498	Transport	Oppose	The Highway Code is the modern interpretation of the Law in relation to people and transport. It starts with a hierarchy of road users judged by the risk (of injury or death) they run in road use. a) The most vulnerable are those who cannot understand the risk they run – this would be young children, animals, and incapacitated persons. This category is the most unlikely to cause accidents as they should be looked after by competent persons – they do not ride bikes or drive cars etc.- but they are most vulnerable in accidents and therefore are the critical group. b) Other groupings follow. c) The last grouping is those road users who use vehicles ranging from bikes to HGVs. These will have stored energy due to motion and limited protection in their design for occupants or other road users – in general the bigger the vehicle the greater the potential to do harm to other road users d) The Local Plan chooses to implement this as measures that improve Sustainability which is not a Risk Assessment. e) This skewed assessment therefore rates a small vehicle as a less desirable solution than a bus whereas a risk assessment would reverse this as giving a greater total risk. f) The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 places a legal duty on employers to ensure, as far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety, and welfare of employees and the public. It requires employers to provide safe equipment, risk assessments, training, and a written safety policy. g) Derby City Council takes over these responsibilities from road building companies / developers as specified in their contract and should comply with the law to reduce the risk to road users as members of the public. Recent winter weather has caused serious deterioration of the road surfaces, aka pot holes. The Council protocol seems to be that only the biggest, deepest, longest surviving pot holes shall be resolved, which does not comply with the words of the law “as

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				far as is reasonably practicable" which requires the benefit/detriment to be judged in relation to the cost. h)HGVs and LGVs are a constant nuisance on roads that were laid down about the time of The Great Fire of Spondon (1340). They can be 44 tonne and may be used in such things as building Derby's infrastructure. These vehicles are almost encouraged to use their SatNav without knowing the road size. Spondon suffers particularly with the main road through the village (Sitwell Street - A6096) with traffic going to the transport Depot at Stanley Warehousing.
173	217		N/A	I would like to write and disagree with the proposal of 400 new homes on stoney lane. ONE OF THE BIGGEST PROBLEMS WILL BE CARS with at least 800 more cars trying to get through spondon village based on at least 2 cars per family about . At the meeting in the market hall, no-one could answer the question about the road so I assume the question was to hard for them to understand, if you also build by the cricket ground and up by pheasant field drive have you worked out how many more cars estimating 2 cars per family, going through the village, you have about ruined the village is your intention to destroy it because your doing a good job of it. Next will the drains cope and sewage drains cope, will flooding start for the innocent who have [Redacted]. Doctors and dentist we cannot get in now, more pressure for the hospitals Schools and parking will be another problem, parents cannot walk children to school even though some only live 10 min or less walk away and the standard of driving is bad, they park on bends opposite junctions and the best they now park full on the pavements so pedestrians have to walk on the roads to pass them. All fields are now being taken by housing if we need to grow our own food because of cconflicts we haven't a chance ,also take note of public footpaths which do get walked often.

169	214	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different.

170	213	Housing, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to lodge my disagreement with the proposed 400 new homes planned for Stoney Lane. The current infrastructure is already showing signs that it is on the limit with the constant power outages, the low gas pressure especially in winter, and the constant problems with the fresh water pressure. Then the problems will also be exacerbated by the creaking sewage system which is appearing on Sandingham Road as the recently renewed road surface is currently “rippling” up near the junction of Hampton Close and showing signs of sinking further down the road; also, the drains have not been cleaned for many years and this road is on a hill! Then there is the perennial problem of traffic! Whether it is the number of cars, vans, lorries, etc. There is a height restriction under the A52 bridge on Willowcroft Road. There is a 7.5 tonne weight limit on Sandringham Road which is very frequently ignored. How can the “village" cope with at least 1000-1400 more cars? They have currently started work on the 450 houses on Dale Road which is in the Erewash District Council area. More of which below! There appears to be a proposal to also build near Spondon Cricket Ground and off Pheasant Field Drive. Also, the land of Acorn Way seems to rear its head every few years! More often than not, the only real exit out of Spondon is Willowcroft Road and this gridlocks every morning and is backed up through the village to at least the White Swan pub roundabout. During the day the traffic queues most of its length. Often taking some twenty minutes or more to get through the traffic lights at the bottom of Willowcroft Road.

				Which have been reset against the Spondon traffic flow since their upgrade and road resurfacing. Sometimes allowing only four or five vehicles through at va time! Ockbrook, which is in the Erewash District, is trying to petition against more vehicles through their village and therefore no doubt putting even more pressure on Spondon's road network. Public transport - we lost a lot of our regular bus service over the years, and it's only through the ongoing actions of the Spondon community groups and councillors that there is a somewhat shadow of the service that has been reinstated. Alas, a lot of people have since been using their own vehicles instead. Attending the recent February meetings in the Market Hall, no one could answer our or the other people's questions put to them, so I assume the questions were too hard for them to comprehend or even understand people's concerns or apprehensions! There is an abundance of wildlife on "Stoney Road" fields, including rabbits, mice, birds including those hunting birds: kestrels, buzzards, and I've seen Red Kites! We quite often have pheasants coming into our garden, not forgetting the bats flying around these fields. Have you worked out how many more cars, estimating the two cars per family - which seems to be the norm nowadays? They have about ruined the "village". As it seems the intention is to destroy it because they're going about it.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Next, how will the drains cope and the sewage system cope? Will flooding start for those innocents who have [Redacted] without many problems? The two doctors and a dentist cannot cope now, as we all know the problems of seeing a doctor! Therefore, more pressure is on them and the hospitals. Schools and associated parking are already a major problem, therefore the problem will increase exponentially! As parents cannot walk their children to school, even though some only live a ten-minute or less walk away, and the standard of “driving" is at best bad to dangerous, they “park" on the pavement edges, across driveways, bends, opposite junctions, bus stops, etc. When they are asked to be more considerate, the response is at best “go away” or their entitlement is off the scale. They now “park" full on the pavements, so pedestrians have to walk on the roads to avoid them. With all the green fields being built on as it is cheaper and not brown or even grey land/fields because of the costs of decontamination, they are slowly but surely being taken by housing and warehousing, etc. We are losing our own ability to grow our own supplies! If god forbid we need to be self-sufficient and grow our own food because of the uncertainties and conflicts that are mounting across the world, we haven’t a chance of growing any crops.

171	215	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

172	216	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

174	218	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

175	219	Housing, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I put the following points in objection to the proposed development: The addition of 400 new homes to Spondon, in addition and as well as the other proposed developments, will weaken an already stretched infrastructure There are already serious issues with parking in the village to access essential amenities. It is a nightmare finding parking to access shops, library and the village Hall ; GP's and schools are already well over subscribed. The access and egress to Spondon residential areas and the village centre is already very busy with minor roads such as South Avenue, Sandringham Drive, and Sancroft Road being used as rat runs to to access the main arteries to Derby and Nottingham 400 more houses is likely to equate to a minimum of 500 more vehicles using routes to major roads via the village or the A52 The reality is that this could be an under estimate. The site of the single point of access is cause for concern , being close to an already busy junction to the A52 Any other access eg via roads off Sandringham Drive will make that road more congested than it already is. The land itself is noted for having natural springs and properties adjacent to it already suffer from drainage issues during heavy or continuous rainfall when the land becomes becomes saturated. The provision of more houses will result in more flooding and is very likely to be of concern to residents of new properties in spite of the "comprehensive surface water solution" ....see areas on the Sandringham Drive and Pheasant Field Estates which have been build on Natural springs

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				The Government and the City Council seems determined to build on any land and destroy green areas between neighbourhoods using the excuse of granting planning permission on the pretext of providing "Affordable Housing", only for the plans to change once planning permission has been granted

177	221	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process.
178	222	Green Wedge	Support	Due to the need to protect Chaddesden as an ancient woodland I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

179	223	Gypsies And Travellers, Environment, Open Space	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries. [Redacted]. There have been many changes since I moved here. Almost 30 years ago Pride Park was built and an access road was put in across the fields behind the houses and a new estate was built on most of the remaining land. Wilmorton was left with a sliver of land half of which is now allotments. Local residents were very disappointed at the time because our voices were not listened to and the only compensation they gave us was some bunds to absorb noise from the road and a tiny play area for the local children on the remaining field. Now the council want to take this last remaining green area and use it to house gypsies and travellers on a permanent site. This is a broken promise and leaves Wilmorton residents with nothing. This will mean no more access to the field where children play, people walk their dogs and local workers sit and eat their lunch in the nice weather. In the past we have had gypsies/travellers move illegally onto the field and set up camp for weeks at a time. Eventually when they are moved on they have left the field in an awful state. They have left their rubbish, dog waste and even human excrement was found in the areas where children used to play. This cost the taxpayer money to clean up. Also people walking on the field with their families or dogs were threatened if went too close to the caravans and some local people living next to the site reported gypsies/travellers on their property and trying door handles to check if locked. All of which is not a promising forecast for a permanent site on this land. Wilmorton is already the forgotten dumping ground of Derby. We have an above average amount of HMOs in this area with an increasing transient community. This leads to residents not caring about where they live as not around for long. Fly tipping is a massive problem and I regularly email the council to come and pick up the latest dumped tv or bags of household waste. 90% of residents leave both wheelie bins outside their houses all year round (increasing to 3 from March), there have been several cannabis farms in local houses discovered by police that bring criminality and anti social behaviour to the area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				We had a mental health hospital built without informing local residents of plans so no chance to object. Hospital patients used to walk around the neighbourhood unaccompanied when the hospital first opened. Leaving local people with no knowledge of who they were and if they posed a risk, this was stopped soon after. We have had halfway houses in the local vicinity filled with single men, again local residents having no idea who these men were and what crimes they had committed. Will I be able to sell my house with a gypsy/traveller site at the end of the road? How much will this devalue our properties? Where will children play? Where will people let their dogs chase a ball? Where can people go for a walk for their mental health locally? Will our voices be listened to this time or have the council already made up their mind to go ahead with this plan?

186	229	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
188	232	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space	Oppose	I strongly object to the erecting of 17 Caravans on green field site for Gypsy and travellers.Loss of green spaces in the area will have a negative impact in the local area.This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure and national planning policy (NPPF Paragraph 102-103 and174-188) which requires the protection and enhancement of open spaces.

190	234	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure, Transport	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

191	235	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure, Transport	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
192	236	Green Wedge, Housing	Support	I am submitting my comments on the Draft Local Plan for Derby [Redacted]. I support the Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document. [Redacted] I have witnessed and experienced the value of this Green Space to Nature and to the wellbeing of the community. I attended a presentation re the Plan in Derby Market Hall where I found the information provided by the Chief Planning Officer and Colleagues very helpful. Oakwood has contributed a significant amount of green land to housing development in recent years which has contributed towards Derby City's Plan to provide 12,500 housing requirement over the period 2023 - 2043. This area's facilities and infrastructure are now up to capacity for provision of education and health services. I fully support the proposal to reject any further development plans for this area and to retain the North Oakwood Green Wedge.

196	240	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure, Transport	Oppose	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include:

				Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents. Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives

				The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods. I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

234	281	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process.

243	289	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I request that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites should be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

247	294	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

275	323	Gypsies And Travellers, Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

277	325	Gypsies And Travellers, Infrastructure, Flood Risk, Environment	Oppose	[Redacted] I am raising an objection and sharing my concerns about a proposal under policy HA17. The proposal if brought forward into delivery would result in the loss of Public Open Space. Resulting in a loss of facility of amenity to existing local residents, including many vulnearble persons and children. Noting in particular the residents of the YMCA on London Road and the Cygnet Hospital at City Gate. Children already have to navigate busy roads to access Alvaston Park. They will have to walk between 1 and 3/4 of a mile to reach a similar green open public area safely and are unlikely to do this if unaccompanied by their caregivers. The proposal gives no indication of any landscaping or other measure to mitigate in particular the noise and air pollution issues associated with accommodation of this type, which are known to be factors. Given lifestyle and cultural preferences of travellers themselves. The area of green is prone to waterlogging and flooding and this is noted of benefit to the River Derwent as it reduces the risk of fluvial flooding. Creating more hard surfaces and reducing the area available for soil infrastructure to slow down and filter rain water run off will bring benefit how? Some of the trees in the proposed area are subject to Tree Protection Orders and outline the historic route of a spur of the Derby canal. How does the proposal seek to accommodate these factors please? Two residential sites for trailers/mobile homes within the locale, Navigation Home Park and Meadow Lane Home Park. This proposal if brought forwards to delivery, would lead to an increase in the over preponderance of this type of accommodation/lack of diversity in housing type, which is inherently vulnerable to both flood and fire. Wilmorton consists primarily of poorer suburban housing. What positive benefit will the siting of Traveller accommodation of this type, bring to this area? The proposal is not seen as regenerative of the local area in any way. There is a factual and noted negative impact on the saleability of existing homes, sited close to traveller sites. Please expand on the consideration given to this within the proposal. Wilmorton sits in Derby 024F LSAO, is in the top quintile for deprivation overall. Areas with similar characteristics in Derby are benefitting from inward investment in facilities and amenities, not a reduction of these. What consideration has been given to the equity of allocation in this respect? It would be unreasonable to cite the proposed area abuts

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				024F, as it in fact comprises a fully green area and public amenity, rich in bio diversity which should it be removed, should the proposal go ahead. Further increasing deprivation in terms of access to such spaces for existing residents. In noting the existing pressure on services, and in particular lack of access to NHS services with GP surgeries in the local area. Both Doctors and Dentists do have waiting lists to take new NHS patients on board and often only when meeting specific criteria. The Lakeside school and nursery is already oversubscribed. Census figures for 2021 indicated an increased population of around 5.1% locally. What consideration has been given by the council to these issues when formulating the proposal. Travellers already experience significant increased risk of mortality and at earlier ages than the general population. Siting accommodation of this type, in this area will residualise those risks. Please expand on the consideration undertaken with the relevant authorities and bodies in this regard, including Traveller groups themselves. It is not clear what, if any consideration has been given to the impact on the local community at all. Local residents note with alarm, that situations which have caused distress and fear have been reported in relation to the existing travellers site at Russell Street. This has included intimidation, leading to reports of harassment and public order incidents. Despite it being in 'public' management. These include noise nuisance, illegal fly-tipping, environmental damage, and intimidating behaviour due to clashes of culture and lifestyle, dog fouling and nuisance bonfires for instance. The council has a specific public sector equality duty which requires councils to tackle prejudice and promote understanding between different groups. There is clearly unrest and a distinct unfavourable response noted towards the proposal from local residents. How does the council propose to meet its legal duties in these circumstances? What will be done to reduce the significant risk of tension and hostility between travellers and the settled communities of Wilmorton and City Point should the proposal go ahead?

311	359	Gypsies And Travellers, Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
334	382	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I strongly oppose the proposal of a travellers site on our Green space .. Wilmorton has had a Mental Hospital & YMCA in our community and now we are being told that a travellers site is proposed.. Why can't you put them on a Brown site rather than a Green Space , like the old Derby training ground next to the Recycling site on Raynesway?

344	391	Gypsies And Travellers, Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Open Space	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
431	475	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure, Health, Environment	Oppose	Dear Planning Team, I am writing to formally object to the proposal to use the Wilmorton Recreation Area as a Gypsy and Traveller site for a minimum of 17 caravans. My objections are based on the following grounds: 1. **Loss of Essential Green Space:** This area is a vital community asset for exercise and mental well-being. Developing it would result in a permanent loss of open space that is irreplaceable for local families. 2. **Pressure on Healthcare Services:** Local GP surgeries and medical facilities are already overwhelmed. The significant increase in residents from the high density of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in the immediate area has already stretched these services to a breaking point; adding further residential capacity would be unsustainable. 3. **Impact on Local Infrastructure:** The addition of a large site would place undue pressure on local roads, drainage, and utilities which are already heavily utilised. 4. **Environmental Impact:** The development would disrupt local biodiversity and the established natural landscape of this cherished green space. I urge the Council to protect our parkland and seek alternative brownfield sites that do not negatively impact the health and recreational needs of the existing community. Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed of any further developments regarding the Emerging Local Plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
195	239	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Health	Oppose	This ground is the green space for the 320 dwellings in old Wilmorton. It is heavily used for ball games, dog walking, picnics, peaceful contemplation, parties, working, and many more activities. Your plan to tarmac it over and fill it with hideous caravans and associated vehicles is abhorent. We have already experienced caravans over running the ground in the past and it is instilled in many memories the disgusting mess that was left behind. The council had to bring in many skips to clear it up at our expense. Covid clearly demonstrated the crucial health benefits of green space on the population. It also demonstrated the disadvantage of the many that had no access to a private garden. In fact the Government is consulting of new guidance to add green space to new developments. Since the dwellings in places such as Allestree have already got private gardens, one wonders why you haven't planned to eliminate one of their public green spaces?

341	388	Infrastructure, Stoney Lane, Green Belt	Oppose	I wish to register my strong objection to Policy HA7 with regards to any housing on the eastern side of Stoney Lane, Spondon. The land has always been agricultural and as a pupil more than 60 years ago at Asterdale Primary School on the other side of what was then known as the Borrowash by-pass we used to be taken across to the fields for nature walks. During the Covid pandemic many people used to go across this land for walks across the fields for exercise and fresh air, sometimes taking very popular routes into Ockbrook and back. The land is in the green belt - including on the current Local Plan - and is designed to keep the communities of Spondon in Derby and Ockbrook in Erewash apart and separate rather then joining together, rather than an enlarged conurbation linking Derby and Nottingham. .This was demonstrated before the last Derby and Derbyshire County Structure Plan around the turn of the century when there were very strong protests by people from Spondon and Ockbrok and Borrowash about the idea of developing housing on that land which I seem to remember Derby City Council opposed. The result was that the inspector who conducted the public inquiry agreed and dismissed the idea of building on that land, much to the great relief of people. Despite new regulations about Grey Belt I would submit that this land remains a valuable part of the Green Belt . While I understand the need for new homes I don't think that it is up to councils, developers, or housebuilders to suddenly decide that land which has been justifiably designated Green Belt for decades should suddenly overnight be re-classified as Grey Belt just because it suits their needs. There is no demand for extra, large homes on this site. There are about 90 homes for sale on Rightmove, Spondon, including some large and highly-priced.ones. Plans have also been approved to build amost 300 homes just outside Spondon and Derby's boundary in the Green Belt off Dale Road and another 90 on the green wedge west of Royal Hill Road, both of which were strongly opposed by local residents. This was not just because of their designared status but because of concerns about infrastructure, partricularly road, schools, and sewage disposal but also because of effects on already over-crowded facilities. Again, while there is a need for low cost (what people mistakenly called

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				affordable) housing in Derby more should have been done in the past to encourage housebuilders to construct one and two-bed homes rather than three or four. There are many examples where this could have been done in Spondon. Not everybody wants or can move into three, four and five-bed homes with double garages and large gardens. Homes should be built to meet the needs of people not the profits of landowners, developers and housebuilders. Because of its situation, surrounded on three sides by Green Belt or green wedge, new housing in Spondon was encouraged for decades on infill sites. Now there are no such sites left, not even small ones. So developers are looking to build on the edges of Spondon for various attractive reasons, including good communications to the M1. Too many new homes can not only lead to over-stretched facilities but also affect the nature, cohesion and community spirit of Spondon, which still has a village heart. People dont want it to become a large built-up blob on the edge of Derby and lose its special identity. Finally, any idea of constructing an acess or egress to and from any housing on this site from Stoney Lane is a ridiculous non-starter The road is one of the few main arteries to and from Spondon village. It is busy with vehicles coming off the A52 at speed and vehicles going on to the A52. There would be a conflict of traffic interests which would be a major safety issue. For these reasons, I oppose the policy HA7.
273	320	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I strongly object to your proposal to create a Traveller/Gypsy on green land adjacent/near to Archer Street, Wilmorton.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
182	226	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am emailing out of concern and objection of any plans for a traveller site on wilmorton Park. My reasons are as follows 1. The majority of houses in wilmorton are terraced houses with small back gardens, the wilmorton field is the only green space within easy reach. 2. The park space is well used with dog walkers, concern over safety with my dogs and traveller dogs that could be loose. 3. The space and paths are used daily by school children and parents as the walk to and from cut school. 4. Having a traveller site on our doorstep will effect house prices nobody will want to buy or even rent in an area with travellers, [Redacted]. Wilmorton is not in a affluent area of Derby, majority are relatively small 2 bed terraced houses. 5. I would be very concerned over rubbish levels left by travellers. 6. Travellers would have a negative impact on the area. I strongly object your decision to put a traveller site on wilmorton Park

176	220	Green Wedge, Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Housing, Flood Risk	Oppose	I am extremely concerned about this proposed housing development. This is going to cause a lot of problems for Spondon residents. The village is not big and does not have very wide roads. There is only 1 pedestrian crossing in the village and no safe places to cross on Dale Road.The excess traffic will be unsustainable as we already have queues through the village at peak times and the small roundabout at the top and bottom of Wiilowcroft Road to take traffic onto Derby Road and gain access to A52 etc have already experienced problems with lorries going through damaging the surface of the road. At peak times the traffic can be backed up right through the village to get to the Derby Road . The only other exit out of Spondon is via Locko road and if the Housing proposal by Bloor Homes on Locko Road is approved This will cause more traffic problems.There will be an decrease of air air quality with the extra cars and lorries on the road There will be excess pressure on local amenities as Spondon will be nearer to access doctors, dentists etc and there is already a problem with getting an appointment now. The schools in Spondon are good and the secondary school is oversubscribed. Primary and Secondary schools already have issues with parking at school time at the beginning and the end of the day. 1of the schools is on Sandringham Road which runs onto Stoney Lane. There is a footpath from Sandringham road and Dale road which leads to Ocbrrok and Borrowash which is regulary used.I hope that this will be retained. The water , drainage and sewerage system is old and needs replacing. and this needs to be addressed with both surface and foul water from the proposed development.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				There are so many reasons why this development will have an adverse effect on the people of Spondon that I strongly object to this development and suggest that planning find a more suitable site away from Spondon . I trust that you will vigorously defend the Green belt land on Locko Road where Bloor Homes are also proposing a housing development. With Spondon Woods Housing develpment being passed though vigorously objected to Spondon residents feel hemmed in with all these proposals. Thank you

461	207	Gypsies And Travellers, Infrastructure	Oppose	I am writing to formally express my strong objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, for a permanent Traveller site. This area is already densely populated and under considerable strain. Local roads are congested, public services are stretched, and residents are increasingly concerned about the cumulative impact of continued development in this part of Derby. Introducing a permanent site of at least 17 pitches will inevitably increase pressure on infrastructure, including highways, policing, schools and GP services. As a council tax payer, I contribute significantly toward the funding of local services. It is deeply concerning that further demands may be placed on those services without clear evidence of investment or expansion to support additional need. Residents are already experiencing the impact of rising costs and stretched resources. Crime and anti-social behaviour are ongoing concerns in this area. Many local residents feel that intensifying residential use on this site risks further strain on community safety resources and could increase disruption within an already pressured neighbourhood. I am also concerned about the financial implications for homeowners. Many of us have invested our savings into our properties, and there is genuine anxiety that this development could negatively affect house values and the overall desirability of the area. In addition, I would like to understand why this council-owned land is not being prioritised for the development of much-needed affordable housing. Derby City Council has acknowledged a significant shortage of homes and increasing levels of homelessness. Given the urgent need to provide housing for Derby residents currently on waiting lists or in temporary accommodation, it is difficult to understand why this site is not being used to help address that shortage.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I respectfully ask that this proposal be reconsidered and that greater transparency be provided regarding the rationale behind the allocation of this land.
189	233	Flood Risk, Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Environment, Infrastructure, Transport	Oppose	To whom it may concern. I am writing to formally object to the proposed traveller site development in Wilmorton. My objection is based on planning and infrastructure concerns relating to the suitability of this location for the proposed use. Firstly I am concerned about the impact on the local infrastructure including road access, traffic volume, drainage waste management and utilities. The surrounding road network is limited in capacity, and increased vehicle movements may create congestion, and safety risks for residents and pedestrians. The proposed site would only be accessible via either Bowmer Road or Warwick Street, this is already under strain with the local residents, football parking and local businesses who's workers and customers use the area to park and gain access. Secondly, the proposed development appears out of character with the existing residential nature of the area. The scale and layout raise concerns regarding visual impact, noise, and the overall effect on neighbouring amenities. I am also concerned about potential environmental impacts which include surface water run off, flood risks and effects on wildlife impacts. A comprehensive environmental and drainage assessment should be undertaken before any approval is considered. The area is currently the only green space we have within this area, this includes the community gardens, which is an allotment space the YMCA use as part of well being and therapy sessions. There is also a nature garden which was put together to house small wildlife and flora and fauna.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
187	230	Green Belt, Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	To whom it may concern I wish to inform the planning committee that i am in opposition to the proposed plan of using the land at Stoney Lane ,Spondon for the building of 400 houses as laid out in Policy HA7:Stoney Lane,Spondon & Green Wedge/Green Belt Allocation This land is designated as GREEN BELT land and its an important that these areas are preserved for the well being of everyone ,this land is an important divide between Spondon and Ockbrook.
278	326	Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Housing	Oppose	I am writing with questions in regards to the proposed 650 new houses for Spondon: In regards to stoney lane- the proposed entry site is off the A52. This would cause traffic issues. The slip road there is already sharp and often with the speed of traffic, if cars or contractor equipment are queued up this could cause a crash. Would this mean queuing onto the A52? There's isn't as much room as you think once you leave the A52. There are only 2 ways in and out of Spondon- adding more cars would mean more congestion. Why so many houses? Spondon is a villiage. That's its attraction. The facilities can't cope with the people already. There is one senior school in Spondon. If all these houses go ahead then west park would need to reconsider its catchment and not include chadd to enable all the extra kids in Spondon a place. Places there are already limited. Drs and Dentists are full to the brim, people can't get treatment. I had no issue with more housing but 650? There is already plans for housing on Dale Road. Parking in Spondon is a nightmare. It's not designed for the amount of people or cars. I think people need to look at the amount of houses and the impact it'll have on safety and the well being of the residents.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
237	284	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I wish raise my concern regarding a planning application to build at least 17 plots for travellers/gypsy site on wilmorton bass recreation site. As a local resident on [Redacted] I totally object to this absurd idea. It's bad enough having the YMCA on London Road where certain layabouts just abuse the wilmorton bass recreation area by dropping all there litter and smoking weed. This is the only green bit of land we have in wilmorton and especially in summer times there are families using the area for picnics and playing with some sunbathing on the hillside. We allow this to happen and it's going to be a dumping ground with families and dog walking having to move on somewhere else.,us as residents are also going to be in fear of crime,vandalism and burglaries. I say totally no to this farce and leave wilmorton recreation ground alone to be enjoyed by dog walkers and families.
239	286	Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing about the proposed travellers site in Wilmorton. I oppose to this plan. The area where they are proposing is a lovely green area that is used by families as the houses in Wilmorton only have small back yards so use the green to play. It seems as if Wilmorton is a forgotten area. [Redacted] has seen a signative change in the area. What with HMOs in the area and the amount of rubbish being left around.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
194	238	Infrastructure, Flood Risk, Transport, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I have several comments on make on the proposed development in Spondon to the East of Stoney Lane. 1. How can you designate it as "grey belt"? It is farmland! 2. What school's catchment area will this be in? All the local ones are already full. 3. There will be serious issues with traffic with the proposed entry point. This was evident with the lorries gaining access to that area when the work was carried out in the fields several years ago. 4. If this is the only entry point for over 400 homes then congestion on this point at peak times is going to cause tailbacks right on a junction that is already very busy. 5. What is to stop this development continuing all the way to Ockbrook and North to Dale Road, in the future. 6. That stretch of the A52 has had surface water issues in the past with run off from those fields. This will only increase with the development.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
292	340	Stoney Lane	Oppose	I strongly protest to building on Green belt land ie locko road for the reasons it has been put in place. I appreciate houses have to be built but spondon has over the years increased in size and a development is already going ahead at Spondon Wood. As a young child it was an adventure to cycle or walk over to Ockbrook to go horse riding - knowing it was another village because of the countryside that divided it. And during Covid walking to lees brook and locko by Avondale you feel you can get directly into some countryside not into a big housing estate. it is a small bit of countryside left between spondon and ockbrook where people in these villages can easily benefit from a short walk (without having to get the car out) whether it be walking the dog or for physical and mental well-being and it was not so long ago during Covid we needed these green areas more than ever for our mental wellbeing. We also need them for our Grandchildren- going to the parks is a totally different experience as walking over fields - do you want to take that away from the next generation- once it's built on it's gone! My next concern is with the increase in population of spondon the effect this is going to have on the infrastructure GPs already under pressure with the amount of appointments - schools - nurseries- dentists. 650 homes means minimum 1300 cars! and fumes! Not to mention Spondon Wood development . All coming through the village and down South Avenue to join the queue on Willowcroft! And it's not any better on Locko Road towards Oakwood we can't cope with anymore cars. I appreciate we need more houses but this is not a very good site for access and not good for those whose house is next to the busy A52 with noise and pollution - and we don't want any more cars going down South Avenue.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
254	301	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I'd like to express my concerns regarding the proposed Traveler's Site on the Green Space at Wilmorton. [Redacted]. I want to express my concerns regarding your proposal of housing the suggested minimum of 17 x Caravans at this particular site. At present this is a green space that I for one feel in beneficial to the health of the Wilmorton Community. The allotments are also beneficial to the community. The plans to build a Traveler's site would disrupt the local environment and increase the amount of traffic experienced in the area. Your proposal would likely increase traffic as access roads and support facilities will need to be built. The tree line that separates the area from the traffic on Pacific Way would also be disrupted. This would create more noise. On a personal level, I will likely need to sell my home in the near future, and your proposals will probably impact on my property value. The area already suffers from increased traffic and parking from the recently failed parking scheme and the unwanted extra vehicles from during Derby County home games. I'd like to suggest another location that would be beneficial to your proposals. Alvaston Park already has a sectioned off area used for static Caravans. It has ample space that probably isn't fully utilised by members of the public. Importantly it already has an access road that would mean minimal disruptions to existing communities. There is also ample space on the di-used sidings off Chequers Road on the West Meadow Industrial Estate.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
193	237	Stoney Lane, Housing, Transport, Environment	Oppose	I am writing to express my concerns regarding the planned development at Stoney Lane in Spondon. [Redacted], I am very concerned at all of the proposed developments in Spondon at present. We firmly believe that the village simply does not have the capacity for significant expansion. We are currently [Redacted] residents and feel that the Stoney Lane development will have the following negative impacts. ● Further strain on an already overstretched set of amenities and services ● Further increased traffic, impacting quality of life and property values. Sancroft Road has already become a busy through-route and this is not desirable now. More cars will make it unacceptable. ● Overall the impact of planned developments on wildlife, traffic levels, influx of people and requirements will further damage a village which has already seen many negative changes of this nature. We would like to register our objection to the development plans.

185	228	Gypsies And Travellers, Open Space, Infrastructure	Oppose	Dear Sirs, I refer to the Emerging Local Plan for Derby regarding the proposal of an establishment of a Traveller/Gypsy site on Wilmorton Recreation Ground, Wilmorton, Derby. I object to the proposal of a traveller/gypsy site at this location in the strongest terms. I fully appreciate the Council is duty bound to find suitable sites for travellers but while travellers' needs are part of the equation, another part is the recognition of the interests of the settled community. Specifically:- **Environmental** – the proposed site presently contains many trees and bushes that are a haven for small animal and bird life and also help block the view and noise from the busy dual carriageway that is Pride Parkway. Undoubtedly all these trees and bushes will be removed (never to be replaced) to accommodate the site and result in the displacement/loss of said animals and bird life and increased visual and noise pollution from the road. Trees once removed are lost for ever. So many trees have been felled on the Recreation Ground over the last few years and have never been replaced. Trees are vital for the environment and the health of our planet. **Loss of amenity** – the proposed site will considerably further reduce the size of the recreation ground by at least a third (a large chunk of the recreation ground was also lost some years ago to the allotments). If this scheme goes ahead, there won't be much recreation ground left. The recreation ground is popular with dog walkers, joggers, golfers, folk from local businesses enjoying their lunch break, and families - especially in the summer with sunbathing, picnics and ball games. The recreation ground is a valuable asset for all the residents of Wilmorton, surrounded as we are by industry, businesses and lack of greenery. Houses in Wilmorton don't have large gardens – only small back yards – and the green space of the Wilmorton Recreation Ground is the only large open green amenity area residents can easily access on our doorstep.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				The propped development would make the recreation ground a far less desirable place in which to walk and spend quality time. Also, I choose to live in Wilmorton because of the peace and quiet it currently provides. A development of this nature would result in a significant increase in the population, add to existing parking problems in the area and will have a serious impact on noise levels, given its proximity to established residences. **Infrastructure Capacity** – local services are already overstretched. The addition of 17 plus families will put unbearable pressure on local GP surgeries and schools in the Wilmorton area. **Road Safety** – the proposed site will border a very busy dual carriageway and present a danger to children living on the site. **Access** – access and egress to the proposed site is off a very busy dual carriageway. This is totally unsuitable for the large vehicles used by gypsies and travellers. I urge the Council to reject this proposal and look for more suitable, alternative sites that do not negatively affect the existing environment and community Thank you for considering my objection.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
343	390	Infrastructure, Flood Risk, Housing	Oppose	I must object most strongly to any more proposed or otherwise developement in the Chaddesden/ Acorn Way area . Acorn Way is already at risk from flooding and was closed at least twice last winter due to the rain water pouring off the fields , fields that are being considered for housing. The traffic in the area is nothing short of abysmal since the so called improvement (unwanted and unused cycle lane) another 200 properties with at least one car or probably 2 is going to be gridlock. Where are the places at the local schools and doctors for the influx of more residents? We can't get appointments now , and dread being ill . Please look at using the many brown sites within the city before blighting the green areas permanently. We never get back Green fields . They are lost for ever.
145	186	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing to express my concern relating to the proposal from Derby City Council Planning Dept to build a Traveller/Gypsy site to house a minimum of 17 caravans on the only piece of green land in our area. This land is vital for our residents to use for walks, spending time with our family - in particular our children and grandchildren. This small area of green space is important to us because all the houses around that piece of land don't have much garden space for our families to get out and make the most of our leisure and exercise. Our grandchildren in particular love to go on the field and practice their football and cricket skills with us, their grandparents and also with other local children who gather there. It would be a great loss for us to lose this green space, which is used daily for the local residents and their visiting families and friends. With this in mind I would like to strongly object to the Traveller Site being situated on this small but precious piece of green space.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
240	287	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I have just learned that there is a proposal to use the Wilmorton Recreation area for a Traveller/Gypsy site, allowing up to 17 caravans. [Redacted], I have no wish to see this happen. Wilmorton in general has, in my opinion, gradually gone downhill over the last few years. Fly-tipping in particular on [Redacted]. This site can only help to push it further downhill if the recreation area is taken away as this is the ONLY green space we have in the old Wilmorton area. I also think there is a question of safety and security of peoples property. I, for one, wouldn't feel secure with regards to my home if this site were to go ahead.

154	195	Green Wedge	Oppose	I am writing in response to the above consultation, and with reference to the erosion of Green Wedges since the late 1980s, when they were presented as a robust environmental policy by the council: "A large number of planning applications have been refused on what might be termed green wedge grounds. When tested on appeal, these decisions, and the principle of maintaining open land, have been consistently supported by the Inspectorate and successive Secretaries of State. ... The open character of land in green wedges will be maintained. Proposals for new development of an urban character will not normally be permitted. ..." Director of Planning, Draft Green Wedges Policy, DCC Planning & Development Committee, 9th November 1988 "At the LPSD Public Inquiry [1992], the Inspector stated support for the green wedges in paragraph 7.36 of his report: 'I believe the wedges as proposed perform an important function through their ability to separate and divide communities and through their presence as open areas of land adjacent to built-up areas. They are of considerable merit in their own right and their extent, I believe, should be maximised where possible and where a degree of physical continuity can be achieved, in a manner consistent with the demands of other Plan policies.' The Plan was adopted in June 1994." 1 Regrettably, they appear to have been subsequently downgraded, and the latest Draft Local Plan, 2026, states: "452. Green Wedges do not have the permanence of the Green Belt, but it is intended to retain the principle of Green Wedges, maintain their identity, reduce the impression of urban sprawl and resist harmful development." (p.123) Which might suggest: lack of permanence + relentless attrition = unsustainable process I have some familiarity with the Green Wedge for Mickleover/Mackworth (arising from an involvement with the transfer of Mickleover Sports Club to Station Road, Mickleover, with DCC grantaid and support, in the early 1990s),

				and suggest the locality as an example of significant erosion. Notably this loss is not evident in the latest Green Wedge details 2025-26 (map and text extracts appended). The National Planning Policy Framework states: "Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development." The accumulated reduction of the Mickleover/Mackworth Green Wedge has straddled multiple local plans and begs a question as to whether a meaningful datum year should be set. Simply assessing the impact on a plan-to-plan basis lacks both transparency and accountability, i.e., by using disconnected increments, and disregarding the previously 'lost' areas. For reporting purposes - especially regarding envisaged changes - it is therefore suggested that a meaningful (fixed) datum year should be adopted by Derby City Council, accompanied by the corresponding surface area for each Green Wedge (in Hectares). For example from the time when the Green Wedge policy was considered substantially operational, perhaps 1994. In principle, this is to offer an opportunity for the general public and council members to gauge the cumulated impact of the policy on any given Green Wedge from its inception. Finally, I have been unable to trace a surface area value for the corresponding Mickleover/Mackworth Green Wedge in most of the DCC documents cited above (1988, 1990 map, 2003, 2026). However, in 1997, "The total land area of the wedge is approximately 300 hectares" 3, and in 2025, "In total, the GW covers approximately 145 hectares" 4. I have reservations as to whether the 1997 value as calculated is correct.

8 Environment (pp.112-113) ...

8.1 “You Told Us”, Consultation responses on this topic to date

413. The Local Plan Priorities Consultation highlighted the significance regarded to these assets by the Derby community.

414. The natural environment was considered the greatest focus for the emerging Local Plan by 371 out of 559 respondents. There was overwhelming support for the protection and enhancement of green spaces and biodiversity; the importance of open space and the need for its maintenance was agreed upon by 97.5% (545) of respondents. Likewise, 90.5% (505) of respondents agreed that all open space should promote nature conservation and biodiversity.

415. The strong value accredited to Derby’s Green Wedges reflects this consensus on the importance of open space. 91.8% (507) of respondents supported the role of Green Wedges to define and separate neighbourhoods and to allow the countryside to permeate into the city. However, the consultation also revealed further Green Wedge functions which accentuate their value, such as use for accessing parks and open space, connecting with nature, informal exercise, and improving health

and well-being. Considering these uses, a significant proportion of respondents therefore agreed that Green Wedges should be protected from inappropriate development (95.3%, 532).

416. The outcomes of the consultation have shown that there are mixed opinions on reviewing Derby’s Green Wedge boundaries in the next Local Plan. 65.3% (365) of respondents were against reviewing the boundaries at all, whilst 30.3% (169) agreed that a review was needed only if meaningful Green Wedges were retained. Many respondents argued that it is important to protect green assets in the city, but these assets are of varying quality.

417. The consultation also accentuated the significance placed on conserving Derby’s historic environment. Many respondents emphasised the need to ensure that development fits the character of the area it is within, and the need to

				protect historic assets through repurposing. Of the 559 responses, 460 agreed that the re-use of listed buildings and other heritage assets would benefit from specific design guidance; likewise, 372 respondents agreed that design guidance would be useful for development within Conservation Areas. 8.2 Our Response 418. This chapter seeks to protect and enhance the built and natural environment. Many policies relating to the historic environment, designated wildlife sites and Green Belt reflect national planning policy but others such as Green Wedges, Green Gaps and open space are specific to the city. 419. Since the current Local Plan was prepared, concepts such as Local Nature Recovery Strategies, Biodiversity Net Gain and Urban Greening have emerged and policies within this chapter aim to reflect these new concepts. 420. In preparing this Local Plan the Council has commissioned consultants to undertake an assessment of the city's Green Belt and Green Wedges. ... Policy EN6: Green Wedges (pp.122-123) Green Wedges are areas of land that define and enhance the City's urban structure, maintain the identity of the different residential neighbourhoods, provide an uninterrupted link to the countryside, form part of the wider Green Infrastructure network and play an important role in climate change adaptation. Development within Green Wedges, as identified on the Policies Map, will be limited to the following: 1) Agriculture and forestry 2) Nature conservation and off-site Biodiversity Net Gain enhancements, including improvements which provide multiple benefits to Derby's Green Infrastructure network, or which link the Green Wedge to the wider Green

				Infrastructure network. 3) Public Open Space, outdoor sport, recreation and community uses providing the character of the Green Wedge and its amenity is not adversely affected 4) Essential buildings and activities ancillary to existing education establishments, open space and recreational facilities 5) Public utilities, renewable energy facilities and climate change mitigation measures where it can be demonstrated that a suitable site outside of the Green Wedge is not available 6) The extension or alteration of existing dwellings and the erection of ancillary buildings. 7) Cemeteries and crematorium Planning permission will be granted provided that: a) The development does not endanger the open and undeveloped character of the Wedge, its links and green infrastructure value; taking into account scale, siting, design, materials and landscape treatment (including areas set aside for car parking) and would not lead to an excessive increase in traffic or noise. b) The built development associated with categories 3 – 6 will be small scale, essential and ancillary to the operation of the main use. c) The general proposals would not detract from an area where the open character of the green wedge is particularly vulnerable because of its prominence or narrowness. Planning permission will be granted, in exceptional circumstances, for the redevelopment of buildings other than dwellings for residential development and supporting facilities. Permission will only be granted where the Council is satisfied that the original buildings are genuinely redundant and surplus to requirements, and that the site adjoins

				residential areas. For all development proposals, criteria a – c must be met and the proposed building(s): d) Would not have a greater impact on the openness of the green wedge and the purpose of including land within it than the existing buildings; e) Would not exceed the height of the existing buildings; and f) Would not occupy a materially larger area of the site than the existing buildings, unless this would result in a reduction in height which would benefit visual amenity. Planning permission for the conversion or change of use of farm buildings will be subject to conditions to prevent a proliferation of additional farm buildings under permitted development rights. Development proposals adjacent to a Green Wedge will be expected to demonstrate that: g) they do not adversely impact the function of the Green Wedge, taking into account the scale, siting and layout of the development. Supporting Text 451. Green Wedges are an important part of Derby's character and are a long-standing, and successful local planning policy. Their primary function is to define and enhance the urban structure of the city as a whole, in particular by reinforcing local identity by maintaining areas of open land between the City's neighbourhoods. All have important existing or potential recreational and ecological value and play an important role in mitigating against climate change. In addition, farming remains an important economic activity and extensive user of land in some Green Wedges. Some

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Green Wedges have an additional role of acting as ‘buffer zones’ between residential communities and business areas. 452. Green Wedges do not have the permanence of the Green Belt, but it is intended to retain the principle of Green Wedges, maintain their identity, reduce the impression of urban sprawl and resist harmful development. 453. The proximity of Green Wedges to the built-up area and, in some cases, their narrowness makes them particularly vulnerable to development pressure. Where development does occur, the Council will ensure that the principle of the Green Wedge will not be adversely affected. In addition, the Council expects that development will provide improvements to part, or all, of the Green Wedge. Where urban extensions occur, outside of the city boundary, the Council will seek to ensure that the wedge itself, inside and outside, the city will be continued.

153	194	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.
143	183	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	N/A
146	187	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing to contact you with my concern about the proposal from Derby City Council Planning Dept to build a Traveller site to house a minimum of 17 caravans on the only piece of green land in our area. I strongly object to the Traveller Site being situated on this small but piece of green space which is vital for our small community. This land is currently used by our residents to use for walks, exercising their dogs, meeting other residents and spending time with family. This small area of green space is important to us because all the homes around that area don't have much garden/green space. So this area of land is important for all to get out and make the most of leisure and exercise time in a safe space. Our grandchildren love to go on the field and practice their football and cricket skills with us, their and also with other local children who gather together there. It would be a major loss the whole community to lose this green space, which is used regularly. I trust you will take my objection into consideration and allow us to keep this open green space for community use.

142	79	Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	SPONDON HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS – RESPONSE 1 Bloor Homes Development – Locko Road Overview of Locko Road Currently, Locko Road is a residential urban road with detached, semi-detachedhouses and bungalows. Any new builds should be of low impact, in keeping with the area, particularly as the proposed will be sited on previously designated Green Belt land where anything more than, say, 2-storey housing could be viewed as an eyesore. As 40% of housing is designated affordable: What are the types of building envisaged? Observations from a resident: Traffic is the major issue in Locko Road A Locko Road, used as a 'rat run' for traffic travelling to and from the north, is a major Spondon artery that has serious 'pinch points' at peak times (especially term-time) – at Church Street; at the junctions of Locko Road, West Road and Chapel Street; the junction of Locko Road and Sancroft Road. B Apart from a short stretch, to the north of the controlled crossing at the junction of Chapel Street, there are no parking restrictions on Locko Road. Consequently, parking takes place on both sides, often on pavements, making an already narrow urban road even narrower. C There are severe delays getting in and out of Spondon at peak times, especially at the junction of Locko Road and Morley Road. D There is no possibility of widening Locko Road to the south of proposed site. E Despite restriction notices, large HGVs continue to use Locko Road. F The 30mph speed restriction is rarely enforced, if at all. G The future impact of new traffic from the Royal Hill Road development has yet to be assessed, and a further, say 250 new vehicles from the Bloor Homes development begs the question: Can Locko Road take more traffic? Further Questions

				Transport: What Improvements to the bus service will there be? Will the proposed 'Controlled Crossing' be built BEFORE any foundations or building work is started on site? Is Longley Lane to be adopted as another access to the site? – if so, it clearly would add another junction to Locko Road. Education: There's already a backlog for Spondon children to attend any of the four Primary Schools and/or the one Secondary School. So…to accommodate the influx of possibly 2 or 3 hundred extra new pupils of varying ages: – Exactly what consultation with local schools has taken place? What are the results of that consultation? and Where can those results be viewed? Health: Do both surgeries have the capacity to accept new patients? Stoney Lane Observations arising from City Local Plan HA7: Spondon: Points G: a single point of access onto Stoney lane together with H: financial contributions for off-site transport improvements. Both the above points should be approved, and built prior to any site foundation or building work, to enable construction traffic to bypass Spondon Village as much as possible. Questions arising from City Local Plan HA7: Spondon Transport:What Improvements to the bus service will there be? What improvements are planned for Stoney Lane? Although not specifically mentioned in Plan HA7, has improved access to and from A52 been included? Education: There's already a backlog for Spondon children to attend any of the four Primary Schools and/or the one Secondary School. So… to accommodate the influx of possibly 2 or 3 hundred extra new pupils of varying ages: –

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Exactly what consultation with local schools has taken place? What are the results of that consultation? and Where can those results be viewed? Health: Do both surgeries have the capacity to accept new patients?
432	476	Housing, Community Facilities, Infrastructure, Open Space	Oppose	Dear Sirs In conjunction with Erewash, your department seems hell bent on removing all green spaces around the Spondon area for the purpose of building houses to increase revenue for yourselves and greedy developers; and this with no extra provision for schools or healthcare establishments - or the consideration of vastly increased road traffic. When first coming to the County in the 60's, this area was stiĺl a rural idyll. The expanding Borough of Derby in 1968 and the subsquent mugging, as Derby acquired city status, has resulted in a series of woeful choices to the detriment of the local populace. After nearly two decades residing in other parts of the U.K., I returned for family reasons to be further disheartened by exceedingly poor planning decisions. Brown and grey field sites are consistently overlooked in favour of gobbling up the few remaining green spaces which are essential for well being. I implore you both on my behalf and other residents I have consulted, to reconsider your flawed thrust in planning.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
160	203	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing in response to the proposal to use the green space known as the Wilmorton Recreation area for the development of a Traveller/Gypsy site accommodating a minimum of 17 caravans. I would like to formally express my objection to this proposal. The Wilmorton Recreation area is an important green space for local residents, providing recreational, environmental, and community value. Developing this land would result in the loss of valuable open space that is widely used and appreciated by the community. I respectfully request that the Council carefully reconsider this proposal and explore alternative locations that would not negatively impact existing community green spaces. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.
144	185	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	[Redacted], and I am concerned about the plan to create a traveller site to house 17 caravans. I am worried about the increased crime rates (or perceived crime rates) that follow the creation of these sites. Are the residents for the sites vetted in any way before they are allowed to live there? Although it may be an unfair assumption to make about the link between the traveller/gypsy community and crime; it's one that lots of people have. Because of this, it will effect my house price when I look to sell in the future and people realise that it's only 100 metres away from a traveller site.

139	180	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

155	196	Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Open Space, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

159	202	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment process appear superficial, with no proper consideration of the cumulative impacts on Wilmorton residents or compliance with green space protection policies. 5. Conflict with Wider Planning Policies This allocation conflicts with: National Planning Policy Framework (protection of open space, good design, highway safety). Derby's own emerging and adopted policies on green infrastructure, residential amenity, and sustainable development. The clear wishes of the local community, as evidenced by the growing petition and widespread opposition already being voiced. The consultation process itself feels tokenistic. Residents only learned of this proposal through local circulation of notices, not proactive engagement by the council. Conclusion and Request This proposal is poorly conceived, insensitive to local needs, and will cause lasting harm to Wilmorton as a place to live. It prioritises one specific community's needs over the well-being of the existing settled community without adequate mitigation or justification. I therefore formally object to Policy HA17 in its entirety and request that the allocation of the land west of Pride Parkway for Gypsy and Traveller pitches be deleted from the Draft Local Plan. Alternative sites must be found that do not involve the loss of valued green space or direct harm to residential neighbourhoods.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				I would like my objection to be acknowledged in writing and fully considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation process. I am happy to provide further evidence or attend any future meetings or inquiries.

158	201	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing [Redacted] to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway, Wilmorton, as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site under Policy HA17 of the Draft Local Plan for Derby. This proposal represents an unacceptable loss of precious green space for the local community, will have multiple severe negative impacts on the character, amenity, and value of the surrounding residential area, and is fundamentally flawed on planning grounds. I demand that this allocation be removed entirely from the final Local Plan. 1. Unacceptable Loss of Green Space and Harm to Community Amenity The site is currently an important area of open green space used by local residents for recreation, dog walking, children's play, and general well-being. Even though the draft policy claims the remainder of the site will "remain as accessible public open space," the reality is that a significant portion will be permanently enclosed with fencing and hardstanding for at least 17 caravan pitches plus ancillary buildings and communal areas. This will fragment the open character of the space, reduce its usability, and create a visually intrusive, institutionalised development in what is one of the last remaining green buffers in Wilmorton between residential areas and the busy Pride Parkway corridor. This directly contradicts Derby's own green infrastructure objectives and national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 102–103 and 174–188) which require the protection and enhancement of open spaces, especially in urban areas where such land is already scarce. The partial retention of open space is a fig-leaf that does nothing to mitigate the permanent loss of natural amenity for hundreds of nearby households. 2. Serious Negative Impacts on the Local Community Permanent Traveller sites of this scale bring well-documented and predictable negative impacts, many of which have been experienced in similar developments across the UK. These include: Increased traffic movements (multiple vehicles per pitch, including large commercial vehicles common on such sites) onto an already congested Pride Parkway, creating highway safety risks, noise, and pollution for residents.

				Potential for noise and disturbance from daily living activities, gatherings, and vehicle movements, which will carry across the open space into nearby homes. Concerns regarding site management, litter, fly-tipping, and anti-social behaviour – issues repeatedly raised by residents near other Traveller sites nationally and in Derby's own history of unauthorised encampments. The council's track record of dealing with such problems elsewhere does not inspire confidence that this site will be any different. Pressure on already stretched local services (schools, GPs, and community facilities in Wilmorton) from additional residents without any demonstrated capacity assessment in the draft plan. The enclosed, fenced nature of the proposed development will create a physical and visual barrier that divides the community rather than integrating it. This is the opposite of good placemaking. 3. Detrimental Effect on House Prices and Residential Amenity Numerous independent studies and market evidence from across the UK demonstrate that the introduction of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site adjacent to established residential areas causes measurable and sustained reductions in nearby property values – often in the range of 10–25% depending on proximity. Residents in Wilmorton have already invested significant sums in their homes in an area prized for its relative quietness and green outlook. This proposal will blight that desirability, deter buyers, and damage the economic well-being of the entire neighbourhood. While the council may claim property values are not a material planning consideration, the resulting harm to residential amenity and the character of the area most certainly is. 4. Inadequate Evidence Base and Failure to Consider Alternatives The draft plan provides no robust, site-specific justification for choosing this particular green space over other potential locations. The council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need, but does not demonstrate why this sensitive site is the only or best option. Brownfield sites, underused employment land near Pride

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Park, or locations with better separation from existing housing should have been prioritised. The Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment pro
157	200	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I have been informed that Derby Council are considering planning permission for 17 caravans in Wilmorton. [Redacted] I am shocked that the council are considering this. Traveller communities are associated with antisocial behaviour and this will impact local property prices. Please reject this proposal and protect our green spaces from temporary dwellings.
150	191	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Hello, I am writing to you with concern because it has been brought to my attention that there is a proposal to turn our local green space into a site for traveller/Gypsy site. [Redacted] and have experienced these people breaking in to the site and camping there illegally numerous times and every time there has been an increase in anti social behavior and rubbish dumped on the field and so the idea of having a permanent site provided for these people on our doorstep would be totally unacceptable and something that I know everybody in the area would completely oppose. May I suggest that you build the site somewhere where there would be more space for them such has Duffield.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
148	189	Infrastructure, Housing, Stoney Lane, Green Belt	Oppose	[Redacted], and submit my comments regarding the proposal for 400 houses to be built in this area. I should also add that I am dismayed and troubled that plans are being submitted which encroach on green belt land in and around Spondon. Much of our green belt is home to a number of species both flora and fauna which thrive there. Building on their home areas would destroy them completely. Apart from irreparable damage done to the local area, I am also greatly concerned about the impact of having so many extra houses in this area. 400 houses (and I understand several other large numbers of houses are also proposed in Spondon) would of course mean many more than another 400 people. Spondon's doctor's surgeries, dentists, schools and roads cannot accommodate so great an influx. If these houses really cannot be built elsewhere, then I suggest that it is an essential, non-negotiable item that the plan must include a doctor's surgery, dentist's surgery and an infant/junior school, and that the necessary professionals are available to staff those facilities. I note that there appear to be several empty large office complexes in the City of Derby. Perhaps they should be converted to domestic housing first, before ripping up the suburbs.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
141	182	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing about your plans to host a Traveller/Gypsy site I live at [Redacted]. Under no circumstances will this serve the residents. I have already had issues with someone in this park area breaking my windscreen wiper by walking over my car and leaving footprints on the wind screen. Lots of youths and winos drink there regularly. Do you really think this is a fair or good idea to local residents!? I appreciate what you are trying to do for the Travellller community but to have this so close to a residential area is unfair and reckless. The noise, litter, damage- the potential for theft as well- is all non desirable Please consider the residents.
136	177	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I have just heard that you want to do a caravan site here on our field at wilmorton I I'm not happy with this to go ahead we do not want this around here find some over place for them to go it's just going to bring more trouble they need some where out the way not close to the stadium or people homes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
147	188	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I am writing to formally express my objection to the proposed traveller site in Wilmorton. As a local resident, I am extremely concerned about the impact this development may have on the surrounding community. Wilmorton is already under pressure in terms of traffic, local services, school places, and healthcare provision. I believe this proposal would place further strain on infrastructure that is already stretched. In addition, I am concerned about the potential effect on local property values, community safety, and the overall character of the area. Many residents chose to live in Wilmorton because of its current environment, and this development could significantly alter that. I fully understand the need for appropriate accommodation provision; however, I do not believe this proposed location is suitable. I respectfully request that the council reconsider this proposal and take into account the concerns of local residents before making any final decision. I would appreciate confirmation that my objection has been recorded as part of the consultation process.

480	499	Design	Neutral	1. Design Codes based on TVA should be utilised in preference to Design Guides 2. LAs should establish recurring partnerships with key Consultation Bodies, such as Create Streets and The King's Foundation, etc who specialise in getting through to a huge swathe of grassroots members of the public with tried and tested previous experience in Local Plans, such as Lichfield, etc. 3. Non-demolition of historic buildings prior to the 1950s must be made policy or adhered to as part of LCC's commitment to combatting the Climate Crisis through sequestering carbon in its Old Builds. 4. LAs should adopt a Local List of Valued Buildings (Non-designated Heritage Assets), which have been a Government requirement since the policy introduction through the NPPF in 2012. Historic England produced a guide to help Councils in May 2012. Bristol produced an exemplar list in 2015, which is well worth reviewing. 5. Existing Action Plan if present for Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets needs identifying and/ or establishing (I may support this if invited). 7. Era-style Buildings, especially rows of Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian architecture must be faithfully restored, retained and recreated to complement surrounding historic streets that may or may not be classed in official Conservation Areas preventing harsh contrast with newer built housing estates from the 1950s onwards. 8. Where demolition is proposed for 1950s style housing onwards- any new construction must be in the historic building style and local materials to ensure high carbon capacity, quality aesthetic and true blending of the interconnected conurbations of any one area, place or location. 9. Concerted efforts to identify and locate core suppliers for raw materials and specific heritage skills should encourage new uptake of these limited artisan craft skills by new contractors locally based to support the local economy, provide employment, and reduce the cost of product and service in the long-term. Volunteer labouring assemblies should be fully encouraged and supported identifying key individual an group skillsets that can be utilised to protect historic

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				buildings or areas at risk with a view to supporting the construction of new authentic style housing (as and where appropriate) and the reconstruction of demolished prized old buildings beloved by the community, such as community pubs, libraries and community centres. 11. Simplified streamlined Planning Process for key stakeholders either working to authentically restore buildings and/ or build new ones, such as observed with many civic buildings in Budapest Hungary and the Federal University Buildings in the US.
119	159	Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Housing	Oppose	I wish to object to the above proposal for 400 dwellings to be built on Stoney Lane, Spondon. Considering the amount of new builds and future ones at Spondon Wood and Royal Hill Road Green Wedge, and potential ones at Locko Road, in my opinion there will not be enough infrastructure to support these sites. Plus the traffic these sites cause will be horrendous. There is only one Road out of Spondon which is very busy at peak times at present, goodness knows how people are going to get to work on time and the roads will be blocked when parents take their children to school. Spondon cannot cope with the extra houses, not to mention the health services.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
132	172	Housing	Oppose	It feels like Spondon is under siege from housing developments all on Green Belt designated Land: - on land off Dale Road, over 250 homes (Bloor Homes) are being built, these properties, under EBC local authority control, are adjacent to properties under DCC local authority control. How has this been allowed to happen given that the purpose of Green Belt land was to prevent urban sprawl. It will be the residents of Spondon who will feel the full impact of this development not those in EBC authority. - I believe it is 90 homes to be built on what was previously Green Belt, now designated as Grey Belt, off Royal Hill Road - on land off Locko Road Bloor Homes are consulting to build over 250 homes on Green Belt land - on land to the rear of Stoney Lane, there is a proposal for 400 homes on Green Belt land to be built Whilst I welcome DCC's Local Plan Green Belt strategy and its proposal to keep Locko Road designated as Green Belt, I am concerned at the number of proposed homes looking to be built in or around Spondon given its impact it will have on this ancient village.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
133	173	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted], I write to express my opinion on the future of North Oakwood Green Wedge. As you're well aware, Oakwood covers a wide area & when I studied the drawing of the North Oakwood Green Wedge (6/10/25), this area provides vital pieces of public space & playing fields, which together with Chaddesen Wood, represents a "Jewel in the crown" for the various wildlife, ecosystems & **an area we must retain for future generations please!** I therefore wish to support the Derby City Council Local Plan, retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

117	157	Housing	Oppose	I wish to respond the Derby Local Plan and how, if approved it will impact Spondon as I believe at the moment there are plans in place to build 98 houses on Royal Hill Road, 250 houses on Spondon Wood, although these are Erewash Borough Council, 400 on Stoney Lane, 250 on Locko Road near the cricket ground and finally we have just been informed that there plans to build 200 homes on Acorn Way Green Wedge. This means if all are approved that there could be an extra 1198 houses in Spondon, my concerns are that the local infrastructure, roads are already a nightmare leading to regular grid locked traffic on Willowcroft Road and the thought that an extra possible 1000+ cars could be in the mix! Doctors and dentists are full as are the local schools. But also, most of the planning are to build on Green Belt Land, it beggars belief that Green Belt Land can be deemed to be Grey Belt. The plans suggest that around 40% of the new homes will be 'affordable?' Again, affordable houses aren't social housing, [Redacted] can be reasonably confident in saying that I haven't met any with the odd £40,000 in bank accounts to put a deposit on an affordable house. So, my main concerns are that these proposed houses are not being built as an altruistic gesture, they are for profit and will do nothing to alleviate the housing crisis or shortage. The opposite may be true, as Right Move suggest that there 70+ houses for sale in Spondon and the market is at the moment 'sluggish' some houses have been on the market for a lengthy period, and to put an extra 1000+ houses into mix could mean that to sell their new houses the developers often offer part exchanges. This could I believe lead to houses that are slow/difficult to sell being taken as part exchanges leading to houses being left vacant and therefore no Council Tax unless of course the developers pass these onto the social housing sector. [Redacted], but the Derby Local Plan isn't providing social houses it just a bean counting /ticking boxes exercise which a Labour run council should be ashamed

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
120	160	Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I object to the inclusion of Stoney Lane in any future housing development and believe it should remain part of the green belt allocation. Similarly, I object to the current proposals by Bloor Homes for devlopment of an area off Locko Road, Spondon; this too should remain part of the green belt allocation. Over the years I have seen much development of Spondon and now to the point that it is saturated and cannot sustain any further development. It does not have the infrastructure to sustain further devlopment and has seen very little investment from past developments.

151	192	Housing, Community Facilities, Infrastructure , Environment, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the proposed housing developments in Spondon. [Redacted], I am deeply concerned about the potential negative impacts this development along with 3 other proposed new build sites in the area will have on our community, environment, and quality of life. I urge the council to reject these proposals in their current form. My objections are based on the following key grounds: 1. Environmental Impact: These developments threaten local green spaces, wildlife habitats & biodiversity]. This contradicts the council's own environmental policies and national guidelines on sustainable development. 2. Overburdened Infrastructure: Our local infrastructure is already at capacity. Adding an exponential number of new homes will exacerbate already significant traffic issues on Willowcroft road and the route through and out to Ilkeston, strain on schools, healthcare facilities, and public transport. Without significant upgrades, this will lead to longer commute times, overcrowded services, and reduced safety. 3. Community and Heritage Disruption: The proposals fail to preserve the character of our area. Potentially overshadowing neighboring properties and eroding the historic charm of Spondon. This could diminish property values and community cohesion, ignoring the voices of long-term residents. 4. Lack of Affordable Housing and Sustainability: While housing is needed, these developments prioritize your own need to more taxpayer money and builders' greed. Moreover, they lack adequate provisions for renewable energy, green spaces, or public amenities. I believe these developments represent short-sighted planning that prioritizes developer profits over the well-being of residents. I request that the council consider alternative sites or scaled-down versions that better align with community needs. Furthermore, I ask for a public consultation meeting to allow affected residents to voice their concerns directly.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Also with the British government strongly supporting a net zero policy, the building of new housing , more traffic, and less greenbelt land contradicts everything local and national policies are striving for. In conclusion, I strongly object to these four housing developments and implore the council to reject them to protect our local area. I look forward to your response and confirmation that my objection has been noted.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
122	162	Housing	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the proposed housing developments in Spondon. [Redacted], I am deeply concerned about the potential negative impacts this development along with 3 other proposed new build sites in the area will have on our community, environment, and quality of life. I urge the council to reject these proposals in their current form. My objections are based on the following key grounds: 1. Environmental Impact: These developments threaten local green spaces, wildlife habitats & biodiversity]. This contradicts the council's own environmental policies and national guidelines on sustainable development. 2. Overburdened Infrastructure: Our local infrastructure is already at capacity. Adding an exponential number of new homes will exacerbate already significant traffic issues on Willowcroft road and the route through and out to Ilkeston, strain on schools, healthcare facilities, and public transport. Without significant upgrades, this will lead to longer commute times, overcrowded services, and reduced safety. 3. Community and Heritage Disruption: The proposals fail to preserve the character of our area. Potentially overshadowing neighboring properties and eroding the historic charm of Spondon. This could diminish property values and community cohesion, ignoring the voices of long-term residents. 4. Lack of Affordable Housing and Sustainability: While housing is needed, these developments prioritize your own need to more taxpayer money and builders' greed. Moreover, they lack adequate provisions for renewable energy, green spaces or public amenities. I believe these developments represent short-sighted planning that prioritises developer profits over the well-being of residents. I request that the council consider alternative sites or scaled-down versions that better align with community needs. Furthermore, I ask for a public consultation meeting to allow affected residents to voice their concerns directly. In conclusion, I strongly object to these four housing developments and implore the council to reject them to protect our local area. I look forward to your response and confirmation that my objection has been noted.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
135	175	Flood Risk, Infrastructure, Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	The land gets extremely boggy and Spondon is prone to flooding. The traffic at this moment is unable to cope at peak times as is evident for residents heading to and from work in the mornings and evenings, this will cause much more congestion and pollution. Spondon is already losing green space to Erewash. Wildlife – especially Bats and Owls which have been observed. The infrastructure is already at breaking point with local GP surgeries struggling to offer appointments within a timely manner. Schools are oversubscribed and will struggle to accommodate more children. It is not possible at this time to get an NHS dentist in Spondon – this will result in more people needing additional – out of area – private services. The public transport service in Spondon has significantly diminished over the years meaning that more residents will need to rely on cars further polluting and adding to the congestion of the village. This is green belt land which is essential for wildlife and mental well being. What are the developers track records at delivering “Affordable Homes” Not Dwellings?

118	158	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	1. The proximity and size of the planned site to existing Residential housing. The planned Traveller site will encroach on the Residents' privacy and there will be a potential noise nuisance both from the site itself and from the additional traffic it will create. The Travelling Community have a largely outdoor lifestyle due to their limited living environment and this will lead to a disproportionate increase in noise levels locally. 2. The area is a small community with narrow Victorian roads and is not designed for large vehicles and mobile home access. 3. The green space enjoyed by the Wilmorton Community and locale will cease to exist. There has been a small community wood planted to which will also become inaccessible. The wood was planted to increase biodiversity along with the allotment scheme. The Traveller site will have a significant negative impact on the attempts to make the green space more biodiverse. 4. Using the community green space to house Travellers will negatively impact upon the feelings of wellbeing within the community and will negatively affect social cohesion. All properties in the Wilmorton area have very small or no gardens due to the terraced housing, so having additional green space close by is essential for personal wellbeing and health reasons. The green space will no longer be useable by the existing residents and will cease to be attractive, with the green view becoming non-existent and ugly. This is our only "Common" ground and should not be built upon or eroded. The green space is also used extensively by residents of the YMCA, who are vulnerable, and need outside space to use. 5. There will also be a greater demand on local services, such as the local school. Once again, I re-iterate that we are a small community and cannot accommodate this change. We have already had to absorb the impact of the expansion of occupants in the area due to HMO's being created. The infastructure of Wilmorton was originally designed for family homes only and this has already been pushed to the limits, without adding in a whole new community. 6. The impact on social cohesion within the existing Community must also be considered. Introducing a whole community of people, with their own differing culture and values will create division and increase the risk of increase

				of antisocial behaviour, car crime and burglaries. There have been widespread reports of the negative social impact of traveller sites in different communities, and [Redacted], I do not think it is fair or reasonable to have to live in fear of the consequences of the establishment or a Traveller site being forced upon us. Please note that I have already submitted my views on the proposed site before being made aware of the exact location. The site is proposed to be located in an area which has raised banks and trees and public pathways adjacent to Eton Street and Pride Parkway roads. I have been a Wilmorton resident since before the development of Pride Park took place and before the Pride Parkway road was created. At the time of the Pride Park road system development being put to consultation with the local residents, there was a more extensive green space and many large long-established trees forming a leafy avenue all along the boundary of where the terraced houses in Wilmorton are located. There was a Community objection to losing the trees and the green space to this new road and in response the Council agreed that replacement trees and raised banks would be put in place to deaden the noise from the new road and reduce the environmental impact and the visual impact. Public pathways were also put in place. I would argue that this area was developed in such a way to reduce the impact on the busy road system on local Community and the environment, and therefore the Council is breaking an existing agreement with the Wilmorton residents by planning to put a Traveller site in their place. The environmental impact of removing the now established trees would be the loss of habitat for wildlife, an increase in pollution and an increase in noise pollution. When you remove a tree, the nearby temperature rises and disrupts the natural environment. Being in a wooded area is also proven to be beneficial for good mental health. Also if the land is to be developed for a caravan site, there have been issues in the past with land in this area being contaminated. The Traveller site is proposed to be put in a location which will ensure that the Travellers will be exposed to excessive noise and air pollution from the extremely busy A6 Pride Parkway road. There are also safety issues for the Travellers if families with largely outdoor lifestyles and young children are living adjacent to the busy A6 main road. The proposed access to the site from this road would only cause even further congestion on an already overused, frequently

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				grid-locked road system. The other entry point would require using a very narrow Victorian road which is already always used for on street parking and is not suitable for large vehicles, such as vans etc that the Traveller community may require for their self-employed businesses. The proposed Traveller site location is far too close to existing resident housing. It would mean that instead of having a green community tree-filled space, the residents would have to overlook a Traveller site. This will also be the view for houses and flats at the City Point Housing Development. The noise levels from the new site will also potentially be problematic to existing residents due to it's close proximity to their housing. I would suggest that this is not good for anyone's mental health and would lead to a great deal of friction within the local Community. There will also be the issue of personal safety. The Travellers site being placed so close to Pride Parkway could make the travellers a target for football fans travelling too and from Derby County Football games at Pride Park. There are also my own concerns regarding my personal safety with having a rapidly changing influx of travellers at the end of Eton Street. [Redacted]. We have been the victims of criminal activity by members of the Travelling Community in the past and I think understandably have no desire to live check by jowl with them. The social impact upon a small Community cannot be understated by this proposed change. The site in it's proposed location would be fully on display and the proximity would be intimidating to existing residents. The impact on existing the Residents who pay their Council Tax should be taken into consideration and their opinions surveyed before any decisions are made.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
108	147	Gypsies And Travellers, Infrastructure	Oppose	I'm writing to formally object to the allocation of land in Wilmorton to a 17 pitch permanent traveller site within the Draft Local Plan. [Redacted] I strongly oppose the possible build of a traveller site on the green space next to the allotments. Approach roads are narrow, numerous HMOs resulting in more traffic, loss of a much valued green space and possible noise, crime and general unsightly addition to the area is simply not welcome. Not to mention effecting house prices and difficulties selling homes due to a traveller site. We have an extremely small garden and the additional green space near the allotments is something [Redacted] don't want to lose. The green space is a great place in the warmer months to walk, sit and generally enjoy the outdoors. [Redacted], so this green area is great for me as the park is just that bit too far unless I drive! I also struggle to see what benefits such a development will bring to a densely populated area... the fact remains that the area will loose green space and traffic will increase. The area already suffers with extremely high traffic congestion at peak times and match day football traffic. The addition of 17 pitches will only exacerbate pressure on local roads and create potential safety hazards at the site entrance/exit points. I'm not aware of the rational behind the council considering building this site on a green space. Why are the local residents not consulted in this? Will there be a meeting with the council and residents? I'm not familiar with the process of how such planning works. So I'm reaching out to you to listen to the residents of Wilmorton and support us not wanting this green space developed into something that will offer no value to the area. I know there is a petition [Redacted]. I think there was over 500 names on there. I also note that the responses to your survey also showed many people not wanting the site to be developed. Residents should really have the final say in any development in their community and not local authorities who seek to generate income.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
138	179	Housing, Infrastructure	Oppose	I wish to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed housing developments in Spondon. The village boasts a close-knit community that relies onmutual support. Increasing the number of houses significantly would threaten theintegrity of this community. Additionally, the existing infrastructure cannot accommodate an increase in population. Traffic congestion is already frequent, with Willowcroft Road often experiencing long queues extending back into the village. Healthcare facilities, including doctors and dentists, are operating at or beyond capacity and would be unable to handle additional patients. Schools are also at full capacity and unable to accommodate more students. The Locko Road development encroaches upon designated green belt land and should not be permitted. Similar concerns apply to the Stoney Lane proposal, particularly regarding access and traffic management. Stoney Lane is unlikely to handle the additional traffic without substantial modifications, such as major alterations to theA52 at that location. I urge careful and thorough consideration before proceeding with either of these proposals.
107	146	Infrastructure, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	I would like it known that I totally oppose these two developments. SPONDON does not have the amenities do have such developments. The schools are already packed to capacity….the doctors surgeries are busting to capacity….the parking for parents picking children up from school has become a nightmare. Coming into SPONDON and going out with the increase of motor cars will be beyond ridiculous. We have limited green belt as it is and seeing the wildlife that inhabits these areas disappear will be heart breaking. SPONDON needs to be retained as a village ……STOP ANY ACTION PLEASE

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
495	500	Stoney Lane, Green Belt, Housing	Oppose	The site does not meet the definition of Grey Belt and development on this site does not meet the tests for Grey Belt set out in the NPPF. The fields have been used by local people for recreation (dog walkers, runners etc). The historic use of the land for recreation means that this is a right-of-way for the public travelling from Spondon to Ockbrook. Development of the site will reult in the loss of biodiversity and the loss of agricultural land. Over the last three years, Spondon has faced flooding due to extreme water volumes from drains, watercourses bursting their banks, and overflowing into people's homes. For example, several homes had flooded due to high volumes of water coming from the narrow drainage network across Spondon. Considers that there are alternative sites within the city which would help meet Derby's housing need. Concerns raised over GP, Dentist and school capacity, public transport, safe access to the site and congestion. Development may require a new junction on the A52
496	500	Green Belt	Support	Supports the Green Belt policy.
497	500	Green Wedge	Support	Supports the Green Wedge policy.

152	193	Infrastructure, Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I wish to comment on the above policy in the Draft Local Plan. I have several objections, quite apart from the general objection of plundering more and more farmland to house more and more people. An extra 400 houses on Stoney Lane will create three main problems 1) Traffic - Spondon is already struggling to cope with the existing traffic and heavy lorries (to the ridiculously sited distribution centre off Dale Rd). For much of the morning, especially during rush hour, the traffic is backed up through the village, largely due to the poorly timed lights at the bottom of Willowcroft Rd. An extra 400 houses near Stoney Lane + the new houses off Dale Rd + the new houses on Royal Hill Rd will make the already unacceptable traffic situation intolerable. A solution, which I'm sure hasn't escaped your notice, is to connect Dale Rd to the A52 via the Stoney Lane development. The developers won't like it but why do we have to put up with their wishes. As an aside, parking on both sides of Locko Rd in general but particularly in the vicinity of the Vernon Arms, makes driving difficult and hazardous. 2) Infrastucture - will there be another medical facility to cope with all three extra developments? It's difficult enough to get timely appointments as it is. Will the schools cope? Again, the traffic at school times is currently horrendous without all the extra houses. 3) Public Transport - we are urged to use public transport instead of our cars. The current bus service is inadequate although better than nothing. What's required is a resurrection of the Spondon Flyer, then people on the existing housing estates as well as the new ones will use it fully. In addition to all this, there's the Bloor Homes raid on the Locko Rd Green Belt. For them to claim it is Grey Belt (whatever that is) is ridiculous. If the proposed area is not Green Belt, then neither is any of the surrounding area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				We fully support the council's stance on defending Green Belt land. If Bloor are allowed to build on the proposed land, then the developers can build anywhere they like. Why can't the developers build on land such as the old Celanese area? They will say 'nobody wants to live there' (and, of course, it's more expensive than ripping up farmland) and they can make it attractive. There are lots of places people don't want to live, but they do.
87	124	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. I feel that there are brown land sites within Derby City that could be used before green wedge land is considered for redevelopment. In addition there are many health benefits for the public using Chaddesden Wood. Young children love the wood and are able to run along in a safe, traffic free environment, seeing the numerous birds feeding and the squirrels scuttling up the trees.
82	118	Green Wedge	Support	I have looked at the Draft Local Plan for Derby, specifically concerning the Land North of Chaddesden Wood remaining within the Green Wedge. I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. It is important that we protect the site and the impact on the ancient woodland from future housing.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
89	126	Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Housing	Oppose	I would like to formally object to the proposed Draft local plan for the 400 homes planned to the rear of Stoney Lane, Burnside drive, Lochinvar, Argyl etc, etc. Along with other planned projects the amount of traffic could be unmanageable. Spondon traffic is a nightmare at present already without more vehicles involved. Based on Derbys average of 1.33 cars per household it doesn't take much working out to realise how many more cars will be on Spondons roads. Also based on Derbys kids per household of 1.74 kids then Spondon would need a minimum of a junior school & a Senior school, plus numerous nursery places. The existing schools are full, plus doctors & dentists would also be required Any community spirit we have would disappear, along with the loss of a large amount of wildlife. So the building of the proposed projects shouldn't happen, we just don't have the infrastructure. I genuinely hope that sense prevails Many thanks
79	115	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. It is critical that we protect the site and the impact on the only ancient woodland in Derby from future housing.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
115	154	Housing	Oppose	[Redacted] totally object to more housing in Spondon. There is already a strain on the infrastructure of the village. It Is nearly impossible to get a doctor's appointment on request and schools are already full. The village has become dangerous with all the traffic congestion and the large articulated lorries that now thunder through it. The village has totally changed since we moved here 50 years ago and not for the better

149	190	Housing, Infrastructure, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the ongoing and proposed expansion of housing developments by Bloor Homes on the Spondon/Erewash fringe (including Land West of Dale Road). As a local resident, I am deeply concerned that the cumulative impact of these developments constitutes "unsustainable development" under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). My objection is based on the following verified infrastructure failures: 1. Secondary School Over-Capacity (West Park School) As of 2026, West Park School is operating at 105% capacity (approx. 1,463 pupils against a capacity of 1,390). There is no physical room for expansion. Any further housing will leave local Spondon children without a secondary school place in their own village, forcing them to commute to schools across Derby, increasing traffic and social isolation. 2. Healthcare and "Physical" GP Shortages While local surgeries like Chapel Street and Derwent Valley remain technically open for registration, they have reached their physical consulting limit. Adding 1,000 new residents (approx. 2.5 residents per household) creates a requirement for over 1.0 additional Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) GP. Without a physical building extension, "funding" from the developer is useless as there are no rooms to house additional doctors. 3. Dental Desert Status There are currently zero dental practices in the DE21 postcode accepting new adult NHS patients. Waiting lists for Spondon Dental and Chapel Street Dental exceed 12 months. This development will worsen an existing public health crisis in the village. 4. Breach of Green Belt & Sustainable Policy

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				The Planning Inspectorate (Nov 2025) has already raised "serious shortcomings" regarding the allocation of this Green Belt land. To proceed with further development while the housing strategy is being questioned by the Government is a breach of the integrity of the planning process. 5. Traffic and "Village Severance" The narrow Dale Road and Sitwell Street corridor cannot handle the additional 400+ daily vehicle movements this site will generate. This development is "severed" from city services but relies entirely on village roads that are already at a standstill during peak hours. I request that this application be refused and that a full Cumulative Infrastructure Impact Assessment be conducted for the whole of Spondon before any further "fringe" developments are considered.
84	121	Housing	Oppose	My objections to the **MINIMUM** of 400 high quality homes along the Green belt:- Stoney Lane.
90	127	Green Wedge	Support	I support the proposal of keeping a green wedge on the fields next to the woods as this is an ancient woodland with wonderful biodiversity which would be destroyed if this green wedge was not kept

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
85	122	Infrastructure, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 400 new houses in Spondon. While I understand the need for housing, this particular plan raises serious concerns about the strain it will place on local infrastructure and essential services. Spondon is already experiencing significant traffic congestion, with many roads functioning as a rat run during peak hours. Adding hundreds of new homes will inevitably increase traffic volumes, making existing problems far worse and creating safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and current residents. Local services are already stretched. Schools are at or near capacity, GP surgeries face long waiting times, and other community resources are under pressure. Introducing such a large number of new households without clear, funded plans to expand these services shows a lack of practical foresight. This proposal does not reflect common-sense planning. Sustainable development requires infrastructure to grow alongside housing, not years after problems emerge. At present, the plans do not demonstrate that the necessary support systems will be in place to accommodate such a substantial increase in population. For these reasons, I strongly object to the development in its current form and urge the Council to reconsider or significantly revise the proposal to address these issues.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
86	123	Green Wedge	Support	I would like to add a consultation response to the emerging local plan for Derby City Council. I fully support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining both the Chaddesden and Derwent Industrial Area Green Wedge and the North Oakwood Green Wedge as proposed in the draft document. These spaces are important for wildlife and for social amenity and provide relief from built up areas. Please send me an acknowledgement of receipt of this response.
128	168	Housing, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	To Whom it may concern I wish to strongly support to keep Stoney Lane and Locko road as Green belt The countryside is being ruined and nothing will be left for our children and grandchildren This should not be about money Please Please do not destroy the Green Belt area - it was made Green belt for a reason and surely you are breaking the law by overruling this Please take this as a strong opposition to buiding on these beautiful areas!!!!
78	114	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
83	120	Green Wedge	Support	I fully support the retention of both the Chaddesden and Derwent Industrial Area Green Wedge and the North Oakwood Green Wedge as proposed in the draft local plan documents. These spaces are important to curb urban sprawl, provide biodiversity corridors for wildlife and for social amenity and to prevent merging of settlements.
73	109	Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	How an earth can Spondon cope with 250 homes on Locko Road and a proposed 400 homes to the rear of Stoney Lane. The traffic through the village is horrendous most of the day with large lorries thundering through to the depot. There is also not enough doctors and schools to cope with such a large influx of people, trying to get a Doctor's appointment is very difficult at the moment. The whole character of Spondon would be changed and the trauma of even more lorries coming through whilst building work takes place doesn't bear thinking about.
31	67	Green Wedge	Support	In support of Land North of Chaddesden Wood remaining within the Green Wedge. I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. The land is next to a wonderful ancient woodland enjoyed by many.

99	136	Housing	Oppose	Stoney Lane… Already severe traffic re: access from the A52 to the village and surrounding streets and roads leading to Dale Road. Namely Sandingham Drive that already has problems with school parking and heavy traffic leading onto the A52 towards Borrowash Locko Road….Already heavy traffic using this road in order to avoid Willowcroft Road and the village congestion trying to access areas such as Breadsall and Chaddesden. In Spondon we already have limited ways in which to leave this village. 1. Willowcroft Road…the main way out through the village centre. Traffic jams and holdups are the norm for this road. Awful for the residents to say the least. 2. Locko Road. Which means going round to basically come back on yourself via Acorn Way to get to Chaddesden, Breadsall,Alvaston etc 3. A52. Going to the Borrowash slip road then turning round to the other side to get back on the A52 in order to get to Derby and Surrounding areas. 4. And if you really want to waste time money and fuel , either electric or petrol etc then you can of course go via Dale Road towards Ockbrook and Borrowash to come back on yourself via Derby Road The amount of congestion these proposed house building applications would create is MADNESS. The proposed number of houses is quite frankly outrageous for a small village that already has many traffic problems attached to it. MAYBE COUNCILS SHOULD CONSIDER ACCESSING THE 900.000 EMPTY PROPERTIES SCATTERED ACROSS THE COUNTRY INSTEAD OF

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				BOMBARDING EVERY AREA WITH NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

97	134	Housing, Infrastructure	Oppose	To whom it may concern, I wish to raise my concerns regarding further housing in Spondon. I understand that the housing in Erewash adjoining Spondon will go ahead. However, the proposed develpment on Locko Road and Stoney Lane is completely inappropriate. Despite the promised monies to improve infrastructure in Spondon to accommodate the develpments that Bloor homes will be required to provide. No matter how much money is provided, Spondon is completely inappropriate for the proposed develpments. Apart from the fact that greenbelt land would be used, there is no space in spondon to provide the infrastructure required to accommodate large housing develpments. Spondon currently is often gridlocked and would be compounded bt additional traffic caused by additional housing. It is difficult enough to cross main roads in Spondon. The heavy vehicles already going through the village is dangerous and roads cannot be widened. Access to local schools is a nightmare due to traffic and parking issues that cannot be resolved. There is inadequate parking in the village and no space to provide more. There are not enough doctors and dentists, we are lucky enough to have managed to keep access to a gp in Borrowash for the time being.We are unable to get an NHS dentist in Spondon. Where could additional facilities be provided? I don't know of a single surgery in Spondon, Chaddesden and Borrowash/Ockbrook where there isn't already difficulties getting GP appointments. Floors or any other builders could not provide enough money to fix the NHS!

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				While I understand the need for new housing, Spondon, for the above reasons, is not the place to build it as it not possible to provide the infrastructure needed to support it. This not a case of 'not in my back yard'. New towns would make more sense with infrastructure integral to them.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
59	95	Green Wedge	Support	I support the **Derby City Council Local Plan** retaining the **North Oakwood Green Wedge**, as is currently proposed in the draft document. It is essential that **Chaddesden Woods** – an ancient woodland - has a green corridor northwards, and never completely surrounded by housing. Indeed we should be planting tree saplings to connect Chaddesden woods with the Great Northern Greenway. Connectivity is vitally important, as detailed in the following links. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/200285/Annex-A-Habitats-Directive.pdf https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/1012/contents Why are wildlife corridors important? | Heart of England Forest Derby has an opportunity to continue it's nature-aware initiative, as indeed has already been shown with the re-wilding of Allestree Park.
35	70	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

137	178	Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I would like to state my objections to the HA 7 Stoney Lane, Green Wedge/Green Belt Allocation. Firstly the fact that this area to the East of Spondon has always been designated as green belt and would state my total opposition to its being redesignated as grey belt. It is active agricultural land which in my opinion should remain as agricultural land under green belt. Secondly I would set out some of the undoubted adverse effects and issues which this proposal would create or exacerbate. The loss of green space would have a detrimental effect on many residents who live immediatly alongside the fields with the loss of the lovely open views of countyside as far as Donington/East Midlands airport in the South and Ratcliffe/Draycott to the South East with Ockbrook to the East as well as other residents who enjoy its open facility. Many people use this area for the benefit of both their physical and mental heath using both official footpaths and other unofficial walkways around the edges of the fields whilst both walking and exercing dogs. (whilst also respecting the farmers crops). [Redacted] access to the open space/countryside has been the primary reason for living on [Redacted]. We value the privacy in our garden that this position provides us with. Hopefully this plan will not go forward but if it did then the proposed screening shown in the proposal along the Western edge of the site would be very important to us. This housing proposal would not just affect Spondon residents but some Ocbrook people as well who also walk these paths. In addition there would be some inevitable reduction in property values for all Eastern edge residents once the development commenced and a general reduction for all on the Eastern side if this proposed site goes ahead.. The addition of 400 new homes would inevitably create additional traffic problems. I would not disagree with the siting of the access next to the A52. This would help to reduce the amount of traffic heading West towards Spondon Village from the site entrance but would still result in additional traffic on Stoney Lane heading for the village and significantly

				onto Sandringham Drive to access the Ilkeston road and Lime Lane heading North, There will also be an additional problem of traffic merging onto the A52 especially at peak times when it is already quite congested. The increase in noise, congestion and pollution are all significant factors. When this is considered alongside the other proposed housing developments currently around Spondon it is clearly going to be seriously detrimental to the area. The traffic on both Sandringham Drive and Stoney lane at peak times are already heavy and this and other developments around Spondon are going to make it so much worse. There are also junior schools both on Sandringham Drive and over the footbridge of the A52 for the Asterdale school. Congestion is already a serious problem now at school times and this will make the danger to children, adults and pets many times worse. Other local amenities will clearly not cope. There ia very limited parking in Spondon so any additional trade for local businesses will be limited and it is often difficult to get Doctors and Dentist appointments at the present time. In addition there will be a lack of school places for the additional children. I understand that the local schools are already well subscribed so this would be a serious problem. The Spondon drainage and sewage system is old and frankly struggles to cope at the present time. Only a couple of years ago Sandrigham drive was flooded with a 3 metre wide stream 3 to 5 centimeters deep after heavy rain with manholes lifting as a consequence. In my experience this is not an isolated happening. Whilst I have not had personal experience of other areas of Spondon with drainage problems I understand this has happened at other points in the village. Clearly the system will not cope with any additional load. My conclusion from all of this is that the development should definitly not be allowed to go ahead. It is not in the interests of Spondon or its residents. I hope that you are able to come to a similar conclusion and reject this proposal.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				One final point I would like to make is at a national rather than a local level but I think it is relevent so I hope you do not mind my including it as I feel very strongly about it. I do not believe we should be taking up valuable farmland to accomodate additional housing. We only grow about 60% of our own food in this country. This is clearly not sufficient in the long run. We should not be using valuable farmland for housing, solar farms or any other similar schemes. I am not against renewables but favour Nuclear, Hydro, Wave power and putting panels on buildings etc. I also have no issue wth the use of gas as a power source as this is both relatively cheap and seriously reliable and efficient unlike solar and wind. I certainly do not agree that we should be using additional farmland for housing. The ultimate answer to this lies in restricting the demand caused by excessive imigration (the indigious population is not even reproducing itself in sufficient numbers and imigration needs to be dramatically reduced.) and not punishing farmers who do a great job in hard and difficult circumstances or affecting current residents who will have their present environment damaged or destroyed..
100	137	Green Wedge	Support	With regards to the above,i support the Derby City Council local plan retaining the North oakwood green wedge as is currently proposed in draft document. This should be kept as green wedge being so close to the wood and all the nature.
236	283	Green Wedge	Support	In support of Land North of Chaddesden Wood remaining within the Green Wedge. I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
53	89	Green Wedge	Support	In support of Land North of Chaddesden Wood remaining within the Green Wedge. I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
52	88	Green Wedge	Support	After last years unanimous vote by the planning committee, to reject the planning proposal for land north of Chaddesden Wood. I want to voice my support for the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
60	13	Housing, Transport, Infrastructure	Oppose	The infrastructure in and out of Spondon needs looking at first in order to accommodate more people and cars. We leave our house in the morning at 7.20 in order to avoid the slow journey down Willowcroft Road to get onto the A52. The addition of the new lane onto the Wyvern from the A52 has had no impact on journey times as the amount of cars on the road has increased. The bus service in Spondon has been greatly decreased. I would say it is unfair to expect senior school children to walk from this new intended site as it is quite far. It was just over [Redacted], its ok in the summer but not in the winter. I really think that access to this new proposed site from Stoney Lane is an accident waiting to happen. 400 homes so lets say at least 400 cars in and out, very close to a very busy junction. You have to slow down quite quickly on the A52 in order to turn onto Stoney Lane and if you can imagine extra cars on the A52 going from 70 miles an hour to 30 miles an hour to turn the corner is going to cause some accidents. The bollards and the 30 sign on this corner is very often bent over from someone crashing into it! [Redacted]. I am quite concerned about the extra cars on the road and getting in and out of Spondon. The local councillors have worked hard and got us an extra bus service but when you are working and need to be there on time, this option is not always convenient which means a 12 minute walk to the village to catch the Ilkeston Flyer. I would not imagine the people in the new houses would want to walk 15 or 20 minutes to catch a bus to work so they will drive. Whilst Spondon village offers options for nail bars, coffee shops and hairdressers, we do not have the same luxury in getting appointments at Doctors and Dentists so I am very concerned about the impact on healthcare.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
51	87	Green Wedge	Support	After last years unanimous vote by the planning committee, to reject the planning proposal for lan north of Chaddesden Wood. I want to voice my support for the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document

57	93	Green Belt, Community Facilities, Transport, Housing	Oppose	Looking at these two potential developments as a single injection of 650 additional homes into a very crowded area, I wish to express why we object. Through various outlets, including Government departments, this will be the impact of 650 additional houses in Spondon. The national average (this will be used for all calculations going forward) for house occupancy is 2.35 persons per property. This will add 1528 additional residents to a population of 12,000 to 12,650. That is an increase of 12 - 13%. 34% of houses have 2 or MORE motor vehicles, 44% have one. This will be an increase of 728 cars. Based on Department for Education (DfE) data for England, the average number of school-age children is approximately 0.38 per household, comprising 0.25 primary and 0.13 secondary school pupils. This means that in new housing developments, 100 homes typically contain roughly 25 primary and 13 secondary school-aged children. That equates to 163 Primary and 84 Secondary. Whilst there is capacity in the Primary sector, Secondary, through West Park is already over subscribed by 70 pupils, which is 2 oversized classes currently. 1528 new residents of which 247 will be of school age, with the addition of 728 cars is not an increase that the infrastructure of Spondon can cope with. The vehicle access is very restricted if you wish to travel to the City Center. I currently leave at 7.00AM to drive to this side of the City (5 miles) to get to work for 7.30AM. On a good day it is 20 minutes as Willowcroft Road is a queue to the lights, even at that time in the morning. Locko Road is not suitable for high volume traffic in either direction, whilst it looks like Bloor may upgrade part of it feeding Spondon, I doubt they will upgrade it to Morley Road.

				Primary schools have an over reliance on parents using cars, this will increase. Sandringham Road is almost impassable at 3.30PM. Bloor Developments are known for narrow access, whilst providing 2 car spaces per house, the access for buses would be compromised. Spondon may be a low density area of Derby, that reason is a lot of it is designated as Green Belt Land by the LUC and recognised by CPRE. There are more suitable areas to the south and west of Derby for development, especially close to the A50, than to dig into the one area of green belt that would add to the strain on an isolated part of Derby. In short, this is an easy fix to add some homes, however long term issues, especially access, will add additional costs that the councils will have to find funding for., A two way junction at the bottom of Stoney Lane, to access the A52 in both directions would be required. Also adding additional traffic onto the A52 will impact the already over capacity Pentagon Island and the known issues transferring from A52 to Sir Frank Whittle Way (A38). In addition upgrading Stoney Lane to take the volume of traffic that will feed through Spondon would be another requirement. Upgrading Locko Road to Morley Road would be another requirement, it needs levelling and widening, as the additional traffic will quickly tear it to bits. The hard bends at the Locko Park entrance and where Locko Bark is situated will have to be straightened as there will be accidents, unless the street lighting is installed along Locko Road to Morley Road. Traffic lights would be required at various junctions, such as Stoney Lane / Moor Street, Sandringham Road & Sancroft Road accessing Dale Road, Sancroft Road / Locko Road and Locko Road / Morley Lane. Other considerations, such as sewage, water, gas, eclectic, refuse collection, bus, surgery et al, need to have impact assessments, for 5, 10, 20 years down the line, as Bloor will build, sell and leave long term issues with councils that are

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				already strapped for cash. Their bottom line is more important than the local community. Take a visit to Mickleover, Forgers Way (off Station Road, near The Great Northern Pub) at rush hour, you will see what a single access site does to the local area.

251	297	Stoney Lane	Oppose	I am writing to formally object to Policy HA7 relating to the proposed development at Stoney Lane, Spondon. This proposal raises serious concerns regarding the loss of valuable green space, increased traffic congestion, drainage and flooding risks, and the negative impact on the value and amenity of existing homes in the surrounding area. Firstly, the proposed development would result in the permanent destruction of an established green area that is of significant importance to local residents. This land currently provides environmental, visual, and recreational benefits, contributing to biodiversity and offering an open, natural outlook for nearby properties. The loss of this green space would fundamentally alter the character of the area and remove a key feature that residents value highly. Secondly, traffic congestion in and around Stoney Lane and the wider Spondon area is already a significant issue. The existing road infrastructure struggles to cope with current traffic volumes, particularly during peak hours. Any additional development will inevitably increase vehicle movements, worsening congestion, reducing road safety, and negatively affecting air quality. There is insufficient evidence that the local road network can accommodate the additional traffic generated by this proposal. In addition, there are serious concerns regarding drainage and surface water management. The area already experiences drainage problems, and further development on this green land risks exacerbating surface water runoff and increasing the likelihood of flooding. Replacing permeable green space with hard surfaces will place additional strain on existing drainage systems, which may not be capable of managing increased water flow. Furthermore, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the value and enjoyment of nearby homes. Many properties currently benefit from views of and proximity to this green space, which is a key factor in their desirability and value. The loss of this outlook and the associated increase in noise, traffic, and environmental pressure would significantly reduce residents' quality of life and property values. For these reasons, I strongly object to Policy HA7 and urge Derby City Council to reconsider this proposal. The development would cause irreversible harm to the local environment, infrastructure, and community, with insufficient

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				justification or mitigation. Thank you for considering my objection.

76	112	Environment, Infrastructure, Green Belt, Green Wedge, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	I am writing to formally submit my objection to the inclusion of **Policy HA7 (Stoney Lane, Spondon)** in the Draft Local Plan. I also wish to express my strong opposition to any proposed reallocation or erosion of the **Green Wedge** and **Green Belt** boundaries in this area. The proposed allocation of this site for housing development is, in my view, unsustainable and detrimental to the local community for the following reasons: **1. Preservation of the Green Wedge and Green Belt** The land at Stoney Lane serves as a vital **Green Wedge**, providing a necessary buffer that prevents the urban sprawl of Spondon from merging into neighboring settlements. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasizes that Green Belts should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances." The Council has not sufficiently demonstrated that such circumstances exist, nor that all brownfield alternatives have been exhausted before encroaching on protected green space. **2. Infrastructure and Traffic Congestion** The local infrastructure in Spondon is already operating at—and often exceeding—capacity. Stoney Lane and the surrounding road networks (including Sitwell Street and the A52 intersections) are notorious for heavy congestion. Adding a significant number of residential units under HA7 would: • Exacerbate existing traffic bottlenecks. • Increase air pollution levels in a residential zone. • Put further pressure on oversubscribed local schools and GP surgeries. • **Spondon Island (A52/Derby Road)** is already under "active travel survey" as of January 2026 because it is a known congestion bottleneck. Adding 400+ homes will directly undermine any "journey time improvements" the Council is currently seeking funding for. **3. Biodiversity and Environmental Impact** The site is a rich habitat for local wildlife and contributes significantly to the "Green Lung" of our city. Developing this land would result in a permanent loss of biodiversity that cannot be adequately mitigated by "offsetting." Furthermore, the sloping nature of the Stoney Lane site raises serious concerns regarding surface water runoff and increased flood risks for properties located further down the incline.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Recent sightings and neighborhood surveys (2025) have confirmed the presence of **Great Crested Newts**, **Brown Hares**, and **Hedgehogs**—all species of local and national importance. The area also serves as a flight path for Fallow Deer from Spondon Woods. It is also a nesting site for several red listed birds including Skylarks which are ground nesting. **4. Loss of Amenity and Character** Spondon's identity is defined by its balance of village character and accessible green space. Policy HA7 threatens to destroy the semi-rural aspect of this part of the ward. The Green Wedge is used extensively by residents for physical exercise and mental wellbeing—assets that have become increasingly vital to the community. The plan suggests 40% affordable housing for this site. This "high density" requirement is incompatible with the sloping, rural character of Stoney Lane and will lead to an over-urbanized "hard edge" to the village.
				Conclusion I urge the Planning Department to reconsider the inclusion of Policy HA7. The protection of our Green Wedge and Green Belt must be prioritized over short-term housing targets to ensure the long-term sustainability and character of Spondon. I request to be kept informed of the progress of the Local Plan and any upcoming public examinations.

61	97	Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Transport, Housing	Oppose	[Redacted], I am writing to object to the proposal for around 400 new homes on land off Stoney Lane. My main concern is that the existing infrastructure in Spondon is already under significant pressure, and the application does not show clearly how this level of development could be supported in a realistic or deliverable way. **Secondary school capacity** Spondon is served by one secondary school only. This serves other areas too and is already oversubscribed. [Redacted]. Although the developer has suggested funding an additional teaching block, this does not address the real issue. Any new building would bring ongoing costs for staffing, heating, lighting and maintenance, and there is no clear or guaranteed funding to cover these long-term expenses. They would come from our existing budget. Without this, simply adding a building does not create genuine extra capacity. **Healthcare provision** Access to GP and dental services in Spondon is already difficult. The application does not identify a specific new facility or a clearly funded expansion of existing services. It appears to assume that healthcare provision will increase in the future, but without setting out how or when this would happen. **Traffic and cumulative impact** Traffic congestion in Spondon is already a problem, particularly at peak times. The junction of Locko Road and Morley Road is one pressure point; another is traffic moving through the village and onto Willowcroft Road, as is rush hour traffic on the Asda roundabout. This is before the Spondon Woodside development comes into completion with 259 houses proposed there. The impacts on the road to Ilkeston are yet to be seen. (It must also be pointed out that the Woodside development will be adding to the strain on Spondon's core services, whilst its residents pay council tax to Erewash Council.)

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				My concern is that the transport information provided for Stoney Lane looks at this development in isolation and does not properly take into account the combined impact of the other proposed developments. Given current conditions, adding the traffic generated by a development of this size is likely to worsen congestion and increase reliance on car travel, especially with the reduction of public transport after the loss of the Spondon Flyer bus service. **Character of the village and urban sprawl** While I understand that housing is needed, the scale and location of this proposal would significantly change the character of Spondon. Extending development in this way risks spreading the village further into surrounding open land and contributing to urban sprawl, rather than focusing growth in locations that are better able to support it. I would like more brownfield sites to be considered for use, especially as Green Belt land is under threat of even more housing along Locko Road. The quality of life as we know it in Spondon Village has never felt so under threat. I do hope that Locko Road will remain as designated Green Belt land. **Conclusion** Taken together, the lack of clear secondary school capacity, uncertain healthcare provision and unresolved transport impacts suggest that the proposed development is not supported by adequate infrastructure. I genuinely believe that the application does not demonstrate that this level of growth can be delivered in a sustainable way. For these reasons, I ask the Council to refuse the proposal.

65	101	Infrastructure, Housing	Oppose	We are submitting our objections to the proposed housing on Stoney Lane as per the reference above. Our objections include: The proposal is extremely dangerous regarding the closeness to the A52 slip road from Stoney Lane - proposal for 400 homes will cause major issues with potentially 800 more cars. The current infrastructure in Spondon is certainly not adequate to deal with the additional people wanting to take up doctors and dental requirements. W already have to travel to Oakwood for dental provision and the current doctors surgery's cannot deal with the current number of Spondon residents let alone dealing with another 400 houses. The other exit out of spondon down Willocroft road is currently struggling to deal with the existing traffic numbers especially in the rush hours and can take 30 mins plus to exit spondon. The current senior school at West Park is an excellent and from my understanding will not want to take on the additional pupils and expand. Danger to pedestrians and children crossing roads would be greatly increased due to the high number of additional numbers of cars on the roads within Spondon. The fields where the development is proposed have numerous wildlife which will be affected. A large numbers of residents and ramblers enjoy walking across these fields including walking with their dogs to Borrowash and Ockbrook. We understand the need for additional housing, however, not in this area. Spondon has additional housing already approved. Spondon will not remain a village if this development is agreed.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
77	113	Housing, Infrastructure	Oppose	In my calculations adding all the proposed planning for new housing in Spondon it totals 900 new homes, averaging two children for 50% of dwelling would 900 children to school .Taking the same calclation for cars between 500 and 900 cars to journey out of Spondon daily. There is not the infastructure to cope with these numbers ie roads school places, doctors etc.In other words I am totally against such plans.
105	144	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
55	91	Infrastructure, Green Belt, Housing	Oppose	[Redacted]. The existing infrastructure is only just coping with the heavy traffic which comes through the centre of Spondon as it is, this is without the pressure that will be placed on the local community, schools medical practices and all the other services, if further developments are granted. The local green belt strategy must be upheld and keep Loco Road and Stoney Lane as Green Belt.
44	53	Green Wedge	Support	I would like it to be recorded that I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
70	106	Housing	Oppose	In response to the above proposed Draft Local Plan I wish to state my strong objections to this proposal and also the potential development on Locko Road. Both plans need to be stopped. The plans do not benefit the Spondon community in any way, shape or form. They add strain to the NHS services, schools and bus services in Spondon, not to mention the impact on the environment and wildlife. Green belt is green belt and needs to be protected not dug up and built on to cram more houses into communities. I strongly object to any plans and developments on green belt, I always have and I always will. People want to have fields and open space to be able to enjoy and relax. Children should grow up with open spaces around them not houses everywhere they look. This is not Lego Land. [Redacted]. It's so nice to look out over fields / farmer's land. It's very relaxing and good for health and wellbeing I'll be very disappointed in either of these developments for Spondon are approved and as I said earlier, these both need to be stopped.

134	174	Community Facilities, Green Belt, Flood Risk, Housing, Infrastructure, Health	Oppose	I am writing to formally and unequivocally register my **strong objection** to the proposed residential development at Locko Road, near Spondon Cricket Club, as outlined in your recent communications and consultation material. I live [redacted], and although a planning application has not yet been submitted, I consider it essential to place my views on record at this early stage. This email is intended to make Bloor Homes fully aware that this proposal faces **substantial, informed, and determined opposition** from those most directly affected. My objections are detailed, evidence-based, and rooted in planning policy, environmental protection, public health, and community wellbeing. **1. Severe loss of amenity, outlook, and property value** The proposed development would cause a **significant and permanent reduction in residential amenity** for my household and many others. The open green outlook across this land is a defining feature of the area and a major factor in property value and quality of life. The introduction of up to 250 houses would fundamentally alter the character of the landscape, replacing open countryside with dense built form, lighting, noise, and constant activity. This will **inevitably and substantially reduce property values** for homes bordering the site. **2. Autism, mental health, and the proven importance of green space** In my own case, this impact is **particularly serious**. I am autistic and access to open green space, natural views, and quiet environments is **medically and psychologically significant** for my mental health and daily functioning. A substantial body of peer-reviewed research demonstrates that regular exposure to green space reduces anxiety, depression, and sensory overload in autistic individuals, improves emotional regulation, and supports cognitive functioning. The loss of these views and this environment would therefore have a **direct, negative, and lasting impact** on wellbeing. **3. Noise, light, and air pollution** A development of this scale will introduce prolonged construction noise, long-term increases in traffic noise, significant light pollution, and worsening air quality from vehicle emissions. These impacts will disproportionately affect existing residents, particularly those with sensory sensitivities and other vulnerabilities. **4. Traffic congestion and inadequate infrastructure**

				Spondon already experiences **significant traffic congestion**, and the surrounding road network is not capable of accommodating the additional vehicle movements generated by a development of this size. Local infrastructure — including GP services, school capacity, public transport, and road networks — is already stretched and insufficient to support further large-scale expansion.
				5. Flooding risk and proximity to a brook The land frequently experiences **surface water flooding** and lies close to a **brook**, making it particularly unsuitable for development. Building on this land risks increased runoff, drainage failure, and downstream flooding, especially in the context of climate change and more intense rainfall events.
				6. Destruction of wildlife habitats, nesting areas, and displacement of deer This site supports a rich and established ecosystem, including rabbits, birds (many of which nest and breed on this land), small mammals, herons, and **deer**. It is particularly concerning that **deer have already been displaced from their habitat during previous development at Spondon Woods**. Forcing further development onto this land would amount to **displacing the same wildlife twice**, pushing animals out of diminishing natural spaces with nowhere left to go. This land, together with the brook corridor, functions as a vital wildlife habitat and movement route. The loss of these habitats is irreversible and cannot be meaningfully mitigated through landscaping or biodiversity "offsets".
				7. Green belt designation and loss of a vital green corridor The site is designated **green belt land** and plays a crucial role in preventing urban sprawl, preserving openness, and maintaining the separation between **Spondon and Oakwood**. Its development would permanently erase this natural divide and destroy a well-used walking route relied upon by residents for physical and mental wellbeing — a resource that cannot be replaced once lost.
				8. Overdevelopment, social strain, and profit-led planning Spondon has already absorbed **two major housing developments**, and this proposal represents overdevelopment of a community that has already contributed more than its fair share. The proposal appears driven primarily by commercial opportunity, exploiting the "tilted balance" associated with an out-of-date local plan, rather than by sustainable, ethical planning principles.

9. Viable alternative locations exist

Less sensitive and more appropriate sites exist, including brownfield land near the A52 by the Shell garage, the former Looms site, and areas along the railway corridor where housing has already been introduced.

10. Clear intention to oppose

Should this proposal proceed, I will **actively and publicly oppose it** at every stage. As a [Redacted], I am well placed to mobilise community opposition, raise public awareness, and ensure that this proposal receives rigorous scrutiny.

Local residents will not simply accept the destruction of green belt land, wildlife habitats, and community wellbeing for profit.I am writing to formally register my strong objection to the proposed housing allocation at locko road, Spondon, within the Draft Local Plan consultation.

I am writing to formally register my strong objection to the proposed housing allocation at locko road, Spondon, within the Draft Local Plan consultation.

I live [Redacted] have serious concerns regarding the suitability of this site for residential development. My objections are based on issues relating to residential amenity, environmental protection, infrastructure capacity, flooding risk, and the long-term wellbeing of the local community.

1. Severe loss of residential amenity and outlook

The land behind locko road currently provides open green views and a sense of rural character which are integral to the identity of the area. The introduction of approximately 250 houses would permanently transform this landscape into dense built development, bringing increased noise, activity, lighting, and loss of open outlook for neighbouring residents.

This would represent a significant and irreversible loss of residential amenity for existing households bordering the site.

2. Importance of green space for health and wellbeing

Access to open green space and natural views plays a vital role in supporting mental health and wellbeing.

In my own case, as an autistic person, quiet natural environments and access to green space are particularly important for managing sensory sensitivity and maintaining good mental health. There is substantial research demonstrating the positive mental health benefits of nearby green space, including reduced anxiety, improved emotional regulation, and improved wellbeing for neurodivergent individuals.

				The loss of this open land would therefore have a direct and negative impact on wellbeing for myself and many other residents. 3. Noise, light and air pollution A development of this scale would introduce prolonged construction disturbance and significant long-term increases in traffic, noise, artificial lighting and air pollution. These changes would fundamentally alter what is currently a relatively quiet residential edge-of-village environment. 4. Traffic congestion and pressure on local infrastructure Spondon already experiences significant traffic congestion and pressure on local services. The surrounding road network, GP services, schools and other local infrastructure are already heavily used and do not appear to have the capacity to support a development of this scale without major additional investment. This raises serious questions about the sustainability of the site as a housing allocation. 5. Flood risk and proximity to watercourses The land regularly experiences surface water issues and lies close to a brook. Development in this area risks increasing surface water runoff and worsening local flooding, particularly given increasingly intense rainfall events associated with climate change. This raises concerns about whether the site is genuinely suitable for large-scale development. 6. Loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity The site currently supports a range of wildlife including birds, small mammals, rabbits, herons and deer. The surrounding fields and brook corridor function as an important wildlife habitat and movement route. Development would result in the permanent loss and fragmentation of these habitats. Such ecological impacts cannot be fully mitigated through landscaping or biodiversity offsetting. 7. Loss of an important green corridor The open land behind locko road contributes to the wider network of green spaces that provide recreational walking routes and environmental value for local residents. These spaces are widely used by the community and contribute to both physical and mental wellbeing. Once lost to development, this open landscape cannot be replaced.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				8. Overdevelopment of the local area Spondon has already accommodated significant housing growth in recent years. Further large-scale development risks placing unsustainable pressure on the character of the village and the infrastructure that supports it. Please confirm that this objection has been received and recorded as part of the Draft Local Plan consultation.
109	148	Housing, Infrastructure	Oppose	[Redacted] to have up to 650 homes built in the surrounding areas of the village possibly in the next few years is worrying. I have not yet heard anything about updating the sewage and water utilities infrastructure which can only just handle what the village requires at the moment. To build the houses which are required with the population increasing will you also be looking at schooling, medical, dental and public transport links. With all the extra traffic this will mean extra HGV goods vehicles moving through the village. The road congestion at peak times means it can take up to a1 hour to get to work. The road system needs to be really looked at to make one of these developments work within already stretched system.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
75	111	Housing	Oppose	As I am quite sure you are aware there is a lot of upset in Spondon with the proposed new house builds . It does seem as disproportionate amount of housing for one small village . I however understand people need homes and the population is increasing . [Redacted] increasing volume of people in the Derby area and the horrendous strain it is putting on an already broke NHS . [Redacted] I appeal to you too look at the awful traffic chaos we experience already at rush hour times and the impacts on the access to the A52 toward Derby in the mornings . I would ask you to consider one development only as this would be more sustainable and with improved or new access to th A52 to take the strain off the current situation.
48	84	Green Belt, Green Wedge	Support	I would like my support to be registered for the land north of Oakwood to remain green belt. I support the Derby City Local council plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. Green land is being gradually eroded and the impact on roads is terrible since the other two new housing estates have been built. Please, please keep us green. Very concerned Oakwood resident.
96	133	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

56	92	Infrastructure, Housing, Green Belt, Stoney Lane	Oppose	I would like to register my **objection** to the proposal to build circa 400 homes on Stoney Lane, [Redacted], I feel, this proposal is not acceptable, my concerns are as follows: 1. The proposed location of the road joining Stoney Lane is too close to the junction of the A52, the traffic will build up on the A52 and Stoney Lane causing problems during rush hour, with a potential of 800 extra cars (if there are a average of 2 cars per house). 2. The land is designated/protected "Green Belt" for many years and should not be downgraded to "Grey Belt" to suit. 3. The residents, over recent times, have struggled to get GP appointments, Dentist appointments, school admissions, and, there is not a regular bus service to help with public transport since the removal of the very efficient Spondon Flyer, yes, Arriva have provided some assistance, but not as regular as previous services, provided by Trent Barton. 4. Additional congestion will increase pollution into the area. 5. Noise levels will no doubt increase, especially those houses backing onto the proposed estate. 6. Spondon road structure already suffers from heavy transportation including HGV traffic, with many near miss accidents within the village. I would also like to **object to the proposal** of building on the Erewash boundary by Bloor Homes, for the following reasons: 1. The woods are home to a group of deer and many wildlife species, their wellbeing should be taken into account when trying again to downgrade land that is designated/protected as "Green Belt" for many years to "Grey Belt" to suit 2. Building directly on the boarder of Spondon suggests the council who are proposing the build will expect Spondon to cater for their demands, like schools, GP's, Dentists, as already mentioned regarding the objections to the Stoney Lane development. 3. There are no foot paths etc and the road is not conducive for the volume of traffic that will be using the estate. 4. Additional congestion will increase pollution into the area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				And Finally the proposal to build circa 250 homes next to the Spondon Cricket Ground on Locko Road is yet another concern that again will impact on Spondon's infrastructure with the same reasons provided in my previous objections in this email. I therefore ask that these concerns are registered **AGAINST** the proposals to build further homes in Spondon. We need the additional facilities suggested to be built, **before any future developments are considered** by the council.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
129	169	Green Wedge	Support	I write as part of the local plan consultation. I fully support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as it is currently proposed in the draft document. This is a vital piece of land to help preserve the ancient Chaddesden Wood and needs preserving and protecting.
38	74	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
72	108	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
113	153	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document.
63	100	Green Wedge	Support	I support Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document.
181	225	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
24	58	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
125	165	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
33	69	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. I am writing to express my strong support for keeping the land North of Chaddesden Wood within the designated Green Wedge. This area plays an important role in preserving local biodiversity, maintaining a natural buffer between communities, and providing valued green space for residents' wellbeing. The Green Wedge contributes significantly to the character of the area and offers environmental, recreational, and ecological benefits that would be lost if the land were removed from this designation. Protecting this space is essential for current and future generations. I therefore urge the Council to retain the North Oakwood Green Wedge exactly as proposed in the draft Local Plan.
32	68	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing to let you know I wholly support the Plan's statement that the Land North of Chaddesden Wood remain within the Green Wedge.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
40	76	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document. This area is of great importance to remain in its current state. It helps to maintain the current ecology of the woods which is home to many species of wildlife but also many ancient trees. Building houses will block off the remaining route for wildlife to readily access the woods. Species of bird that are already on the critical list could be wiped out from the woods. Reduced insect and bee numbers could impact on the farmers plants being pollinated. The area provides great mental and well being. As most of the soil structure around here is clay building on it is not ideal. There would be no areas for drainage. There would be no ideal access of that area if houses were built. The road at the bottom part of the field has so many twists there is no clear vision and people are known to travel too fast. No extra amenities have been put in to Oakwood. The schools are already full. Our local doctors has closed so people have to travel to Chaddesden or Borrowash to be seen. More housing will only impact on this situation. Oakwood would benefit from better maintenance of roads and other amenities instead of more houses.
103	142	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council local plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge. As is currently proposed in the draft document.
101	138	Green Wedge	Support	With regards to the above,i support the Derby City Council local plan retaining the North oakwood green wedge as is currently proposed in draft document.
66	102	Green Wedge	Support	I am emailing to support the Derby City Council local plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
74	110	Green Wedge	Support	I would like to add my support to retain the North Oakwood Green Wedge. ***I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.***
50	86	Green Wedge	Support	Please accept this email in support of Land North of Chaddesden Wood remaining within the Green Wedge. I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft
229	276	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the north Oakwood Green wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
130	170	Green Wedge	Support	Dear Planning Policy Team, I am writing to formally submit my response to the Derby City Council Local Plan consultation. I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. The land to the north of Chaddesden Wood plays an important role in protecting local green space, wildlife, and the character of the surrounding area. Retaining this site within the Green Wedge provides a clear and necessary safeguard against future inappropriate development and helps preserve a valued natural buffer for existing communities. I strongly support the current draft proposal and ask that the North Oakwood Green Wedge remains protected in the final adopted Local Plan. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Local Plan.
482	499	Historic Environment	Neutral	Alterations for Listed Building Consent must be simplified with additional streamlined testing methodologies, such as proof of legitimate third party support, such as correspondence chains between applicant and Groups, such as The Victorian Society that can assist LAs complete workload much sooner allowing more attention for challenging cases, such as Non-Designated Heritage Assets at live or upcoming risk of demolition by Housebuilders, etc.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
484	499	Historic Environment	Neutral	Highways & Street Furniture should be duly supported across the whole of an area to enhance its historic appeal to the commercial community as much to its indigenous community; as this is supported greatly in equivalent Public Realm Strategy SPDs- where any and all guidance and support must and should be provided, with key at risk projects being an exceptional anecdote that may be cited in future documents or versions of this and other consultations to stimulate economic construction and restoration across other designated Conservation Areas, etc or otherwise. Provide incentives for the return of lost adornments and decorative features, such as roof fixtures like Chimney Stacks once again with an approved contractor directory to make Old Builds practical to own, live and work in the 2020s onwards. If a Directory cannot be provided then specific wording and guides on esoteric restoration and new traditional building styles that would see modern-day use of decorative features must be provided by the Local Council. Permissions for authentic replica and more durable materials, such as reproduction sash windows must be supported to prevent exorbitant high costs through procuring these, limited longevity and economic climates being unstable. This must be assessed on a case by case basis. No more deliberate manipulation and selective misinterpretation of using contemporary modern designs using old-style fabric raw materials, such as stone cladding for new housing where the design and shape clearly undermine the concept of blending within or around a Conservation Area.
485	499	Historic Environment	Neutral	New Conservation Areas should be established covering areas of surviving built historic environment to positively reverse fascia changes to more modern ones.

481	499	Historic Environment	Neutral	1. Enhancement of Historic Areas to remove modern street furniture with the integration of classical style timepieces should be encouraged and pursued wherever possible with clear preferred guides set out for each part of the City. 2. Enhancement of Setting with funding grants and financial incentives from all tiers of Government for Private Investors especially those contributing actively towards achieving Net Zero through Embodied Energy/ Carbon Capacity rich measures, i.e. Retention of Old Builds. 3. Archive Pooling of invaluable source material, such as Historic Photographs, Oil Paintings, such as “Memory Lane” featured on InYourArea Magazine to enrich existing material archives. 4. New officialising of Non-Designated Heritage Assets must be actively supported even if informed by the (wider) community thereby providing some possibility of removing these from risk of demolition. 5. Incentives must be provided to those dependable sincere third party investors that take on, maintain and protect said sites against their annihilation from the streetscape with rescue-packages actively promoted and supported once again with a trusted Directory creating goodwill amongst the local community. 6. Opportunity to meet or correspond on Zoom Conference Call regarding key areas, buildings and places at risk where key stakeholders, such as property owners may be better placed to engage in positive and constructive discussion through third parties, such as myself and a trusted panel of experts in their fields and sectors who could enable these people and organisations to maximise their civic heritage, whilst proactively striving to protect more historic buildings from decline and/ or demolition where a strategy package for raising the revenue to do this could be arranged and facilitated. 7. Defining Character Areas- zoning symmetrical parallel construction recommended where distinctive individualised properties remain as checked against authentic archive blueprints. This will ensure high-quality housing for everyone reducing the societal divides between misperceived “good areas” where affluent people reside in historical style properties and less advantaged reside in contemporary ones.

				8. Industry should be conserved at former industrial complexes, such as Economic Docks with equivalent sites offering modern-day uses, alongside traditional uses such as export and import of raw materials at places such as Docks and Port encompassing: ICT sector, Green Research & Development, etc. 9. Every effort must be made to reach out to Property Owners, especially Housebuilders that are pursuing demolition of long-beloved buildings, especially those with demonstrable evidence of Holy Worship. 10. Every effort must be made to reach out to Property Owners, especially Housebuilders that are pursuing demolition of landmark buildings, especially those with key links to an area's founding or history locally. 11. All Powers to monitor, collaborate with existing and/ or new property owners to conserve these buildings should become mandatory with appointed Community Champions for Civic Heritage that area direct link between Local Authorities and said wider key stakeholders to prevent demolition of structures that may be at risk of destruction from vandalism, urban exploration and demolition. 12. Reconstruction Programme harnessing existing limited crafts people's skillsets to be used as a fundraising vehicle to bring back buildings that may have been demolished to dissuade future demolition as a choice by property owners and by means of expanding these otherwise lost skillsets that are at live risk of becoming extinct from the UK. 13. Checklist of buildings at high risk must be expanded beyond the existing groups and organisations that are saturated with high caseloads, such as SAVE Britain's Heritage, etc so that dialogue channels can be created and fostered between Community Champions for Civic Heritage. 14. Bespoke-tailored funding packages for Properties at Risk of decline or demolition should be integrated with Local, Regional and Central Government-funding as a means of regional economic output through the return on investment that may support other key grant funding capital infrastructure projects, such as transportation and drainage

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				improvements.
26	60	Green Wedge	Support	To whom it may concern, Regarding the new Draft Local Plan for Derby, I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. This space is a vital eco-corridor which should be preserved for future generations. I would also support any plan which sought to bring this space into community ownership, preferably by the Friends of Chaddesden Wood or Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, in order to further improve the area for wildlife and biodiversity.
27	62	Green Wedge	Support	To whom it may concern, Regarding the new Draft Local Plan for Derby, I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. This space is a vital eco-corridor which should be preserved for future generations. I would also support any plan which sought to bring this space into community ownership, preferably by the Friends of Chaddesden Wood or Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, in order to further improve the area for wildlife and biodiversity.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
54	90	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I'm writing to show my objection towards the land adjacent to Harrow street, Wilmorton being proposed for a traveller site. Should this go ahead it would take away valuable green space for local residents. The footfall would be higher particularly during Match days when it's already bus with cars trying park. On those point I object to this planning.
93	130	Green Wedge	Support	I am pleased to read the draft proposal for the land North of Chaddesden Wood. **I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.** This is the most sensible way forward for all concerned to protect both the ancient Chaddesden Wood and the wild life of the wood.
34	71	Green Wedge	Support	**I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.** This is the only way forward to protect wild life and the life of the ancient Chaddesden Wood.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
80	116	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted]. This field and the one next to it are vital to the continued health of Chaddesden Ancient woodland and its inhabitants. We should protect nature, not only for its sake but also for our own survival! So we support Derby city council local Plan retaining North Oakwood Green wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
49	85	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted] I fully support the Derby County Council local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
30	66	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing to confirm in response to the consultation that I support the Derby City Council Local Plan of retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
28	63	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
68	104	Green Wedge	Support	I reside in Oakwood and I would like to give my full support to the Derby City Council Local Plan of RETAINING the North Oakwood Green Wedge status, as currently proposed in the DRAFT document. I believe that the arguments previously put forward and discussed extensively at planning meetings to be well considered and that the council should continue with the proposed draft document, keeping this areas status as “Green Wedge”. I see no sensible argument to go back on the draft proposal. I strongly ask you NOT to make yet another U-turn on a decision made.
67	103	Green Wedge	Support	I fully support the Derby County Council local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
45	81	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. I am writing to express my strong support for the protection of the Land North of Chaddesden Wood. It is encouraging to see that this area is not included as a development site in the Draft Local Plan and that its Green Wedge status is proposed to remain. This area provides important green space for wildlife, recreation, and the overall wellbeing of local residents. I urge the Council to maintain this designation and ensure that the Land North of Chaddesden Wood continues to be protected from future development. Its preservation is vital for the character of the area and for the benefits it provides to the community.
39	75	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
71	107	Green Wedge	Support	In relation to the draft local plan, i support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
98	135	Green Wedge	Support	I would like to make it known that [Redacted] I strongly support the Derby City Council local plan to retain the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document. It is such an important piece of land for nature and the residents of Oakwood and those who visit. I strongly oppose it ever being built upon.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
29	64	Green Wedge	Support	I WISH TO CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE POLICY GRANTED AT THE COUNCIL MEETING WHERE WE MADE OUR VOICES HEARD ABOUT NO BUILDING ON THE OAKWOOD GREEN WEDGE. ***I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document*** AND HOPE FERVENTLY THAT THIS WILL REMAIN THE CASE FOREVERMORE. PLEASE RECORD MY VIEWS.
127	167	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted] extremely pleased that Derby planning had honoured the green wedge status of North Oakwood. This field and the one next to it are vital to the continued health of Chaddesden Ancient woodland and its inhabitants. We are custodians of our world and should protect nature, not only for its sake but also for our own survival! So we support Derby city council local Plan retaining North Oakwood Green wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
126	166	Green Wedge	Support	[Redacted] were so happy and pleased that Derby planning had honoured the green wedge status of North Oakwood. These fields are vital to the continued health of our Ancient woodland and its inhabitants. We are custodians of our world and should protect nature, not only for its sake but also for our own survival! So we support Derby city council local Plan retaining North Oakwood Green wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
88	125	Green Wedge	Support	The land north of Chaddesden Wood should NOT be considered now or in the future for development for the reasons already outlined by many concerned Oakwood residents, Oakwood Ward Councillors, Friends of Chaddesden Wood and other key representatives. I therefore support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
47	83	Green Wedge	Support	I am writing to confirm in response to the consultation that I support the Derby City Council Local Plan of retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
46	82	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. I strongly support the proposal to keep the land north of Chaddesden Wood protected from development and to retain its Green Wedge designation. This area provides important environmental, ecological, and recreational value for local residents. It contributes to biodiversity, supports wildlife, and offers accessible green space that benefits physical and mental wellbeing. The Green Wedge also plays a vital role in maintaining the character of the area and preventing urban sprawl. I welcome the Council's decision not to allocate this land for development in the Draft Local Plan and believe this protection should be maintained throughout the plan period to 2043 and beyond. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan and for recognising the importance of preserving this valued green space.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
114	36	Green Wedge	Support	Dear planning department I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. We are so grateful that you have decided to protect the extremely important ancient woodland. Thank you
37	73	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City council local plan, re saving the North Oakwood Green wedge as it is currently proposed in the draft document
104	143	Green Wedge	Support	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
81	117	Green Wedge	Support	We think that it is essential to maintain this full green wedge between the open countryside, land north of Chaddesden Wood, Chaddesden Wood itself and Oakwood Park. This will both protect the ancient woodland, and encourage and care for the wildlife in and around the area. If any of this land is developed, the Wood could die, wildlife would be adversely impacted, and we would lose a facility that is vital for local residents' physical and mental wellbeing. It is not just a green space, there is very little woodland within Derby and Chaddesden Wood is within easy walking distance for a large number of households. So we believe that it is vital that the land north of Chaddesden Wood is included as part of the North Oakwood Green Wedge.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
124	164	Green Wedge	Support	To who it may concern I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document. It is vitally important to keep this green wedge / wildlife corridor open for the continued health of Oakwood's community, wildlife and future.

62	98	Housing, Infrastructure, Transport, Green Belt	Oppose	[Redacted]. I'm writing to you, with regard to the above policy HA7; Stoney Lane reference to proposal to build 400 houses off Stoney lane in Spondon. While I truly understand the need to build more houses, to meet the current housing shortage. I firmly believe this proposed site is not at all suitable for many reasons. The entrance and exit to this site is right on top of the Stoney lane exit and entrance of the A52 for Spondon. This slip road is already dangerous due to the speed of vehicles on that section of the A52, any vehicles wanting to go to Derby from this site will either have to come through the narrow street in the village, or us the A52 towards Nottingham and come off at the Ockbrook turning to re-join the A52 Derby bound. This section of road is used by parents to walk their children over the bridge, to and from Asterdale school. With the proposed number of houses to be 400, this could mean an additional 400-800 vehicles will be using the slip road or the village. It is already a nightmare to get in and out of Spondon. The land that is proposed for development is as you know Green Belt, is enjoyed by many people to enjoy the green space to walk dogs and families. We need to protect these green space for future generations to enjoy. These fields flood every year and in more recent years this is getting worse due to increased rain fall. The number of house proposed will have a massive impact on the local community, schools, doctors dentist are already stretched. Where will all the children who will live in these new houses go to school. You cant get appointments at the doctors now. Spondon already has two sites being considered Royal Hill Road and Deer Park, the latter of the two isn't even derby City Council. Its Erewash. So DCC wont even get the council tax from this, but Spondon will have to take the hit on its services. These three sites could in total bring 800+ new houses into our village. Has the land on the site of the old Asterdale club ever been considered, this site would give far safer access form with Borrowash road or the A52. what about the land where Albert looms was. Surely there has to be Brown field sites that could be used. There is already a development on Nottingham/Derby road that has been on going for several

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				years, cant this site be extended. I'm strongly against this site being used, I want to register my concerns on the impact this development will have on the local community both on the road network and already stretched services in Spondon.
95	132	Environment, Green Wedge, Infrastructure	Support	I am writing in support that the land north of Chaddesden Woods (North Field) retains its green wedge designation. [Redacted]. This land is fundamental to the Chaddesden Woods Local Nature Reserve preserving its environment as an ancient woodland, providing essential wildlife corridor and habitat. The green wedge links to wider countryside for essential physical and mental well-being, and is indispensable as natural drainage. There is also limited road access with surrounding highways already having notoriety for accident hot spots and losing the green wedge would ultimately lead to higher traffic generation on already highly used roads. The current residential amenity of the nearby neighbourhoods would be detrimentally impacted. I support North Field retaining green wedge status.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
156	199	Open Space, Community Facilities, Green Wedge	Oppose	I am writing to formally oppose the proposal to remove Chaddesden Wood from the Green Wedge. I am [Redacted]. The wood is local to our family and is approximately a five minute walk from our home, making it one of the only truly accessible natural spaces [Redacted]. For both of them, Chaddesden Wood is an irreplaceable resource. The woodland provides a quiet, natural environment where [Redacted] burn off excess energy, and feel safe away from the pressures of built up areas. Access to this space has a significant positive impact on their mental health and wellbeing. As neurodivergent children, they particularly benefit from the calm, predictable, and sensory friendly nature of the woodland, which cannot be replicated by parks or indoor facilities. [Redacted], which helps her connect with nature and provides comfort and routine. The presence of wildlife is a vital part of what makes this space so beneficial for her wellbeing.I am also deeply concerned that if land neighbouring Chaddesden Wood is used for housing development, it could increase the risk of flooding, lead to wildlife leaving the area, and result in the wood becoming completely surrounded by housing. This would fundamentally change the character of the woodland and significantly reduce its value as a peaceful, natural refuge for both people and wildlife. Removing Chaddesden Wood from the Green Wedge would mean the loss of one of the few accessible natural spaces that genuinely meets the needs of [Redacted]. I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and to recognise the vital role this woodland plays in community wellbeing, inclusion, biodiversity, and long term public health.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
94	131	Green Wedge	Support	I [Redacted] would like to register my support for the Land North of Chaddesden wood remaining as Green Wedge status. It is imperative for the wellbeing of Chaddesden Wood and local wildlife that this land is NOT built on, as demonstrated by the failure of the most recent planning application. Please don’t even consider changing the status of this lad - do the right thing and protect the environment.
131	171	Green Wedge	Support	Hello there, I'm emailing in regards to the local plans for Derby. The only thing I have to say is the green wedge located North of Chaddesden wood MUST always remain as it is. No development should ever be made to this land and it should be ideally be brought into protected public ownership as part of the other green spaces in Derby. It's a vital walking route for the people of Oakwood and surrounding areas and is appreciated for what it is in an ever expanding ocean of tarmac. Wildlife use it as a corridor and would be unnecessarily impacted if it were ever removed, there's plenty of space in the city to build that wouldn't cause such issues. I implore you to listen to all the residents who contact you about this as we feel very strongly about this land, it's part of our community.

36	72	Green Belt, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	I am writing regarding the proposed outline permission to build 400 new houses at the bottom of Stoney Lane Spondon next to the very busy A52. It is impossible even as I write to get out of Spondon during periods of people trying to get to and from work. The village is a no-go area for transport during these times. With the heavy haulage transport that thunders thru our tight road structure the additional 400 houses this will add a further 800 vehicles to Spondon chaotic traffic situation. It is impossible now to get a doctor's appointment so with the average family or 2 adults and 2 kids we are talking of an additional 1600 possible people getting added to the list This is not acceptable the dentists are also full and trying to get an appointment is also unbearable. There is also the issue of where would 800 children go to attend a school where I do not have the figures but I would think that all places are taken already. Spondon West Park school cannot cope at present as pupils are being drafted in from all over derby presently. Our road structure for vehicles is over loaded now. Have you done any surveys regarding Transport in the area because I have not seen the black rubber cables that stretch over the road to count traffic recently ? This is also a Green blet bit of Land whilst it states that the boundary will be moved it is removing a large green belt space that exists currently. You cannot continue to remove Green Belt land this is home to hundreds of wild life insets etc removing green belt land will eventually have ecological problems. Has this been looked into. I have to say that that this propose land should be reconsidered as a housing plot of land especially the size of 400 houses. In reflection my issues are :- Schooling Dentist appointment Doctors appointment Traffic over load in / out the village Green Belt removal

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
				Accessing the A52 I understand that new houses are probably needed but I ask that you reconsider the proposed plot HA7 Stoney Lane there is also the subject of the other 90 + houses being Built in Spondon (more green belt land and a part of land that separates Spondon and Chaddesden that would add even more stress to all the above.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
123	163	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	I would like to express my concerns about this proposal. The residents of Wilmorton at the present time have the YMCA, the residents here are not allowed to take alcohol onto the premises, because of this they sit most of the night on the children's play area. They have the Cygnet Hospital, which although it doesn't seem to cause any problems, is still a worry when you have children. And now you are planning to put a traveller camp into the mix. The existing traveller camp on Russell Street is causing nothing but problems for residents, the children are breaking wing mirrors off cars and causing havoc in the local shops, to name a couple of issues. Wilmorton has always been a lovely community, even when the school was turned into a business centre, the residents managed to maintain this. The green area where you propose to put the site is used a lot in the fine weather due to the fact that a lot of the properties in the vicinity only have small yards. I do think that if this proposal goes through that it would cause serious problems for the residents ... the businesses nearby, including all the ones on Ascot Drive, and the local allotments.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Redacted text
58	94	Transport, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	I have just had a look on your site at the HA7: Stoney Lane, Spondon development policy document I do have great concern that the site access for everyone is so close to the A52 junction and looks like an accident waiting to happen. People coming off the A52 then wishing to turn immediately right onto the new estate could be forced to stop because of traffic queuing to access the A52. This could cause the traffic on the A52 itself to halt, or worse still trying to move into the outside lane. Hoping that you can note my concern

All consultation form responses

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
227	273	Housing, Green Wedge	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 59?	The Green Wedge Review (September 2025) states that this wedge makes a strong contribution to the character, wellbeing, and environmental quality of the area. [Redacted]. The emerging plan proposes shrinking it and losing the wonderful vista so many frequently walk to see everyday. The current road system is also not suitable and cannot take anymore traffic. The increased traffic will also do nothing for carbon emissions and the environmental quality of the area. Millennium Wood and Heatherton Pond are already connected by a well used and easy accessible cycle and walking path on the Heatherton side. This path also serves to protect the wildlife both in and between Millenium Park and Heatherton Pond which which would no longer be the case if the area between the two was built on.
227	273			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	No
227	273			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
227	273			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our Parking Standards?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities?	Yes
203	224	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 183?	more peole need more facilities.
203	224	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 169?	Consultaion could avoid a lot of opposition.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Design, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 163?	Local Authorities worked together to devise this policy. It is worth trying it out.
203	224			Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Land Contamination policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Design, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 151?	Council Officers find the atmosphere unattractive to customers.
203	224			Do you agree with our Advertisements policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Tourism and Culture?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Local Labour Agreements?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
203	224			Do you wish to comment on the Evidence Base?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Flood Risk, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 81?	THe OCOR project has proved to be successful.
203	224			Do you agree with the Former Manor/Kingsway Hospital allocation?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	Yes
203	224	Health, Environment, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 211?	Good sleep is essential for healthy citizens and darkness and quiet help a beneficial quality of sleep.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our Quiet Zone policy?	Yes
203	224	Transport	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 221?	I do not have any experience of these needs so I did not answer.
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
226	272	Housing, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 59?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 57?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	No
226	272	Housing, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 55?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with the Rykneld Road allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 53?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 51?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our policy for Self-Build, Custom Build and Community Build Homes?	No
226	272	Housing, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 47?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 45?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 43?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	No
226	272	Housing, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	No
226	272	Housing, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	No
226	272	General Development Principles, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272	Health, Gypsies And Travellers, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	No
226	272	General Development Principles, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	No
226	272	General Development Principles, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272	General Development Principles, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	No
226	272	General Development Principles, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	No
226	272			Do you agree with our Summary?	No
226	272			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	No
226	272			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No
226	272			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	No
226	272			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	No
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Plan Objectives	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers, Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272	Spatial Strategy, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I do not agree with a traveller site being located in Wilmorton / adjacent to the City Point estate as this will have a huge negative impact on house prices and will increase crime / traffic / noise levels.
226	272			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			We have published a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which examines the potential impact of the Local Plan. Do you wish to comment on the SA?	No
203	224			Do you agree with our Active and Inclusive Frontages policy?	Yes
203	224	City Centre, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 205?	You have explained why it should be.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	City Centre, Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 201?	The safety of air travellers is important.
203	224			Do you agree with our Tall Buildings?	Yes
203	224	Community Facilities, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	traffic surveys and lived experience have shown there are only delays during the time children are going to and from school. If buses and trams were available the whole population would benefit. I hope the latest costings will make the Secretary of State decide to use the money on more beneficial National Highway Schemes. Derby City Council and the University of Derby and the Derbion shops all expect to lose a lot of income.
203	224			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 175?	Wasteful to dig agan and again.
203	224			Do you agree with our Communication Infrastructure policy?	Yes
203	224	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	It is disappointing to know the the current generation of students is resistant to the idea of walking. Markeaton Brook Walk was built with mitigation money for the removal of an avenue of Lime trees for the widening of the A38. It should be brought into more use.
203	224			Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Transport, Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	It is better to have schools in walking / cycling distance of the housing.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Education Provision?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with Social and Community Facilities policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with the Embodied Carbon policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 159?	Climate Change extreme heat caused heat bubbles in our flat roof. Then the speed of rainfall caused the water level of puddles to rise above the burst bubble. Raindrops flowed down the flex of the light above our Dining Table.
203	224			Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Shopfronts policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Archaeology policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 139?	Romans first used this sitehundreds of years ago so there a a lot of previously used sites around.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes
203	224	Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 117?	To the best of my knowledge there has always been a waiting list for Allotments.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for the Indurent Park Employment Allocation?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Office Development?	Yes
203	224	Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 93?	The Council has aquired the background knowledge.
203	224	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 91?	The Council has researched the impacts of changes.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Existing Employment Locations?	Yes
203	224	Gypsies And Travellers	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	That seems the most suitable option
203	224			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	Yes
203	224	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 85?	Could there be scope for Higher rise housing there?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Housing, Flood Risk, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 83?	The root areas of the existing trees must be fully protected by fencing before builders are allowed access to the site. Each tree reduces the flood risk.
203	224			Do you agree with our Kitchener Avenue/Browning Street housing allocation?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Beaufort Business Centre?	Yes
203	224	Housing, Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 79?	There is no indication that the surrounding houses fully use that area for recreation.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with the Bembridge Drive housing allocation?	Yes
225	271			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
203	224	Housing, Flood Risk	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 77?	Possibly there must be excavation to provide flood storage area in certainty of increasing named Rain Storm.
203	224			Do you agree with the housing allocation to the North of Sinfin Moor Lane?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with the Former Shaftesbury Leisure Centre allocation?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with the Elton Road Works allocation?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with the Bramblebrook House/Humbleton View allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Housing, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 69?	The houses would not displace any plant life.
224	270			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes
224	270			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	N/a
203	224				Yes
203	224			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	Yes
203	224	Moorway Lane, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 59?	Houses have to be built somewhere.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	Yes
224	270			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	No
224	270			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	Derby city needs more green spaces not less
224	270			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes
224	270			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
224	270			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	There was more reference to the wider economy and areas such as Birmingham and Sheffield. Felt more outward looking.
224	270			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
224	270			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Derbion is not an opportunity but a threat. As someone who moved to the city in 2006 the shopping centre as destroyed Derby's high street. Areas in the West Midlands have not followed that path and their high street is in more robust health. Derbion reduces the footfall to businesses outside the centre. Weakness around short commutes, this hasn't got to the root cause. It's because there is a lack of a joined up cycling network that is protected from traffic from Littleover, Mickleover and into the city. Buses do not effectively use the circular roads and only go point to point - north to south into Derby city centre but not east to west or around. We are forced to use our cars. Another opportunity is to provide a free bus service covering our transport hubs to the city centre/car parks etc. Sheffield offer a good free well used service that moves to integrate transport.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
224	270			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
224	270			Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I don't recognise the aspect about green areas marking distinctive community areas when the reference to the south of the city including Littleover says there is no green belt. Whilst those aspects may not be the same terms I am not sure you can state areas are separated by green if many green areas have been built upon around Littleover etc.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
224	270			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	No
218		Leisure And Culture	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 107?	Whilst we support this policy and its premise, the ambition for "elevating Derby's identity and reputation as a cultural and leisure destination" will remain compromised whilst the city lacks a large-scale theatre. Derby has been without such provision since the closure of the Assembly Rooms, which means it is both losing the footfall and spend of local residents who must now travel to other cities and towns and is similarly losing out on the economic benefits of inbound visitors. We suggest that this should sit as a bespoke point, or potentially within a revised part c as follows: c. encourage investment to improve the quality of infrastructure, including public realm, attractions and venues for culture and leisure activities . Facilities should be accessible and inclusive, engaging residents, building strong communities and attracting visitors
218				Do you agree with our policy for Tourism and Culture?	Yes
213	253		Oppose	Please provide comments on the Sustainability Appraisal.	Not at present - insufficient understanding of the content to be able to comment.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			We have published a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which examines the potential impact of the Local Plan. Do you wish to comment on the SA?	No
213	253		Support	Please provide comments on the Evidence Base	The information provided is extensive and detailed. [Redacted] it is difficult to assimilate and respond to everything that has been presented, particularly where there are deadlines and it's difficult to obtain clarification on features in the plan. Having reached this stage of feedback, I would like the opportunity to comment further as plans are developed.
213	253			Do you wish to comment on the Evidence Base?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 221?	Theresa lot of detail and I'm sure it's very relevant but when reality consists of HMOs with no parking provision because it's acceptable to state that the premises is on a bus route and a bike rack will be provided you tend to lose faith in the management of planning and regulation.
213	253			Do you agree with our Parking Standards?	No
213	253	City Centre, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 219?	The significant intervention statement prompts disagreement. Elsewhere, reference is made to working with partners. This is classic multi-agency approach where the financier dictates what will happen.
213	253			Do you agree with our North Castleward policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 217?	Significant intervention by the council and more homes. The delivery organisation to manage this doesn't presently exist. The aspirations have merit - there are shortfalls in the information provided.
213	253			Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	No
213	253	Community Facilities, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	There are numerous benefits but the redistribution will require improvement and better integration of public transport. This should be a unified scheme, not dependent on the University as a scheme operator and the commercial bus operator companies.
213	253			Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	No
213	253			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 213?	The policy is promising, in unlocking green and open spaces - the ‘opportunity’ to create more residential accommodation should be resisted. There are other policies that would contradict this approach. Missing from all of the work in this plan is the total number of people that the city is planning to accommodate - accompanied. Y some objective evidence of the need. An ‘if you build it they will come’ model is not suitable.
213	253	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 211?	Reasonable, apart from the arbitrary 12:30 cut-off. Clarity relating to the need to accomodate loud venues after this time is needed.
213	253			Do you agree with our Quiet Zone policy?	Yes

216		Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 169?	Draft Policy IC1 focuses on the provision of new community facilities and redevelopment of existing community facilities. This includes the protection of existing community facilities which will require demonstration of either criterion (f) or (g) in justifying the loss of an existing community facility, which is also further detailed within supporting paragraphs 614-615. NHSPS supports the provision of sufficient, quality community facilities but does not consider the proposed policy approach to be effective in its current form particularly with regards to the loss of existing community facilities. Where healthcare facilities are included within the Local's Plan definition of community facilities, policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets can potentially have a harmful impact on the NHS's ability to ensure the delivery of essential facilities and services for the community. The NHS requires flexibility with regards to the use of its estate to deliver its core objective of enabling excellent patient care and support key healthcare strategies such as the NHS Long Term Plan. In particular, the disposal of sites and properties which are redundant or no longer suitable for healthcare for best value (open market value) is a critical component in helping to fund new or improved services within a local area. Requiring NHS disposal sites to explore the potential for alternative community uses and/or to retain a substantial proportion of community facility provision adds unjustified delay to vital reinvestment in facilities and services for the community. All NHS land disposals must follow a rigorous process to ensure that levels of healthcare service provision in the locality of disposals are maintained or enhanced, and proceeds from land sales are re-invested in the provision of healthcare services locally and nationally. The decision about whether a property is surplus to NHS requirements is made by local health commissioners and NHS England. Sites can only be disposed of once the operational health requirement has ceased. This does not mean that the healthcare services are no longer needed in the area, rather it means that there are alternative provisions that are being invested in to modernise services. Where it can be demonstrated that health facilities are surplus to requirements or will be changed as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation and service transformation programmes, it should be accepted that a facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use, and policies within the Local Plan should support the principle of alternative uses for NHS sites with no requirement for retention of a community facility use on the land or submission of onerous information. To ensure the Plan is positively prepared and effective, NHSPS are seeking the following modification to Draft Policy IC1 and/or supporting

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					paragraphs to ensure the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property will be fully supported: Proposed Modification to Policy IC1: “Proposals which would result in the loss of an existing local community facility will only be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that: f) it is no longer viable to retain the facility in its current use; or g) a suitable replacement can be provided which will deliver the equivalent or, where possible, greater community benefit and is easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport by the community it is intended to serve; or [ADDITION] h) healthcare facilities are formally declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS or identified as surplus as part of a published estates strategy or service transformation plan.” Proposed Modification to supporting paragraphs: Where healthcare facilities are formally declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS or identified as surplus as part of a published estates strategy or service transformation plan, this will be considered sufficient to justify the loss of an existing healthcare facility.
213	253	City Centre, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 209?	Implementation and enforcing developer engagement will prove challenging based on recent outcomes
213	253			Do you agree with our Streets and Spaces policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Design, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 207?	This is both urgent and important. The negative impacts on communities arising from the business practices referenced are under reported. The trading entities interest in the city are entirely focused on maximising revenue whilst avoiding any social responsibility.
216				Do you agree with Social and Community Facilities policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
216		Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	NHSPS supports the principle of delivering affordable housing in line with local housing needs. In the implementation of this policy, we suggest the Council also consider the need for affordable housing for NHS staff and those employed by other health and care providers in the local authority area. The sustainability of the NHS is largely dependent on the recruitment and retention of its workforce. Most NHS staff need to be anchored at a specific workplace or within a specific geography to carry out their role. When staff cannot afford to rent or purchase suitable accommodation within reasonable proximity to their workplace, this has an impact on the ability of the NHS to recruit and retain staff. Housing affordability and availability can play a significant role in determining people's choices about where they work, and even the career paths they choose to follow. As the population grows in areas of new housing development, additional health services are required, meaning the NHS must grow its workforce to adequately serve population growth. Ensuring that NHS staff have access to suitable housing at an affordable price within reasonable commuting distance of the communities they serve is an important factor in supporting the delivery of high-quality local healthcare services. We recommend that the Council: • Engage with local NHS partners such as the local Integrated Care Board (ICB), NHS Trusts and other relevant Integrated Care System (ICS) partners. • Ensure that the local need for affordable housing for NHS staff is factored into housing needs assessments, and any other relevant evidence base studies that inform the local plan (for example employment or other economic policies). • Consider site selection and site allocation policies in relation to any identified need for affordable housing for NHS staff, particularly where sites are near large healthcare employers.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
216				Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	Yes

216		Infrastructure, General Development Principles, Health	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	Draft Policy GD9 sets out the overarching policy for ensuring development makes a positive contribution to sustainable growth through the delivery of the necessary and appropriate infrastructure. NHSPS welcomes the recognition of health infrastructure as infrastructure for which development proposals are expected to make provision to meet the cost of additional infrastructure for, where the need arises from the development, also in line with Policy IC1. In areas of significant housing growth, appropriate funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services to mitigate the direct impact of growing demand from new housing. Additionally, the significant cumulative impact of smaller housing growth and the need for mitigation must also be considered by the Plan. We also emphasise the importance of effective implementation mechanisms so that healthcare infrastructure is delivered alongside new development, especially for primary healthcare services as these are the most directly impacted by population growth associated with new development. The NHS, Council and other partners must work together to forecast the health infrastructure and related delivery costs required to support the projected growth and development across the Local Plan area. NHSPS recommend that the Local Plan have a specific section in the document that sets out the process to determine the appropriate form of developer contributions to health infrastructure. This would ensure that the assessment of existing healthcare infrastructure is robust, and that mitigation options secured align with NHS requirements. The Local Plan should emphasise that the NHS and its partners will need to work with the Council in the formulation of appropriate mitigation measures. As set out in the referenced Planning Obligations SPD (2018) under supporting paragraph 166, section 2.5.29-2.5.44 details the process and methodology used in establishing required contributions for health infrastructure which includes the need for engagement with the (then) CCG. To accurately reflect the structures which exist to plan for the local health infrastructure in line with the Health and Care Act 2022 which abolished CCGs and established Integrated Care Systems (ICS), we would request for clarity to be given with regards to the responsible commissioning body for health infrastructure to now make reference to the Integrated Care Board (ICB). NHSPS therefore recommends that the Council continue to engage with the relevant Integrated Care Board (ICB) to add further detail within the Local Plan and supporting evidence base (Infrastructure Delivery Plan) regarding the process for determining the appropriate form of contribution towards the provision of healthcare infrastructure where this is justified. As a starting point, we

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					suggest the following process: • Work with the ICB to understand the capacity of existing healthcare infrastructure and the likely impact of the proposals on healthcare infrastructure capacity in the locality. • Assess the level and type of demand generated by the proposal. • Identify appropriate options to increase capacity to accommodate the additional service requirements and the associated capital costs of delivery. • Identify the appropriate form of developer contributions. Healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining the most appropriate means of meeting the relevant healthcare needs arising from a new development. Where new development creates a demand for health services that cannot be supported by incremental extension or internal modification of existing facilities, this means the provision of new purpose-built healthcare infrastructure will be required to provide sustainable health services. Options should enable financial contributions, new-on-site healthcare infrastructure, free land/infrastructure/property, or a combination of these. It should be emphasised that the NHS and its partners will need to work with the Council in the formulation of appropriate mitigation measures.
216				Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
216		Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	Draft Policy GD6 sets out the Council's commitment to making sure that new developments promote healthier lives and help reduce health inequalities through the built and natural environment in ensuring any adverse health impacts resulting from a development is addressed or mitigated. NHSPS support the inclusion of a standalone health policy that supports healthy lives. There is a well-established connection between planning and health, and the planning system has an important role in creating healthy communities. The planning system is critical not only to the provision of improved health services and infrastructure by enabling health providers to meet changing healthcare needs, but also to addressing the wider determinants of health. Identifying and addressing the health requirements of existing and new development is a critical way of ensuring the promoting healthy and safe communities. In accordance with the NPPF, these requirements should be based on identified needs in the joint strategic needs assessment and support delivery of relevant health strategies, such as the health and wellbeing board's joint local health and wellbeing strategy and the integrated care board's infrastructure plan. On this basis, we welcome the inclusion of a comprehensive policy on healthy places in the Local Plan. The use of health impact assessment is also a useful tool to ensure planning applicants and the Local Planning Authority have the right information to make sound planning decisions in promoting healthy and safe communities. The Planning Practice Guidance supports the use of health impact assessments. NHSPS supports the requirement for Health Impact Assessment to focus on major developments with potential for significant health impacts.
216				Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Active and Inclusive Frontages policy?	Yes
213	253	Economy, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 205?	There are significant assumptions regarding the balance between retail and leisure an activity in the city centre. The consequence of opportunities taken under existing legislation consists of street food - a misleading term in this country as it is essentially a variation on established fast food outlets and various gambling venues. Cafe and restaurant demands are directly affected by other economic factors but landlords are able to accommodate virtually anything to secure rental income.
213	253			Do you agree with our Shopping, Eating and Drinking policy?	No
213	253	Economy, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 203?	Inconsistencies between higher education, business and neighbourhoods policies. The size and d flexibility of office accommodation is critical but in the absence of any insights on the nature of future employment further analysis is needed.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Business, Creativity and Learning policy?	No
213	253	City Centre, Design	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 201?	Proposed development of tall buildings in Derby don't display any architectural merit - developer requirements require minimal build costs and rapid return. This is not ideal for the aspirations described. The underpinning need for the overall provision has not been objectively quantified in relation to regional housing needs.
213	253			Do you agree with our Tall Buildings?	No
213	253	City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 199?	The statements contradict current council programmes - assembly Rooms demolition, Queen Street baths demolition, disposal of other premises which could form part of a public business portfolio. As a transparency exercise, a publication explaining how current plans support this policy would be welcomed.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities?	No
213	253	Housing, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 197?	The scope is unduly focused on density rather than quality of living environment. Further work is needed to illustrate how other policies connect and enable - the present overview suggests areas of inconsistency.
213	253			Do you agree with our Residential Led, Mixed Use Site Allocations policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	City Centre, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 195?	City centre living will be critically dependent on apartment accommodation. For this to be effective there is a need for significant expansion of community and green space provision. Examples feature in Asian cities. Plans submitted by developers don't recognise this factor and the consequences of poor community, health provision will result in increased socio economic problems for public agencies to resolve.
213	253			Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Defining the City Centre?	No
213	253	City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 193?	Without explaining the content within the 'city centre' it doesn't serve any purpose if the predominant focus is on quarters. The difficulty is you run out after four. If the term city centre is going to be publicly promoted it has to be supported with a streamline of the quarters and districts.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 191?	Valid concepts but without regulatory changes the aspirations won't be met. The city centre has been compromised by Derbion which does not represent the city. The commercial operators have undue influence over what happens in the city. Effort should be devoted to addressing the open and older areas of the city. It will not survive with a focus on 'street food', vape and tattoo premises. 'Nighttime economy' lacks objective justification. There is arguably a greater need to address the 'evening economy'.
213	253			Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our Safeguarded Areas around Aerodromes policy?	Yes
213	253	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 189?	This would appear to be a recognised national standard.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 187?	Possible location and facilities at hubs haven't been identified. A starting point would be bus hubs around the city suburbs. Cycling is appropriate for a proportion of the population. Segregated routes are inadequate and badly designed in Derby. Scooter use and misuse is creating problems along with electric bikes. Policy, regulation and enforcement is not keeping pace with technology and public behaviours.
213	253			Do you agree with our Transport Mobility Hubs policy?	No
213	253	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 185?	The concept and strategy for EV charging is flawed. Economic public charging locations need to be developed instead of personal on street charging provision solutions. Technology advances mean that the rate of charging will be broadly equivalent to refuelling combustion vehicles. On street parking Introduces complexity over entitlement and extensive dig requirements. The policy may introduce significant additional costs as a result of poor concept/detail design development.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities?	No
213	253	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 183?	A wider interpretation of protected routes is needed so that off-highway or lower traffic routes are encouraged and developed
213	253			Do you agree with our Protected Routes policy?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our Servicing, Accessibility and Parking policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 181?	Aspirationally appropriate. Existing implementation and legislation is deficient. Examples on major routes into the city demonstrate conflicts between different categories of road users and the implementation of junctions - absence of road markings is a basic deficiency.
213	253	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	The timeframe to implement highway changes does not recognise other factors that shape needs. There is no recognition of the impact of major highway improvements on city traffic flows whilst changes are carried out. Traffic changes will have significant negative impacts across the city lasting for years and the benefits are not adequately quantified particularly where other policies may be compromised and wider industrial and economic factors sill change needs.
213	253			Do you agree with our Transport Infrastructure policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	Aspirational but inadequate understanding and lack of transparency around responsibility for different services. Effective and efficient public bus services are essential to meet the objectives. Services are delivered by commercial operators and the arrangements prevent effective network integration and management. Compounded by an EM strategic authority that has no direct accountability to the electorate. Bus regulatory control in Derby is non-existent - reliance on a trade industry survey to claim excellence is outrageous.
213	253			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	No
213	253	Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 175?	Too late in relation to recent experience in Derby. City Fibre's demonstration of how not to undertake a programme and the legacy of wayleave rights that prevent shared use. Other utilities - gas/water/electricity demonstrate the lack of enforcement in relation to restitution of sites - expensively laid pedestrian areas in the city centre replaced by tamped tarmac. A centrally coordinated authority is needed

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Communication Infrastructure policy?	Yes
213	253	Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	This policy attempts to address numerous interdependencies, eg housing and student accommodation. The provision is driven by speculative commercial development and is objectively underwritten by the university. The release of housing for families may work in principle but it depends on widespread reconversion of HMOs. The use of f Student accommodation blocks for non student use will be a financial success for developers, having built to a lower specification and able to secure an improved letting market. Improving travel links is not the sole preserve of higher education - it has a far wider relevance. Possibly the most unfocused policy in this plan - more work needed.
213	253			Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	Principles are valid but education provision managed through competing academy trust businesses leads to sub-optimal solutions and creates additional problems eg pupil transport/commuting demands. Provision of nursery facilities is distorted by costs and entitlement.
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Education Provision?	Yes
213	253	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 171?	Pragmatic solution - access to a place within the city is important. Transport links are not adequate
213	253			Do you agree with the Cemetery policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with Social and Community Facilities policy?	Yes
213	253	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 169?	Future needs are recognised but the loss of existing community facilities continues to blight neighbourhoods. Exacerbated by loss of community shops/cafes/pubs.
213	253	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 167?	Will this policy apply to the Assembly Rooms or will have been demolished before this plan is in force?
213	253			Do you agree with the Embodied Carbon policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 165?	This policy would suggest that the Sinfin Waste Plant should move directly to end of life removal. An overdue outcome for a flawed design.
213	253			Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes
213	253	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 163?	The shortfall in this policy is the recognition that building practices still need to evolve and management of existing housing stock needs a different approach to ensure that a continued economic life is viable rather than HMO or demolition. Current practices for both domestic and commercial purposes don't appear to adopt more radical changes referenced - domestic homes developments perpetuate traditional construction and are very dense and don't support community engagement.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes
213	253	Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 161?	A work in progress with demonstrable positive progress. The operational model should be used for other policy management action.
213	253			Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes
213	253	Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 159?	Derby has been proactive in its approach to managing flood risks. The model is relevant to enabling other policies to be effectively supported.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	Yes
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 157?	Resources are needed to monitor and enforce. Current LA resourcing is not adequate.
213	253			Do you agree with our Pollution policy?	Yes
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 155?	Without effective independent scrutiny and enforcement this policy will not have any relevance.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Land Contamination policy?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	Yes
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 153?	Effective reduction measures could include the introduction of electric buses across the city network. A significant challenge is greenwashing eg stop/start technology on buses. Private car use will continue whilst there are no alternatives that are convenient and economically comparable.
213	253	Design, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 151?	Without enforcement this policy will be disregarded. With enforcement it would make a significant change and contribute to other improvements such as reduction in antisocial behaviour.
213	253			Do you agree with our Shopfronts policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Design, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 149?	Policy identifies existing unacceptable practices - eg digital displays on bus stops and other buildings where the display is in the driver's sight line Convenience stores where the front glazing is fully obscured.
213	253			Do you agree with our Advertisements policy?	Yes
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 147?	There is scope to justify wider inclusion of other areas in the city.
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Historic Parks and Gardens and Designed Landscapes?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 145?	Resistance to this policy is likely to come from developers as part of their profit maximisation economic model. Local authority resources will be needed to ensure that policies are effectively applied and challenges resisted.
213	253			Do you agree with our Archaeology policy?	Yes
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 143?	Anything that discourages a demolition first mindset is to be encouraged and supported.
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Uses Within Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 141?	Resourcing and maintaining the service is essential if it is to have any relevance.
213	253			Do you agree with our Heritage Statements of Significance policy?	Yes
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 139?	A reasonable proposition, however, open to interpretation - the stand out example being The Assembly Rooms. Demolition is imminent. Future replacement schemes lack detail and justification.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 137?	It recognises the importance of specific and better known areas. The principles also apply elsewhere to maintain and develop communities.
213	253			Do you agree with our Conservation Areas policy?	Yes
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 135?	The mill complex is a privately owned commercial enterprise. There appears to be a complex mix of past failings between businesses and statutory authorities which has led to a situation where significant costs will need to be borne by the local authority. A public enquiry is needed to establish what deficiencies have led to the present situation.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Darley Abbey Mills?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site policy?	Yes
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 133?	Well stated but the reality is that a lot of sites will be compromised by overdevelopment particularly in relation to access, overshadowing and the wider perspectives of the built environment.
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for the Historic Environment?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 131?	Long overdue. Recent past permissions and ongoing plans compromise the policy aspirations. There is a need to scrutinise the economic benefit/harm arising from developments particularly where a burden will fall on the local authority. Speculative housing development with high rise properties being a significant risk.
213	253			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	Statutory credits - an abstract concept designed to avoid local responsibility - the concession granted against a global credit will still have a negative local effect.
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	This policy will require the local authority to have dedicated specialist resources to oversee and manage the requirements.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	A significant element to promote this policy will be education within communities and in schools and colleges.
213	253	Green Gap	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	Enforcement is likely to be a challenge and the existing presumption to permit development under existing legislation.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
213	253	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	Reasonable provisions but there disappear to be a contradiction with other specific schemes in the plan. Loss of viable agricultural land is a particular concern.
213	253	Green Belt	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	This policy must be at the top of the hierarchy to prevent piecemeal erosion by small schemes.
213	253			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	Yes
213	253	Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 117?	An important characteristic that can be used to sustain and revitalise local communities.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	Yes
213	253	Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 115?	Shortfalls - reference to ongoing maintenance provisions by developers does not include economic considerations. The responsibility for finding needs to be defined - this is a subset of leasehold conditions relating to new developments.
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	Yes
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 113?	The approach will appear radical to many. There are extensive arguments to support the approach but there will be instances where the policy may be used to justify a do nothing approach on economic grounds. A specific omission in the policy is the rights and support for residents when premises install excessive and inappropriate lighting.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes
213	253	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	Comprehensive coverage to safeguard environment and encourage responsible development. Implementation and consistent application may be compromised by plans for green wedge development.
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
213	253	Retail, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 109?	Action has been long overdue. There appears to have been reluctance and resistance amongst some local politicans to pursue legislative change to address long standing problems.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Tourism and Culture?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Main Town Centre Uses Outside of Centres?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Office Development?	No
213	253	Leisure And Culture	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 107?	Tourism and culture have been marginalised. Culture in particular is comprised. Quad has pursued a policy of niche interests that haven't demonstrated adequate popular appeal - outcome is unaffordable. Tourism requires more robust analysis to develop a viable programme.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Retail	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 105?	Confusing - the city has a city centre and area centres. Better definition and explanation needed
213	253	City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 103?	Local needs is valid but the provision of more tattoo parlours, barber shops and 24/7 gaming is not a reflection of a healthy community. Food outlets under the guise of street food introduce more fast food outlets. Better definition of needs and support needed.
213	253			Do you agree with our Defined Centres policy??	No
213	253	Employment Land	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 101?	Warehousing - could do better

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for the Indurent Park Employment Allocation?	No
213	253	Employment Land	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	A rail connected site - discarded. Limiting improved environmental and logistics opportunities. food and drink market is ill defined
213	253			Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	No
213	253	Employment Land		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	Lacks a robust and viable public transport element

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	No
213	253	Economy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 95?	It is unclear whether the policy in action will result in widespread demolition of islands of continuing decay
213	253	Economy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 93?	Superficially valid but doesn't understand or address underlying problems. There is an opportunity to develop the intention but it requires effective engagement
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Local Labour Agreements?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 91?	A strategy is needed to manage the land. This is only part of a much bigger picture on what will take place on the land
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Existing Employment Locations?	Yes
213	253	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 89?	Provision of land is a starting point - this will not offer any benefit without a viable industrial strategy - that needs national engagement
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for New Employment Locations?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
213	253	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	Provision addresses specific building requirements but does not recognise interacts with other policies
213	253		Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 65?	This site has been compromised by past changes to original consents and road capacity is already inadequate and further increases are dependent on the implementation of A38 enhancements. The location also illustrates the absence of adequate community facilities - in this instance, Abbey Ward
213	253			Do you agree with the Former Manor/Kingsway Hospital allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253		Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 63?	Loss of farmland and significant risk to surrounding area in terms of roads and transport services.
213	253			Do you agree with the allocation at The Hollow?	No
213	253	Green Wedge	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	Viability of remaining green wedge assumptions are questionable - creates the conditions for further development
213	253			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253		Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 59?	Further example of inserted housing appears to compromise the wider preservation of green space
213	253			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	No
213	253	Green Belt, Brook Farm	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 57?	One of a number of developments that encroach on green belt, compromising overall preservation
213	253			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	No
213	253	Rykneld Road	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 55?	The general principles appear valid but any shortfall or change in specific provisions may compromise the overall plan. Impact on transport and travel and public transport needs more work and the loss of agricultural land is unsatisfactory

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with the Rykneld Road allocation?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Self-Build, Custom Build and Community Build Homes?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	No
213	253			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes
213	253			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
213	253	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 53?	The built environment provisions are appropriate. The need cannot be treated in isolation. Other policies relating to housing and accommodation have interdependencies. This policy seems to stand in isolation. This needs to be explained.
213	253	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 51?	It appears to present reasonable management controls for a niche circumstance. The principal consideration is that other policies also impose obligations relevant to communities.
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	Inadequate control. Student accommodation is built a different standard to other accommodation. The authority considers planning regulations only. The commercial need and the impact on communities is not addressed - it can’t be without a change in legislation. There is an excess of student accommodation at present and it is not unreasonable to suggest that student needs can’t be met from the wider approvals for apartment builds in the city.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
207	249	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	The need for more prescriptive policy approach is welcomed to ensure standards are maintained and the homes which are delivered are of a high quality. Defining what is meant by 'high quality' is important as this requirement is likely to be seen as adding an additional financial burden to developers, so having a robust policy which has been examined and formally adopted is essential.
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 47?	This policy can only be regarded as a template, it bears no resemblance to the lived experience of neighbourhood HMOs with the added characteristics of exempt and supported living business operators. The reality has been years of excuses and obfuscation whilst commercial businesses increase financial returns from people who become commodities. Will the policy provide for restitution in areas that exceed the policy thresholds?
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	Agreeing or not agreeing to the housing delivery policy is too simplistic. The theory may be sound but almost all larger housing schemes meet with opposition from existing residents. Also the 'Council' mostly does not deliver the housing. Even if planning permission is granted for development there is no certainty if or when it will come forward in a market driven by private housing developers who seek to maximise profits. Finding ways to deliver social housing, affordable housing and more specialist provision surely cannot be left to the commercial developer. The lack of truly affordable housing and social housing drives the demand for HMO's. I am not convinced our policies address these problems.
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 45?	Policy does not address the contractual operation of facilities. Defining building requirements is insufficient if there is no regulation and oversight
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 43?	The policy is principally concerned with structural changes. There doesn’t appear to be any policy or regulation of the commercial operators if premises and services where children and young people are considered as commodities in terms of the revenue yield for the service providers. This policy requires expansion to address licencing and competence of providers including contract management and revenue.
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	The policy appears to build a complex algorithm to define and approve compliant solutions. Unfortunately, the underpinning justification of housing needs may be flawed. More explanation and justification needed.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No
213	253	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	Reasonable, but it is difficult to manage intent where HMOs may feature.
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	Aspirational. How do the National Defined Standards compare with what's happening in Derby? The lived experience is significantly different to this policy and by the time it's enacted, the damage will be extensive and irreversible.
207	249	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	whilst supporting the principles, will it be possible to stick to these when developers claim schemes are not viable and contributions cannot be afforded. Will we be able to refuse proposals and defend refusals at appeal, if contributions cannot be agreed?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	The statements regarding past action and future intent do not reflect lived experience in the city. HMO conversions continue at pace - restrictions have not been implemented. Family housing needs are not being met - the authority has already identified this deficiency. More house being built on agricultural land whilst usable family homes are converted for HMO use. Arguments regarding energy performance between old and new build are spurious when considered in relation to wider socio-economic factors.
207	249	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	to achieve the aims of this policy the Enforcement team needs to be better resourced. One officer and one assistant are not adequate to manage the workload generated.
207	249			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
207	249	Health, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	Education, and greater social equality are also required. Clearly the dominance of cheap fast food has a negative impact on health, as does poor housing and general poverty . Bringing about change in these areas is a very long term task which requires financial support and buy in from all sectors of society, so whilst the policies might have the right approach achieving the aims is more complex than simply writing a policy.
213	253	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	If the policy is managed correctly, significant improvements may emerge. The current arrangements result in farcial distribution of funds and schemes that appear to be expensive in relation to the scope of works. There is a critical shortfall of community facilities in different parts of the city. Local authority disposals are driven by maximum financial return rather than community need and benefit.
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249	Design, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	Community safety initiatives are important in making residents feel comfortable visiting the city centre. This does beyond what can be achieved through building design however and the active involvement of police etc is also required and this is out of the control of the planning authority.
213	253	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	Valid and needed. Reference to statutory enforcement powers - current circumstances suggest that these are inadequate.
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
213	253	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	The policy is appropriate and needed. Current practice suggests that a lack of transparency regarding the responsibilities and decisions of agencies may prevent this policy from functioning as intended.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
213	253	General Development Principles, Health	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	Current practices and associated legislation are not conducive to delivering this policy. The need to identify what needs to change is essential to improve the credibility of the plan. Facility and clinical provisions are the responsibility of different agencies - this will compromise policy compliance.
207	249	Derby City Centre Vision, Retail	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	I think this vision is more than a little unrealistic. Changes in retail activity suggest the city centre is never going to be a centre for shopping as once it might have been. Cultural activities usually need some financial support, and take time to become established and this hasn't been forthcoming in the past. There are many social problems which are beyond the remit of the local plan to control. Whilst 'aiming high' is admirable I suspect this vision of the city centre is not one most residents would relate to.
213	253	General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	Policy is reasonable and robust. It isn’t achievable as the authority doesn’t have supporting legislation to regulate activity.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	A reasonable policy but as previously noted. Too little, too late in relation to what is already happening.
213	253	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	The policy is appropriate, however, the extent of activities and changes in the recent past and currently being progressed that breach the policy suggests it's too little, too late.
213	253	General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	The policy supports local community needs but as with preceding comments, there is no indication of how it will be achieved without legislative change.
213	253			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	Clear expectations are set out. The principal constraint is that significant legislative changes will be needed to enable the local authority to manage and enforce requirements. Without this change the authority is simple the facilitator for commercial interests.
213	253	Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	Aspiration is valid. The vision is not deliverable because of a lack of holistic thinking on the interdependencies and interactions between employment, education, housing and industry. There is no local industrial strategy - this is directly affected by the lack of a national strategy. Derby is not going to thrive as a result of the extensive and continuing warehousing developments around the city. Derby can't compete with other better developed logistic hubs and the opportunity to establish local manufacturing is out of reach.
213	253	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	Developments within and outside the city boundary are imposing increasing demands on services within the city. Traffic congestion is increased, school travel patterns become more complex as pupils travel across and around the city. Housing demand is focused on family detached residential houses and apartment blocks. Existing g communities have been and continue to be destroyed because of unregulated HMO conversions and associated social and health problems. Housing is the most significant failure of Derby's local authority management and governance.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253	Plan Objectives	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	Defined objectives - progress and achievement can be measured. Indicative milestones and timeframe needed. Progress on each one will fluctuate. In the 1990s I supported the Derby 2020 Vision. The overall perspective in this plan shares significant features with the 2020 Vision. What happened to that? National, international and local factors will emerge and affect the progress and viability of the objectives. More detail on the risks and mitigation measures to secure progress is needed.
213	253	Outside City Centre Vision		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	It's a positive and beneficial vision. It won't be delivered because green wedges are being eroded for residential development and the city built environment is being compromised by widespread high rise apartment developments. The density of residential provision is not complemented by adequate green space and other local community provisions. This trend is being driven by commercial development businesses able to progress their plans because of the expectation that planning consent is granted and if not, it is secured on appeal. A critical obstacle to balanced and independent review is the possible liability for local authorities to meet significant legal costs
213	253	Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	It's an attractive proposition. It won't be delivered because local politicians refuse to address the need for legislative changes to enable the preferences and vision to be delivered. National and local political engagement does not recognise the need to drive change.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	City Centre, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 219?	The current use does not reflect the potential of that area.
213	253	Derby City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	It's a vision. It is likely to encounter obstacles and delivered outcomes will have significant shortfalls compared to the aspiration. A principal factor that creates the conditions for these problems is the 'multi-agency approach' which obscures ownership, accountability and leadership. The conditions are further complicated by commercial interests who aren't accountable to residents and the authorities responsible for safeguarding community interests.
203	224			Do you agree with our North Castleward policy?	Yes
203	224	Housing, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 217?	There is good potential in that area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	Yes
203	224	City Centre, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	Markeaton Brook had a significant role in the industrial activity of Derby, powering Britannia Mills and allowing boat traffic to deliver goods along Brook Walk. Some local residents care for Brook Walk themselves.
213	253	Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Identifies principal factors that can be used to develop solutions
203	224			Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	City Centre, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 213?	It could restore Riverside Gardens into a pleasant place to relax and meet friends.
213	253			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
212	256	Environment, Green Wedge		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	This is the main area that concerns me in the local plan. I do not want you going back on promises made to keep green spaces and then giving in to developers. [Redacted]. I want the North Oakwood Green Wedge to be retained in the Local Plan! Areas of neglect within the city should be re-developed before you build on green belt land. We are likely to be going to war so will need to grow food, raise cattle and work the land. Derbyshire has prime arable land and we should be keeping this for food production and to help with flooding.
203	224			Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
213	253			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	No
213	253	Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Objective statistical evidence is quoted but the lack underpinning evidence of disproportionate negative impacts. Housing provision is not representative of needs, evidence of public transport bus services does not address shortfalls. In general, the profile is good and reflects well on the city.
203	224	City Centre, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 209?	[Redacted]. It feels to us that in all directions from the bus station the road is uphill.
203	224			Do you agree with our Shopping, Eating and Drinking policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
212	256			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	No
203	224	City Centre, Leisure And Culture, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 203?	The policy was developed wih consultations and meetings of interested parties.
212	256			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Business, Creativity and Learning policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities?	Yes
203	224	Housing, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 197?	it is a response to Consultations and changes in Government Planning rules.
203	224			Do you agree with our Residential Led, Mixed Use Site Allocations policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 195?	It was developed after Consultaions.
203	224			Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	Yes
203	224	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 193?	It is based on suitable research.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Defining the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	I am very grateful to Gordon Brown that he introduced free bus travel for pensioners. I am dismayed that successive governments have delayed repayments to the Bus Companies while those companies have to bear the immediate impacts of changes in fuel prices, the costs of maintenance of their vehicles and need to replave equipment before they get any income from their vehicles.
203	224	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 191?	This plan is based on the previous consultations.
203	224			Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	Yes
203	224	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 189?	The reasons suggested in tthe Council report.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our Safeguarded Areas around Aerodromes policy?	Yes
203	224	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 187?	both Yes and No Trams have proved to be very successful in the towns that have them. As a city whose history is closely bound with rail public transport Derby couls benefit from energy efficient trams.
203	224	Design, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 181?	All new developments need roads not too bendy for buses. The roads must be wide enough to allow parked Ambulances and Furniture Lorries when families move in or out of the dwelling or vehicles servicing Dish / Clothes washing machine or delivering Freezers or collecting refuse NOT to completely block the road. Should Derby City Council consider having roads that have access to both the front and the back of the houses? I would like Governments to insist that vehicle manufacturers must stop making vehicles wider and wider every year.
211	255			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our Transport Infrastructure policy?	No
203	224	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 171?	The increasing population inevitably leads to a need for more funeral facilities. However it is almost certain that Bonnie Prince Charles walked along the the nearly obliterated path that used to be the original road from Ashbourne whose remnants can be traced near to the A52 Ashbourne Road. Will people have to park elsewhere and cross roads to get to this site?
203	224			Do you agree with the Cemetery policy?	Yes
203	224	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 167?	Both [Redacted] have suffered damage from the named Rain storms.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 165?	It would be irresponsible of the Council to ignore Climate Change.
203	224			Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes
203	224	Flood Risk, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 161?	Phase 1 has been an award winning success. The increasing patterns of excess amounts of rain in named storms leads to a lot of damage.
203	224			Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Environment, Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 157?	It will lead to a more healthy environment.
203	224			Do you agree with our Pollution policy?	Yes
203	224	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 155?	The proposal text gave good reasons.
203	224	Health, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 153?	Polluted air leads to bad health and pollution can accuulate in food plants grown for people to eat.
203	224	Retail, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 149?	Adverts must not divert driver's attention from events on roads or detract from the heritage of buildings.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Historic Parks and Gardens and Designed Landscapes?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Uses Within Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Heritage Statements of Significance policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 137?	It reflects the compromises that are necessary amongst all the competing situations.
203	224	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 131?	Some really historic events that have occured in Derbyshire changed the course of history of the British Isles.
203	224			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Managing the Proliferation of Specific In-Centre Uses?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Main Town Centre Uses Outside of Centres?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	Yes
203	224	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 89?	The reasoning postulated in this document satisfies me.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for New Employment Locations?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	Yes

209	251	Gypsies And Travellers, General Development Principles, Transport, Environment, Open Space	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	My concerns relate to: 1. The loss of recreational green space for a community that already feels somewhat forgotten. It is worth noting that the recreation ground is widely used by local residents, especially for older people who can't walk further to take their dogs for exercise, and any development there would significantly affect how the space can be used and whether people feel safe enough to use what is left. I like to go out there and read or play frisbee with friends in the summer, given that my tiny garden backs onto a now very busy road. 2. The impact on local infrastructure and services, which are already pushed by the HMO's and 'B&Bs' that have been allowed to set up in the area. There is not enough parking with these multi-occupancy buildings already, 17 or more caravans on site will only make this worse. 3. The lack of suitability of the site given its proximity to existing homes (again, the road is already full of cars), as well as the railway track (easy access from the site could risk damage to passing trains). 4. I am also concerned about how a site such as this might impact safety and security for local residents (this makes me personally the most nervous), along with the value of our properties. 5. I respect the traveller community and wish for them to have somewhere to live, but perhaps since there will be no income from them, using what is actually prime land seems like a poor judgement. If the land i going to have a change of use, then perhaps a sports facility would be more suitable (pitches/ courts/ table tennis table) would be more fitting with free passes / reduced cost access for immediate locals to help boost the community rather than continue to negatively impact the area (obviously, keeping an area to walk around for people to walk dogs, picnic and play games). I am also aware from when people from this community stay on the park nearby that i feel less safe due to the language and activities i've witnessed. I would like to put it to anyone who is in the position of having power over this decision: 'Would you vote for this site to be set up a few yards from your own house?". And then ask whether this site would be set up in Allestree? Is it fair to ignore the people of Wilmorton yet again and do to them as you would not have done to yourself, friends or relatives? I would like to suggest that this community is worthy of something good happening for a change, rather than being seen as a group that doesn't matter.
203	224			Do you agree with our	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
				Conservation Areas policy?	
203	224	Climate, Historic Environment, Design	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 135?	The replacement bridge could be built with Hydraulic turbines and Wind turbines to generate electricity.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Darley Abbey Mills?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for the Historic Environment?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Environment, Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	It is proven the being outside with natural life surrounding is beneficial to Human's health.
203	224	Flood Risk, Climate, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	Derby residents need more trees especially to mitigate against the flooding and air pollution arising from too much use of cars.
203	224	Historic Environment, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	These poicies prevent the heritage of our city from being destroyed.
203	224	Health, Green Gap	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	Green Gaps are an ingenious way to benefit Derby with wellbeing from nature.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Health, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	Green Wedges have been an ingenious way to benefit Derby with wellbeing from nature.
210	252	Transport, Community Facilities, Infrastructure, Housing, Stoney Lane, Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Re: Policy HA7: Stoney Lane, Spondon & Green Wedge/Green Belt Allocation I would like to submit the following comments, relating to the proposed site for housing development, off Stoney Lane in Spondon. While understanding the necessity to review Green Belt allocations, etc. and the need for additional housing in the Derby Draft Local plan, I have concerns regarding the overall strategy for housing proposals in the Spondon area. Namely, that the development off Stoney Lane is now only one of five housing developments proposed for Spondon and its immediate surrounding area. The total proposed increase in housing stock is around 1180 properties. In the early years of the developments, this could equate to 2,500 or more additional residents, and 1000 or more additional vehicles. I believe that the immediate pressure on local amenities, infrastructure and highways would be extreme and unsustainable. Also, in the first 5 years the Primary school places requirements could increase by more than 1000. The available capacity in Spondon Primary schools, at the time of writing, is 208 (GOV.UK figures). The Spondon Secondary school is currently over-subscribed. This additional requirement equates to two/three additional Primary schools after 5 years, and an additional Secondary school after 10/12 years. In my opinion, it is essential that the impact of the total housing increase, across all proposed developments, should be considered, and a suitable infrastructure strategy agreed, before any further development proposals are agreed. (N. B. I have also sent a copy of this comment via email) [Redacted]

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Green Belt	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	I agree with it.
203	224			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	Yes
210	252			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
203	224	Environment, Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 115?	Derby used to have mature trees among its streets.
203	224	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 113?	I find it very tiring and depressing to be kept awake or woken too early by too much light.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes
203	224	Design, Climate, Housing, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	There is scope to increase the use of the Hot water waste heat recovery system that was begun in Derby. The roof turbines trail held at the Kedleston Road site of The University of Derby was very successful. That could be considered for use in the new high rise buildings in the Station Quarter.
209	251			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
203	224	Economy, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 109?	It is appropriate for the changes since the previous Local Plan.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Leisure And Culture	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 107?	It is appropriate for the changes since the previous Local Plan.
203	224	Retail, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 105?	It is appropriate for the changes since the previous Local Plan.
203	224	Retail, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 103?	It is appropriate for the changes since the previous Local Plan.
203	224	Flood Risk, Climate, Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 101?	Our City Our River has already been awarded prizes and these proposals could add to this success.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Climate, Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	There are already facilities for the existing businesses and any heat generated could add to the Low Energy Heating project being delivered to the new housing proposed near the railway station.
203	224	Climate, Housing, Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	The need for more housing outweigh the arguments against using this site. The Council must do as much as it is able to combat the Climate Change that is the reason for the Named Rain Storms that the UK has begun to experience.
203	224	Economy, Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 95?	people could use bus and rail as transport to get to work in these places.
203	224	Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 75?	Some trees and excess of their root areas should be fully physically protected from damage during the build. Heavy vehicles and machinery must not compact the soil near hedges and trees. Is there scope for low rise maisonettes?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	These measures are required by legislation. Again we need to be proactive in ensuring they are delivered and maintained.
207	249	General Development Principles	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	We will need to be clear how we will ensure the required mitigation is delivered and maintained. Who will check if suitable noise reduction measures have been put in place, who will monitor . To be effective further training and resources would be required in both Development Management and Planning Enforcement. We will need to be seen to take action if the appropriate measures are not delivered on a development.
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 73?	There is an acute shortage of housing.
203	224	Climate, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 71?	Could Derby Homes be asked to take responsibility for new homes being built in these types of area? With solar panels on the roof of each house whose generated electricity could be used by the City Council for heating Swimming pools and Activity centres.
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes

208	250	General Development Principles, Gypsies And Travellers, Transport, Flood Risk, Community Facilities, Health, Environment, Open Space	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	I am a resident of [Redacted]. As someone directly impacted, I strongly object to this allocation in Derby City Council's Draft Local Plan. The site is unsuitable for permanent development of 17 caravan pitches, including associated fencing, hardstanding, and ancillary buildings, due to significant adverse effects on local planning objectives, residential amenity, and sustainability. While I recognise the council's duty to meet Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs, this location fails to balance those requirements with protections for existing communities and green infrastructure, contrary to national policies like the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). My objections are based on the following material planning considerations: 1. Loss of Valued Green/Recreational Open Space and Harm to Landscape/Visual Amenity This land forms part of the informal open space near Wilmorton Recreation Ground, used daily by residents for walking, sports, and relaxation. Permanent development would erode its openness and function as community green infrastructure, conflicting with Derby's Policy CP18 on Green Wedges, which protects such areas to maintain urban structure, neighbourhood identity, and countryside links. The site lies adjacent to the Lower Derwent Valley Green Wedge, a key corridor along the River Derwent. Introducing caravans and structures would harm the wedge's character, visual amenity, and role in flood management/biodiversity, leading to moderate harm by narrowing effective separation and impeding countryside flow, as assessed in similar sites. This breaches NPPF requirements for respecting local landscape (para 174) and PPTS Policy H (para 24), which mandate sites avoid dominating surroundings or undermining openness. 2. Adverse Impact on Residential Amenity and Proximity to Homes With over 700 nearby residences, including mine feet away, the site's scale would disrupt privacy, outlook, and peaceful enjoyment through increased noise, activity, and visual intrusion. PPTS Policy E emphasises protecting local amenity without undue harm to neighbours, yet this urban-edge location lacks natural screening, risking dominance over the settled community. 3. Undue Strain on Parking, Highways, and Infrastructure Parking in Wilmorton is already severely limited, with on-street overflow common. Adding multiple vehicles per pitch (potentially 2–4, including larger ones) would exacerbate congestion, block access, and create safety hazards, contrary to PPTS Policy E(f) on avoiding pressure on services. Pride Parkway's busy traffic would compound risks for pedestrians and cyclists using adjacent paths, failing sustainability tests under NPPF para 104. 4. Risks to Community Safety and Unmanaged Impacts While the proposal includes fencing, planting, and

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					waste protocols to enclose the site, the extremely close proximity to existing homes [Redacted] raises ongoing concerns about potential disturbances such as noise, litter, or activity spillover. These measures may not fully mitigate impacts in a location lacking meaningful separation or natural buffering. Past unmanaged encampments nearby (e.g., Alvaston Park) demonstrate how issues can arise without adequate controls, highlighting why this site—despite proposed enclosures—risks undermining integrated co-existence as required by PPTS Policy F. Stronger design safeguards (e.g., enhanced boundary treatments and occupancy management) are essential but appear insufficient here. 5. Unsustainable Location and Environmental Concerns The site offers poor access to services (schools, healthcare), promoting car dependency against NPPF sustainability goals. Potential flood risks in this low-lying area near the Derwent require unaddressed mitigation, while biodiversity loss conflicts with green wedge enhancements for wetlands and habitats. 6. Inadequate Site Selection and Alternatives The evidence base for HA17 appears weak; better alternatives (e.g., brownfield sites with separation) should be prioritised to minimise harm, as per the Green Wedge Review's call to retain CP18 and protect functionality. In conclusion, this allocation prioritises needs at the expense of established communities and green assets. I urge the council to remove HA17 and explore alternatives that align with CP18, NPPF, and PPTS for balanced, sustainable planning. Thank you for considering my views as a directly affected resident.
207	249	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	We are disadvantaged that many, particularly small developers, do not consider fully the factors described in the proposed policy GD2. Many proposals are put together by 'amateurs', not architects, who do not address these fundamental considerations. Much more education and explanation will be required to help deliver this message to local developers and justify why we are striving to achieve these aims which may result in extra costs for developers.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes
207	249	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	I agree with the policies and strategy.. but when need is so high will we be able to resist developments which do not meet our requirements, and if we do resist them, can we rely on external planning inspectors to agree with us and continue to refuse poor quality development when the pressure from central government to build is so strong. So many external factors come in to play that living up to these principles will be very difficult.
203	224	Stoney Lane, Housing, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	There must be proper physical protective fencing for existing trees and hedging and ongoing maintenance care for mitigation planting.
207	249			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249	Housing, City Centre, Community Facilities, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I think the reliance on the city centre is unrealistic. Who will provide the necessary infrastructure ? - Schools, medical/dental centres etc - Will commercial developers fund these and continue to over the years. How will we provide a variety of different types of housing - for the elderly, for the young, for larger families or will all that is offered be small flats with limited appeal. I think the local plan runs the risk of creating unrealistic expectations which it can't meet.
203	224	Housing, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 65?	It is a suitable site. Could Derby Homes be asked to take responsibility for new homes being built in these types of area? With solar panels on the roof of each house whose generated electricity could be used by the City Council for heating Swimming pools and Activity centres and Care Homes.
203	224			Do you agree with the allocation at The Hollow?	Yes
203	224	Housing, The Hollow	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 63?	Thee is no better alternative.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	No
203	224	Environment, Climate, Open Space, Housing, Royal Hill	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	Section 106 could be used (or is it Community Levy now ?) to make sure "Climate Change" and " No more loss of Biodiversity Laws" can safeguard remaing features and enhance the Biodiversity in the surrounding unbuilt areas.
207	249	Spatial Strategy, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	the requirement of the neighbouring authorities to absorb some of Derby's housing need is very unpopular and it appears to be an additional pressure on the towns and villages surrounding the city. If the proposed local government reforms come to pass the HMA will be changed significantly, however I doubt increase in popularity. The need for housing of all types is clear but the need does not seems to be communicated and understood well by the public and this must be a failing of the local plan to inform and persuade both politicians and residents why housing must be built.
207	249			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	No
208	250			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
207	249	Transport, Plan Objectives, Economy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	The objectives are sound, but will be expensive to deliver, possibly adding costs to projects.. reusing brownfield sites is of course sensible but clearing and decontaminating makes them less attractive to potential investors. Again I will repeat the delivery of good public transport is not in the hands of the City Council, and in my experience is being downgraded and made increasingly expensive so some way needs to be found, through funding etc to address these matters to make the delivery of the objectives realistic.
207	249			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
207	249	Climate, Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	My only concern with this vision would be the failure of some political parties to recognise the impacts of climate change and the need to act to do what is possible in the local context to address this.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes
205	247			Please provide comments on the Sustainability Appraisal.	N/A
207	249			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			We have published a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which examines the potential impact of the Local Plan. Do you wish to comment on the SA?	No
205	247			Please provide comments on the Evidence Base	N/A
205	247			Do you wish to comment on the Evidence Base?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 221?	To reduce parking, th epublic transport and walking and cycling facilities need to exist first
205	247			Do you agree with our Parking Standards?	Yes
207	249	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	The vision is admirable. Whether there is buy-in to this vision from all local politicians regardless of political party and a willingness to work together for the greater good of the city, rather than the political 'points scoring' we usually see is doubtful.
205	247	City Centre, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 219?	Using brownfield is good

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our North Castleward policy?	Yes
205	247	City Centre, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 217?	Should consider safe cycling routes and making it safer for pedestrians to access
205	247	Community Facilities, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	No further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Environment, Historic Environment, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 213?	Should reuse the brownfield site, not devalue the cathedral or the Bonnie Prince Charlie statue or museum of making
207	249			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
205	247			Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	No
205	247			Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	Yes
207	249	Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	The summary identifies the main issues facing the city. However I would also add in the weaknesses and threats the reliance on external commercial organisations to deliver public transport/housing/growth. The local plan can identify what is required, but it does not 'deliver' the required growth/housing/infrastructure etc.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 211?	No further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our Quiet Zone policy?	Yes
205	247	Design, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 209?	The space outside the old Eagle centre is good
205	247			Do you agree with our Streets and Spaces policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Design, City Centre, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 207?	No further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our Active and Inclusive Frontages policy?	Yes
205	247	Leisure And Culture, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 205?	More mid-level evening eateries are required
205	247			Do you agree with our Shopping, Eating and Drinking policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Leisure And Culture, Economy, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 203?	Utilise existing buildings wherever possible
205	247			Do you agree with our Business, Creativity and Learning policy?	Yes
207	249			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
205	247	Design, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 201?	Tall buildings should be sensitively designed e.g. not the former Jury's inn

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Tall Buildings?	Yes
205	247	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 199?	Capitalise on the city's assets and develop something for young people to give a focus and entertainment. Included 27 Queen Street in the developments
207	249	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	The summary seems to be an accurate representation of the make up of the city
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
207	249			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
205	247	Housing, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 197?	Yes this makes sense, integrating residential with community and making the city centre more vibrant
205	247			Do you agree with our Residential Led, Mixed Use Site Allocations policy?	Yes
205	247	Housing, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 195?	Make the city centre more vibrant

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	Yes
205	247	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 193?	No further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Defining the City Centre?	Yes
205	247	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 191?	City centre is important and something needs to be done with the Assembly Room site that is positive for the city

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	Yes
205	247	Economy, Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 189?	No furtehr comments
205	247			Do you agree with our Safeguarded Areas around Aerodromes policy?	Yes
205	247	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 187?	Cross city bus routes need to be better integrated

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Transport Mobility Hubs policy?	Yes
205	247	Environment, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 185?	Charging points need to be designed so that they can be used in all weather conditions and don't get damaged by sunlight
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities?	Yes
205	247	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 183?	No further comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Protected Routes policy?	Yes
205	247	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 181?	No further commenst
205	247			Do you agree with our Servicing, Accessibility and Parking policy?	Yes
205	247	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	No further comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Transport Infrastructure policy?	Yes
205	247	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	Need to support safe walking and cycling routes by adding crossings where there are high footfall e.g on the London Road bridge onto Litchurch Lane. Need to encourage public transport use by integrating with rail and bus and making it easier to travel from high residential areas e.g. Chaddesden/Oakwood to high employment areas e.g. Alstom/Rolls Royce. Need to connect buses into trains that get to London for business meetings, need to provide Sunday morning buses.
205	247			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	Yes
205	247	Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 175?	No further comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Communication Infrastructure policy?	Yes
205	247	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	No further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	Yes
205	247	Transport, Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	Safe walking routes need to be included

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Education Provision?	Yes
205	247	Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 171?	Safe access for funeral processions needs to be included
205	247			Do you agree with the Cemetery policy?	Yes
205	247	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 169?	The facilities should consider all parts of the community and provide safe and attractive places for young people to spend their time

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with Social and Community Facilities policy?	Yes
205	247	Environment, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 167?	Prioritise retaining existing buildings and reconfiguiring the insides and installing energy efficient solutions
205	247			Do you agree with the Embodied Carbon policy?	Yes
205	247	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 165?	Support for better walking and cycling routes including safe crossings on high traffic pedestrian routes e.g. London Road to Litchurch Lane

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes
205	247	Climate, Flood Risk, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 163?	Need to incorporate green energy and water management including rainwater storage in new developments
205	247			Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes
205	247	Environment, Flood Risk	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 161?	Need to also consider fish in the design of the flood defences

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes
205	247	Environment, Design, Flood Risk	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 159?	Selection of trees that will help suck up water and survive in slightly contaminated environments should be considered. Alternatives to tarmac that will provide water drainage should be considered
205	247			Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	Yes
205	247	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 157?	Proposals that would clear up pollution should be encouraged

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Pollution policy?	Yes
205	247	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 155?	No further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our Land Contamination policy?	Yes
205	247	Environment, Climate	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 153?	Green roofs should be considered on street furniture to improve air quality
205	247			Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Retail, Design	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 151?	Good quality street art like the falcons at the museum of making should be considered on roller shutters to improve the look of the city
205	247			Do you agree with our Shopfronts policy?	Yes
205	247	Design, Retail, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 149?	Adverts should also not detract from the lighting principles
205	247			Do you agree with our Advertisements policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 147?	No further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Historic Parks and Gardens and Designed Landscapes?	Yes
205	247	Environment, Historic Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 145?	Records should be kept in all cases, the benefits of preservation of artefacts should be considered in relation to the costs and complexities of storage. There are good examples of integrating historic sites into modern development e.f. the roman remains of Seville under the mushrooms and the ampitheatre in London
205	247			Do you agree with our Archaeology policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 143?	Agree, see comments to previous questions
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Uses Within Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance?	Yes
205	247	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 141?	No further comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Heritage Statements of Significance policy?	Yes
205	247	Historic Environment, Design	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 139?	Agree with the principles but the council should work with proposers such that the buildings are used and maintained rather than being allowed to deteriorate because changes are not permitted. Even the best/most historic buildings will have had changes in their life prior to listed status and it is important that they continue to meet the needs of the present and future as well as retaining the historical status
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Historic Environment, Design, Climate	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 137?	The sites should be considered as the benefit to the public and internal changes should be permitted if it means that the building can be utilised. The council should work with owners to meet the needs of preserving the historical aspects of the buildings buyt meeting modern needs e.g. how to manage green energy, double glazing etc
205	247			Do you agree with our Conservation Areas policy?	Yes
205	247	Transport, Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 135?	At least pedestrian access is essential and should be in keeping with the existing site
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Darley Abbey Mills?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 133?	Change of use should be considered and promoted providing the essence is retained
205	247			Do you agree with our Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site policy?	Yes
205	247	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 131?	Historic and listed properties within the city centre need to be properly looked after e.g. 27 Queen Street, Friargate Bride
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for the Historic Environment?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	Offsite compensation should only be last resort as the diversity is important at the existing location
205	247			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes
205	247	Environment, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	Ongoing management needs to be included including when the trees get managed by the council or how they are managed going forwards. Trees and hedges need to be managed so that they do not block footpaths or create unsafe areas
205	247			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Environment, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	Green energy needs to be included and green corridors including hedgehog highways
205	247			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes
205	247	Green Gap	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	Noting that some proposals seem to go against these principles
205	247			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	I agree with this but note that some of the proposals do not comply with these principles
205	247			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
205	247	Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	Green belt should not be built on
205	247			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	No
205	247	Open Space, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 117?	No furtehr comment

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	Yes
205	247	Open Space, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 115?	Definitely should not remove existing spaces
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	Yes
205	247	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 113?	Unnecessary illuminated adverts should be banned and lighting should always be focussed downwards.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes
205	247	Environment, Climate, Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	Green energy should be promoted including proper drainage and providing access in times of high rainfall
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
205	247	Design, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 109?	Shops should integrate into the buildings that they are in, Tattoo parlours should also be considered for the impact that they have

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Managing the Proliferation of Specific In-Centre Uses?	Yes
205	247	Transport, Historic Environment, Leisure And Culture	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 107?	Derby had great museums and a brilliant history. SHould promote this and help with better transport/nicer walking routes. Historical buildings and sites should be retained and looked after in innovative ways
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Tourism and Culture?	Yes
205	247	Retail, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 105?	No further comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Main Town Centre Uses Outside of Centres?	Yes
205	247	Retail, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 103?	No furtehr comments
205	247			Do you agree with our Defined Centres policy??	Yes
205	247	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 101?	Retain existing sites

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for the Indurent Park Employment Allocation?	Yes
205	247	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	Develop existing locations
205	247			Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	Yes
205	247	Employment Land	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	Seems to contradict other plans

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	No
205	247	City Centre, Historic Environment, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 95?	Get people into the city centre, this should be supported by a helpful approach to developing historic buildings for the modern world without losing the facades and important historical attributes
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Office Development?	Yes
205	247	Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 93?	Encourage investment in Derby and make it an exciting place to live and work

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Local Labour Agreements?	Yes
205	247	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 91?	There should be support to utilise exiting location including support for management of asbestos or RAAC as needed
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Existing Employment Locations?	Yes
205	247	City Centre, Employment Land	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 89?	The existing city centre employment locations are not well utilised and existing developments on Pride Park and the Wyvern are not used well, the strategy should be to make sure all those sites are utilised before building new sites

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for New Employment Locations?	No
205	247	Open Space, Environment, General Development Principles, Transport, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	I fail to see how this would be accessed and would create additional overload on local services as there are currently no GPs or supermarkets close by. Acecss via the Victorian streets is not suitable and would create multiple hazards if accessed off Pride Park Way. This would be detrimental to the environment digging up mature trees and reducing the sound break between the railway and the existing residents. It would reduce the green space that is valuable for local residents physical and mental health. The old police station site on Cotton Lane or the Kingsway Hospital would be much better
205	247			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 85?	Brownfield site
205	247			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Ivy House School?	Yes
205	247	Open Space, Housing, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 83?	Though this is green space, it seems like there is plenty of green space around and this is not currently very accesible. It also seems to be acceptable infill

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Kitchener Avenue/Browning Street housing allocation?	Yes
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 81?	Brownfield so should be developed
205	247			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Beaufort Business Centre?	Yes
205	247	Open Space, Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 79?	This is a recreation area which should be retained as important green space if the school is no longer required

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with the Bembridge Drive housing allocation?	No
205	247	Housing, Community Facilities, Open Space, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 77?	The designation should remain and council should identify powers to enforce the park
205	247			Do you agree with the housing allocation to the North of Sinfin Moor Lane?	No
205	247	Environment, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 75?	Brownfield site though the trees should be retained

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with the Former Shaftesbury Leisure Centre allocation?	Yes
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 73?	A brownfield site so excellent to use
205	247			Do you agree with the Elton Road Works allocation?	Yes
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 71?	A brownfield site so excellent to develop

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with the Bramblebrook House/Humbleton View allocation?	Yes
205	247	Housing, Gypsies And Travellers	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 69?	A brownfield site so excellent use to develop/retain as housing. A good site for extension of travellers site
205	247				Yes
205	247	Open Space, Housing, Stoney Lane, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	This appears to be agricultural land which should not be diverted to housing. It would massively increase urban sprawl and reduce identity of community.
205	247			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Transport, Gypsies And Travellers, Manor Kingsway, Community Facilities, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 65?	This would appear to be an excellent site for development and also for consideration as a travellers site as there is already access for large vehicles. Already close to lots of amenities
205	247			Do you agree with the Former Manor/Kingsway Hospital allocation?	Yes
205	247	Open Space, Transport, The Hollow, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 63?	This seems to remove a lot of green space and cause more traffic problems as the exiting road will not cope

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with the allocation at The Hollow?	No
205	247	Royal Hill, Environment, Climate, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	Seems to be some well established hedges and trees that should be retained as these have lots of carbon capture and biodiversity
205	247			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No
205	247	Moorway Lane, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 59?	While there are lots of good points in this plan, there are too many caveats and the management of the site should be much stricter

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	No
205	247	Environment, Transport, Brook Farm, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 57?	This is an extension of an existing development and green space is being retained and nature highways included
205	247			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	Yes
205	247	Housing, Rykneld Road, Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 55?	The site is on the edge of existing housing spaces and the proposals to increase the ammenities sound good
205	247			Do you agree with the Rykneld Road allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Climate, Infrastructure, Community Facilities, Open Space, Environment, Transport, Gypsies And Travellers, Health	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 53?	I agree with the principles listed but the proposed Wilmorton site does not appear to meet these. The access routes are either through Victorian streets which already have parking on both sides of the street and therefore do not have space for large vehicles on a regular basis or off Harrow Street/Pride Parkway which is a congested road with multiple pedestrian, cycle and bus routes which would be neagtively impacted by regular entrance to the Wilmorton site by large vehicles. Wilmorton Recreation is an important area of green space for the local residents who do not have big gardens if any. This space is used by all sorts of people and is a valuable space to help people with physical and mental health. It is an important walking and cycling route to avoid walking along London Road/Pride Parkway to reduce exposure to exhaust fumes. The space is alive with birdsong in the mornings and evenings and was chosen as a mini forest for the Commonwealth Games celebration. It captures carbon emissions due to the prescence of several large trees and has a small play area for children which is well used. It is also a sound break to the houses from the railway and businesses on Pride Park. Adding a new community in here would reduce all these effects and have a negative effect on the existing residents. There are also few facilities in the area with no supermarkets or GP surgeries in close proximity so would increase the burden on these services
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 51?	Yes but the council needs to follow its own principles on budildings/sites it is responsible for
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Self-Build, Custom Build and Community Build Homes?	Yes
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	Good principles
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Transport, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 47?	Number of HMOs in a street need to be considered rather than the number adjacent to each other. The impact on parking needs to be considered
205	247			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	No
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 45?	no further comments
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 43?	Sounds good
205	247			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	Yes
205	247	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	Affordable housing % in the city centre should be much higher as these households are more likley to work in the city centre and should therefore be located closer to the city centre
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Climate, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	Better to extend than build new houses, consideration for green heating also needs to be considered
205	247			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
205	247	Infrastructure, Housing, Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	Overall impact on the area needs to be considered in relation to parking, transport and emergency services access. There also needs to be consideration for post boxes, bus routes, shops and GP practices
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Housing, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	Everything possible should be done to reuse vacant brownfield sites before building on green belt land. All new housing should be built with green energy included i.e heat pumps and space for the tanks or solar panels
205	247			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	Yes
205	247	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	Yes the principles are good. However there needs to be clear plans for handover to the city or ongoing management of the site. The upper section of Alvaston Park for example has taken/is taking too long for handover to the city so responsibilty for management is unclear
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	General Development Principles, Housing, Historic Environment, Leisure And Culture, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	Agree with this, enforcement needs to come sooner and earlier. THere have been too many historic buildings that have suffered damage when something creative could have been done with them. If Derby wishes to become a city of culture and encourage people to visit then the heritage needs to be treated with respect and empty buildings should be managed to create more housing or attractions rather than becoming derelict and dangerous.
205	247			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes
205	247	General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	There should be limits on this though so that approvals can actually happen rather than delaying forever.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
205	247	Health, City Centre, Community Facilities, Environment, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	I agree with the principles. However this should consider making mroe facilities available in the city centre, e.g. closing the Queen Street pool was detrimental and not removing access to existing green spaces
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Infrastructure, Design, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	I agree with the principles. However anti-terrorism measures should be designed in accordance with the location that they are installed to not detract from the historic surroundings and not to make the place feel unsafe. Access for emergency vehicles also needs to be considered
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
206	248	Transport, Community Facilities, Open Space, Health, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	I object to the chosen location A permanent traveller site in Wilmorton would be unsightly even with fencing and planting. It would increase noise and traffic pollution in the area, this would have a negative impact on existing residents and businesses. it would reduce the already very small green space accessible to local residents, particularly affecting children and dog walkers. It would increase the population i an already densely populated space where most residents only have access to yards rather than gardens of their own, local services eg health, social services and schools would struggle to cater for existing residents and well as the increased numbers, There is no easy vehicular access to the site without having a significant impact on existing residents,traffic, parking and businesses.There would be a negative impact on house prices in the Wilmorton and City Point area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Housing, Transport, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	I agree with the prinicples. THese need to be properly considered when making planning decisions e.g. house of multiple occupation which often come with multiple cars and yet not providing parking spaces means that people park on pavements making them less accessible for everybody
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
205	247	Design, General Development Principles, Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	It is important to place the onus on new development/new residents to either research and make the decision based on exisiting businesses and activities to continue as they are. However new developments should definitly consider the impact on existing residents. The proposed travellers development at Wilmorton does not appear to do this as there does not appear to be any mitigation for large vehicle movements down the Victorian streets in Wilmorton.
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Design, General Development Principles, Gypsies And Travellers	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	Policy sounds good but does not appear to be being followed in relation to the proposed travellers site in Wilmorton.
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes
205	247	Design, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	Principles should be followed through and implemented
205	247			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Green Wedge, Plan Objectives, Environment, Green Belt, Health	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I do not agree with reducing the size of green wedges or building on green belt land. Green space is critical particularly in smaller houses or flats, having access to the outdoor space greatly enhances both physical and mental wellbeing
205	247			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	No
205	247	Spatial Strategy, Housing, Transport, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	When planning housing needs you need to assess the transport routes, the shops and the services available in the area. Parking needs is also essential. When addressing housing needs, brownfield sites should always be targeted first as these are infill and do not reduce access to green space
205	247			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247	Plan Objectives	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	I support the objectives however this needs to be properly assessed and implemented with supporting transport networks, green space management and incentives
205	247			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
206	248			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
205	247	Flood Risk, Outside City Centre Vision, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	The green spaces should not be narrowed as thy are already precious and are required for the numbers of people using them. The enhancements are required though and areas that are currently prone to flooding should be assessed to see how they can be made more acessible e.g. through better selection of trees, boardwalks where required

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No
205	247	Derby City Centre Vision, City Centre, Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	THere needs to be activities for young people to give them space to exercise and for entertainment, to make the city centre welcoming and less threatening for everyone
205	247			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
205	247	Spatial Strategy, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	Yes, you have neglected to mention how this should be done. Perhaps offering things like the city hopper in Leicester to connect the railway station to the city centre and the local businesses would help

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
205	247			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
205	247	City Centre, Spatial Strategy, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	I agree with the summary, however you have neglected to mention that there has not been a draw for people to come into the centre of |Derby in the evenings for 12 years following the closure of the assembly rooms. There are also compromised walking routes from the city centre and railway station to Alstom discouraging walking, cycling as the crossing of London Road is difficult.
205	247			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
205	247	Housing, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I agree that the description is correct. However you could do more to encourage people to live in or near the city centre. THere are several derelict buildings or empty sites that could be used to convert to housing and create a community in the existing areas with accommodation
205	247			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Brook Farm, Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 57?	There should be more strong PHYSICAL protection for existing trees + their root areas, hedges, and all biodiversity assets on this site.
203	224	Rykneld Road, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 55?	There is no alternative.
203	224			Do you agree with the Rykneld Road allocation?	Yes
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 51?	The Council has no altrnative.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Self-Build, Custom Build and Community Build Homes?	Yes
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	That is what I think.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	No
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
203	224			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No
204	246	Community Facilities, Gypsies And Travellers, Environment, Transport, Open Space	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	I disagree with the chosen location for the permanent traveller site for the following reasons: 1. it is reducing the already limited green space in the Wilmorton area. This will impact local residents, in particular children and dog walkers 2. It is too close to housing in Wilmorton and at City Point. The site would increase noise and rubbish in the area. 3.Any vehicle access to the site will have a negative impact on traffic, parking, local residents and local businesses. 4. There is evidence from other permanent traveller sites in Derby and around the country that fencing around sites is often damaged and unsightly. 5. There is evidence that a permanent traveller site has a negative impact on local house prices. 6. A significant number of the residents in the area, as Wilmorton is already one of the more socially deprived areas of Derby, do not agree with the choose of site but are unlikely to engage in this formal consultation process, hence their views are not likely to be heard. 7. Concerns that local amenities, eg doctors, dentists and schools will not have enough resources to meet the needs of existing and new residents.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	Yes
203	224	Gypsies And Travellers	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 53?	It is Common Sense.
203	224	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 47?	It should apply to all of Derby.
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 45?	It is Common Sense.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 43?	It is Common Sense.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	Yes
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	Margaret Thatchers rule that Local Councils are not allowed to replace houses sold under the Right to Buy has proved to be a disaster. Money that used to be kept in each Authorities' control can disappear now as diviends to big housing companies.
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	Allowing sub-standard extensions would be more costly in the long term.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	Allowing sub-standard developement would be more costly in the long term.
203	224	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	There is no alternative way to meet Housing Needs.
203	224	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	The council is not allowed to raise the Council tax to levels that would provide it with enough money.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	Past experience shows that Enforcement Measures are necessary.
203	224	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	"Look before you Leap" is a wise proverb.
203	224	Health, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	Council Tax will be less expensive if its citizens are more healthy.
203	224			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
204	246			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
203	224	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	Local Authorities have to be aware of the changes of behaviour and take appropriate measures.
203	224	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	I am [Redacted] experiencing these types of needs. There are often long queues at toilets in Parks in Derby. Disposble nappies can be a problem on sunny days when the bins that the Parks department can afford to service become too full.
204	246			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Economy, General Development Principles, Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	This principle will apply to housing alongside the A38, especially that specifically built for older occupants, should the conversion of a section of the dual carraigeway into 3 lane National Highway go ahead. I am also very concerned about the extra costs to Derby City Council of running water drainage pumps, and Derby City Council becoming responsible for replacing damaged kerbs and road signage if a section of the A52 is detrunked. The petrol station and MacDonalds also warned that in previous places where their entrances from a dual carraigeway were closed their businesses became unviable. Their closure would result in a huge loss of income for Derby City Council. The University of Derby suffered a big drop in numbers of students after families experienced traffic delays during the alterations of the A52 at Wyvern Centre.
203	224	Environment, General Development Principles, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	I think that the statement is correct. It would be good if places that used to have mature trees could have replacements trees even if they have to be recently-bred small sized trees in containers.
203	224	General Development Principles, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	Unfortunately every change of Central Government nearly always prioritise cost cutting above the quality of life that Local authorities would prefer to implement.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Transport, Environment, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	It would be really good for the Council to be able to afford more support for public transport and more trees, hedges and green cycleways but to the best of my knowledge as much has been done to improve the living conditions in Derby as the Council could afford to do.
203	224	Spatial Strategy, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	It refelcts the reality of the ways Housing needs have been met.
203	224	Plan Objectives	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	Derby City has already begun some of these actions but is prevented from doing more by shortage of funding arising from the Conservative government Austerity cuts.
203	224	Outside City Centre Vision, Climate, Design, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	Would it be appropriate to add provision for high rise buildings to have Solar Panels, balcony areas where plants can be grown, energy efficient Heat Pumps, or heating from the pumping of hot water system already being built in Derby?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Derby City Centre Vision, Transport, Climate	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	Would it be appropriate to add provision for Derby Canal and Riverbuses and the presence of a Darley Abbey Local Energy Area?
203	224			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	No
203	224	Climate, Spatial Strategy, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	It would be wonderful if it can be acheived. Is the council aware that there is a factory in Derby that manufactures very Energy Efficient Wheels that could cut the costs of running trams and indoor goods carriers? That could return Derby to the forefront of manufacturing venicles for Public Transport and reduce Air Pollution and Climate Change.
203	224			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
203	224	Spatial Strategy, Environment, Open Space, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	The summary does describe the current situation. It would help both mitigating Climate Change and combat the loss of Biodiversity if Green Wedges, Parks, and some roadside verges and unbuilt spaces have Ecological Management Plans drafted for them.
203	224			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
203	224	Housing, Green Wedge, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	There is no sense in having Green Wedges "to bring countryside through the City" if the neighbouring boundary has been covered in housing.
203	224			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
202	245	Open Space, Green Wedge, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. We need to protect our valuable Green belt and wildlife
202	245			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
201	14	Stoney Lane, Open Space, Environment, Transport, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	This is valuable open space, that needs to remain fields, for families to enjoy. The wildlife includes, Buzzards, Red kites, bats, and pheasants. Its an area enjoyed by hundreds of families in Spondon. Taking in wildlife life in it's on setting, away from the noise and pollution of traffic. The proposed number of houses for this site will have a massive impact on the residents of the area. The proposed access road is immediately on top of a very busy section of the A52 where cars reach speeds in excess of 70mph. The bottom of Stoney Lane is a walking route for children to and from Asterdale primary school. A new junction would make this section extremely dangerous for children and the elderly. Heavy Traffic including HGV and car transporter has already started to use the junction of the A52 and then travel up Sandringham drive. This road has a primary school entrance on a nasty bend. It is only a matter of time before a nasty accident occurs and fatalities. 400+ houses can mean a minimum of 800 cars all coming in and out of Stoney line right on top of the A52. Please reconsider the Stoney Lane development. The Locko road development gives easier entrance and exit, with routes into Oakwood and Chaddesden
200	244	Environment, Health, Housing, Stoney Lane	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Using green land for housing development is certainly not environmental friendly and impacts on the mental wellbeing of all those people who will/would be affected by such developments, myself and my neighbours especially, if we wanted to live in a concrete jungle the we would move to the city, we live here for the open space tranquility that it provides
200	244			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
200	244			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No

199	243	Open Space, Housing, Stoney Lane, Transport, Green Belt, Community Facilities, Infrastructure, Health	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	I object to this planning application for the following reasons. The single point of access to the site at the end of Stoney Lane is located extremely close to the junction with the A52. This is a significant safety concern. Increased traffic to and from the development, particularly during peak times when the road is already busy, could cause vehicles to queue back onto the A52 slip road, creating a serious safety risk for road users. Furthermore, Spondon village already experiences a high volume of through traffic via Sitwell Street, which is frequently used as a route to Ilkeston. The additional residents from this development will inevitably increase congestion within the village. Traffic congestion is already a major issue in Spondon, and this development, along with others, will only worsen the situation. In addition, the increase in residents will place further pressure on Chapel Street Medical Centre, as the new housing will fall within its catchment area. It is already extremely difficult to obtain a timely appointment at this surgery. Additional demand will negatively impact existing residents who may struggle to access necessary medical care within a reasonable timeframe. As of now there is no information on how this increased pressure will be addressed. There will also be increased pressure on local schools. West Park School is already at its PAN, meaning that children living within the new development may not be able to access a place at a nearby school. This would have a negative impact on the quality of life for both new and existing residents. Additionally, the land designated for this development is Green Belt land. Currently, residents use this land as open space for walking and recreation. The loss of a significant portion of this land would negatively impact the wellbeing of the local community. There is also a new housing development, Fawndale Rise by Bloor Homes, already underway on Dale Road. This development will itself bring a significant increase in residents to Spondon, placing further demand on local schools, healthcare services and other amenities. It is worth noting that Derby City Council previously opposed that development for many of the same reasons outlined above. There is also a consultation underway for a further 250 homes to be built on land off Locko Road. As this site is also on Green Belt land, I also oppose that proposal. The cumulative impact of all these housing developments would significantly exacerbate the issues outlined above. For these reasons, I urge the Council to refuse this development.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
199	243			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No

197	241	Health, Housing, Stoney Lane, Environment, Transport, Green Belt, Infrastructure, Open Space	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	For the reasons set out below I strongly object to the allocation of the land to the rear of Stoney Lane for development dwellings. I consider Policy HA7 to be unsound and concerning. It contains uncertain benefits, unproven mitigation, it is without lawful justification or satisfactory evidential support. The policy fails to adequately address the long-term impacts on safety, infrastructure, buffering constraints, public health and integrity. The cumulative impacts of scale, proximity, activity, lighting, noise, safety and loss of openness have not been adequately assessed or addressed. The proposal fails to strike a lawful and proportionate balance between housing need and the protection of existing resident's amenity. The HA7 raises clear risks at examination and is inadequately justified. For these reasons my concerns are set out below: Traffic Safety: The suggested access point is potentially causing further congestion and accident risk at an already proven dangerous junction, rendering the junction poorly aligned with established highway safety principles. Highway capacity and safety - Congestion leaving the A52 due to right turning vehicles. Junction proximity and safety - Dangerously close proximity to the A52 junction. Vehicular speeds and collision risk - Recorded collision history at that junction and there is a blind bend before the proposed access point, hazard potential. Network resilience and emergency access - Not compliant with emergency planning standards. Concerns if the access becomes blocked, preventing entry or exit. Potential congestion of traffic on A52 raises serious safety risks. Sheer volume of increased traffic and parking pressures consistent with such a large volume of dwellings. The proposal fails to demonstrate the appropriate visibility splays, safe turning movements and satisfactory separation distances can be achieved in accordance with Derby City Council Highway Authority requirements. A development should only be permitted where safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users. At present, evidence of a Transport Assessment or mitigation strategy proportionate to this large dwelling allocation has not been presented to demonstrate that this arrangement is safe or appropriate for a development of this scale. The plan should not allocate sites where fundamental access and safety issues remain unresolved and feasibility is unproven; this is totally inconsistent. Harm to the land: HA7 proposal would permanently replace this open landscape with a dense urban extension creating an urban sprawl. No amount of landscaping, buffers or planting can replicate or compensate for the permanent loss of an established open countryside once it has been built upon, fundamentally altering the living conditions of existing residents. Impacts of scale, proximity, activity, infrastructure and loss of openness have not been

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					adequately addressed. No evidence of Biodiversity net gain. The land is rich in nesting wildlife including newts and bats. Green Belt / Grey Belt: This is not previously developed land. This is not demonstrably degraded or enclosed. This land Contributes to openness and countryside separation. This is established farmed land. This land houses livestock and wildlife in abundance. The proposal fails to demonstrate how this site meets the Grey Belt criteria and no parcel-level assessment has been published. Pylons: The policy clearly omits planning, safety and health guidelines that strongly influence overhead high-voltage power lines and pylons and fails to demonstrate enforced engineering rules. There is no address the cumulative impact of pylons on residential amenity, nor safety and access requirements for maintenance. Buffer: A buffer does not preserve openness, elevated housing will still be visible. A buffer would be wholly inadequate to protect existing residents from visual mitigation, loss of privacy and overlooking, noise and disturbance, increased light pollution and visual dominance of a large housing estate where open land currently exists. Health: Long term noise exposure, sleep disruption and stress. Air quality and particulate pollution, respiratory health risks, public health impacts, increased exposure to traffic emissions, street light pollution. No assessments are cited to demonstrate the residential amenity and public health standards can be met, creating a significant evidential gap. I do not consider the strategy to be adequately evidenced for the purposes of plan making. The proposed allocation represents a disproportionate, unjustified and irreversible loss of countryside and residential amenity and I do not believe it meets the tests of soundness or safety required of a Local Plan. For a more in-depth and concise report on my findings strongly objecting against the proposed HA7 please refer to my email response to the planning department. Thank you for considering this representation. Kind regards [Redacted]

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	Policy CC13 is concerned with the creation of a new City Centre campus for the University and requires new development in the defined area to, “explore opportunities to integrate with decentralised energy networks and deliver on-site or near-site energy generation”. This Policy supports the connection of the new campus to a heat network and explicitly notes that on/near-site energy generation would be supported. Nevertheless, we feel that the policy wording relating to connecting to a heat network could be made more tangible through a requirement to connect unless a reasonable alternative is available that would achieve the same or increased benefit. We are therefore seeking to amend the policy wording to: “integrate with an existing decentralised energy network where one is available and viable, unless a clearly evidenced favourable low carbon alternative energy solution can be demonstrated. Where no immediate network connection is possible, proposals must incorporate the necessary infrastructure to enable a future connection when a network becomes available. Development should also assess and, where feasible, incorporate opportunities for on site or near site low carbon energy generation as part of the overall strategy for reducing emissions”. This removes the speculative nature of the policy regarding connecting to a heat network and makes it more explicit that such opportunities should be taken (rather than just being explored), whilst retaining a level of flexibility for potential on/near-site energy generation for any potential future energy centre to come forward on this site.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes
198				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	Policy IC4 confirms that the Council will support development which allows the University to work towards delivering their sustainability ambitions, with particular reference to achieving net zero carbon. It is felt that this could go further to articulate that support through tangible means of achieving its aims such as the provision of energy centres and heat networks. We therefore propose to include some wording that supports energy centres and heat networks as part of this Policy, and that the use of University land would be supported for this where available and where its use would not cause any harm to surrounding environmental receptors. Example wording could be: “h) encourage the delivery of or connection to district heat networks and support the use of appropriate parcels of land within the University campus and surrounding area to deliver the infrastructure to facilitate this, subject to compliance with other relevant Local Plan Policies”.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	Yes

198				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 165?	We feel it would be helpful for the policy to reference energy centres given they are the key overground component of heat networks that will ultimately face most scrutiny in getting the principle of the development accepted on a site, given there are no allocations for energy centres and they would therefore have to compete with land allocations / designations. Proposed wording to be added: “Proposals for the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy generating and distribution networks (including decentralised energy schemes, community led schemes and district heat and power schemes) and their associated energy centres, energy storage, and the associated infrastructure…” We are also proposing the addition of a new bespoke energy-centre Policy that will follow via email as there is not the opportunity to include it via the online form. The government’s plans in relation to heat network zoning to accelerate heat network delivery are likely to come into effect this year. Given the imminence of zoning, we are keen to ensure the Local Plan includes reference to this, working in adequate flexibility given that a plan has not yet been developed for Derby. It is not unusual for planning policies to reference emerging trends, government guidance or legislation, and it is therefore felt that some appropriate text could be included in the Policy to reflect upcoming changes to heat network zoning. Proposed text for inclusion: “Subject to Heat Network Zoning being implemented in Derby, development within identified ‘priority areas’ or in proximity to existing or planned networks will be expected to connect to a heat network as the priority heating solution. Where immediate connection is not possible, proposals should demonstrate how they have been designed to be heat network ready. This may include, for example, allocating space in plant rooms for heat exchangers and thermal stores, safeguarding suitable routes for pipework from the site boundary and making provision for connections to the future network at the site boundary. Where Heat Network Zoning is implemented, development within ‘priority areas’ or in proximity to existing or planned networks will be expected to follow the a ‘heating hierarchy’ which involves: connecting to local existing or planned heat networks in the first instance; or where there is no such available network, allowing for connection at a later date; or as a last resort… Any departure from securing a connection to a heat network would need to be suitably justified within the Energy Statement to support the application. The Heating Hierarchy would sit alongside the Energy Hierarchy for developments falling outside of identified zones”. This is akin to the London Plan’s approach to supporting heat networks, where heat network zoning is already in operation. We propose that

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					the supporting text includes detail on what should be covered in an energy assessment for developments in these areas, including the requirement for robust evidence of active correspondence with the heat network operator/s where one is available in the vicinity or research into planned networks in the area; and a cost analysis where economic reasons are sited as to why a connection would not be feasible. The supporting text for Policy CL4 confirms 1Energy's plans to create a low-to-zero carbon heat network utilising waste heat from SmartParc. Whilst this is still the intention, as discussed in a meeting with WSP, [Redacted](1Energy) and [Redacted] of the Council's Planning Policy team, Derby Energy Network Limited (a subsidiary of 1Energy) are drawing up plans to create a heat network across the City with multiple energy centres to serve different sections of the network. It would therefore be useful to make reference to this expansion in 1Energy's plans. We are also keen to include some supportive wording within the policy supporting text that relates to the delivery of heat networks given the challenges they face: "Heat networks often involve long lengths of pipe network covering large swathes of a city or urban area and therefore encounter significant challenges in relation to crossing major infrastructure such roads, railways, rivers, as well as interfaces with green space and trees. The Council acknowledges the importance of heat networks in the transition to low carbon, as well as the complexity of the delivery of these networks, and will work proactively with applicants to support this. This will involve establishing a joined-up approach to collaboration encompassing multiple technical teams to work towards solutions for the development, including the aforementioned green and grey infrastructure encounters, acknowledging the trade-offs that need to happen between the protection of assets and the delivery of this essential infrastructure. Pre-application enquiry is highly encouraged to ensure this process begins early on and can be streamlined throughout the development management process".

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes
198				Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes

198				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 163?	Policy CL3 confirms that proposals should embed the Energy Hierarchy within scheme design, and whilst it touches on what that would entail, it largely defers to the supporting text to provide full commentary. We think it would be beneficial to bring text on the Energy Hierarchy into the Policy wording. We also feel that the Policy wording and Energy Hierarchy could include reference to bespoke solutions for Derby, for example district heat networks, given that work that 1Energy has been doing with the Council (and outside of that) to develop the Derby Energy Network. In doing so, it would improve the Policy position for the development of the DEN as developers would be encouraged to seek out district heat networks to provide decentralised heat to their developments. Some example wording could be "applications should demonstrate how design has methodically followed the steps in the Energy Hierarchy which are: firstly through reducing energy use; using energy efficiently; and then meeting all energy needs through renewable or low-to-zero carbon sources generated onsite or by provision of a suitable offsite source (e.g. a district heating network). Conventional energy sources would be a last resort and associated offsetting would be required". Please note we are also requesting the addition of a 'heating hierarchy' within the supporting text of Policy CL4 where any future Heat Network Zoning takes place, which follows the London Plan's example – please refer to that section of our representations for further details. The Policy also includes requirements for information for "all development", including the consideration of providing solar PV and energy storage, and for applications to be supported by an energy assessment. Whilst we are supportive of the principle of this, "all development" is very broad and we feel the requirements of the Policy would not be applicable to all development, e.g. energy-related development. We are therefore seeking to include some wording to note that the policy would apply to most developments but that energy related developments would generally be given an exemption given the focus should be on generation rather than their own requirements. Example wording could be: "All proposals (with the exception of energy-generating uses) should…". To note – we are supportive of the Policy's acknowledgement of, and support for, retrofitting of sustainable energy efficiency measures including for heritage assets.
198				Please say why you gave the	Policy EN6 seeks to protect Green Wedges, limiting development on these sites to specific uses including renewable energy facilities and climate change mitigation measures, provided it can be demonstrated that an

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
				answer to Question 121?	alternative suitable site cannot be identified. This is supportive and provides a positive policy position for the development of an energy centre on a Green Wedge, supported by a site selection exercise that takes into account a reasonable location around the site and required distances to customers, etc. The Policy goes on to say that development in the renewable energy category (among others) must be, "small scale, essential and ancillary to the operation of the main use". Whilst this makes sense for other development types that are also considered acceptable (e.g. ancillary educational / sports / residential buildings associated with an existing education / sport or recreation / residential site) clearly this is not applicable to renewable energy developments. As such, we request that the policy makes clear these criteria will not apply to renewable energy developments. It is therefore proposed to amend the wording from "The built development associated with categories 3 – 6 will be small scale, essential and ancillary to the operation of the main use" to "The built development associated with categories 3, 4 and 6 will be small scale, essential and ancillary to the operation of the main use".
198				Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
198				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	Policy E6 retains SmartParc's allocation for employment development and notes that proposals for supporting energy generation or decentralised green energy production will be supported where serving the site or forming part of a wider network. This is a supportive position for the development of an energy centre on that site to support a wider heat network and does not necessarily require heat energy to be used on-site. As such, the Policy as drafted is supported.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	Yes
198				Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	Policy GD7 We support this policy but feel that there is an opportunity to amend it to support the development of important infrastructure for which there are no corresponding site allocations – for instance energy centres to support district heating networks. To do this, we propose to include commentary on the site selection exercise for unallocated developments. This would provide an opportunity to build a case around why certain sites have been chosen that would be backed up by planning policy. We would seek to include some policy wording around the Council's support for the site selection exercise. Some proposed wording would include: "Where bespoke forms of development are not supported by specific site allocations but are proposed on other allocated or designated sites, applicants will be expected to provide information demonstrating the site-selection process undertaken. The Council will work proactively with applicants to support this".

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198		Infrastructure, Climate, Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	Policy CC13 is concerned with the creation of a new City Centre campus for the University and requires new development in the defined area to, “explore opportunities to integrate with decentralised energy networks and deliver on-site or near-site energy generation”. This Policy supports the connection of the new campus to a heat network and explicitly notes that on/near-site energy generation would be supported. Nevertheless, we feel that the policy wording relating to connecting to a heat network could be made more tangible through a requirement to connect unless a reasonable alternative is available that would achieve the same or increased benefit. We are therefore seeking to amend the policy wording to: “integrate with an existing decentralised energy network where one is available and viable, unless a clearly evidenced favourable low carbon alternative energy solution can be demonstrated. Where no immediate network connection is possible, proposals must incorporate the necessary infrastructure to enable a future connection when a network becomes available. Development should also assess and, where feasible, incorporate opportunities for on site or near site low carbon energy generation as part of the overall strategy for reducing emissions”. This removes the speculative nature of the policy regarding connecting to a heat network and makes it more explicit that such opportunities should be taken (rather than just being explored), whilst retaining a level of flexibility for potential on/near-site energy generation for any potential future energy centre to come forward on this site.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes
198		Climate, Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	Policy IC4 confirms that the Council will support development which allows the University to work towards delivering their sustainability ambitions, with particular reference to achieving net zero carbon. It is felt that this could go further to articulate that support through tangible means of achieving its aims such as the provision of energy centres and heat networks. We therefore propose to include some wording that supports energy centres and heat networks as part of this Policy, and that the use of University land would be supported for this where available and where its use would not cause any harm to surrounding environmental receptors. Example wording could be: “h) encourage the delivery of or connection to district heat networks and support the use of appropriate parcels of land within the University campus and surrounding area to deliver the infrastructure to facilitate this, subject to compliance with other relevant Local Plan Policies”.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	Yes
198		Climate, General Development Principles, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 165?	[continuation of previous submission] We are also keen to include some supportive wording within the policy supporting text that relates to the delivery of heat networks given the challenges they face: “Heat networks often involve long lengths of pipe network covering large swathes of a city or urban area and therefore encounter significant challenges in relation to crossing major infrastructure such roads, railways, rivers, as well as interfaces with green space and trees. The Council acknowledges the importance of heat networks in the transition to low carbon, as well as the complexity of the delivery of these networks, and will work proactively with applicants to support this. This will involve establishing a joined-up approach to collaboration encompassing multiple technical teams to work towards solutions for the development, including the aforementioned green and grey infrastructure encounters, acknowledging the trade-offs that need to happen between the protection of assets and the delivery of this essential infrastructure. Pre-application enquiry is highly encouraged to ensure this process begins early on and can be streamlined throughout the development management process”.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes

198		Design, Climate, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 163?	Policy CL3 confirms that proposals should embed the Energy Hierarchy within scheme design, and whilst it touches on what that would entail, it largely defers to the supporting text to provide full commentary. We think it would be beneficial to bring text on the Energy Hierarchy into the Policy wording. We also feel that the Policy wording and Energy Hierarchy could include reference to bespoke solutions for Derby, for example district heat networks, given that work that 1Energy has been doing with the Council (and outside of that) to develop the Derby Energy Network. In doing so, it would improve the Policy position for the development of the DEN as developers would be encouraged to seek out district heat networks to provide decentralised heat to their developments. Some example wording could be "applications should demonstrate how design has methodically followed the steps in the Energy Hierarchy which are: firstly through reducing energy use; using energy efficiently; and then meeting all energy needs through renewable or low-to-zero carbon sources generated onsite or by provision of a suitable offsite source (e.g. a district heating network). Conventional energy sources would be a last resort and associated offsetting would be required". Please note we are also requesting the addition of a 'heating hierarchy' within the supporting text of the next Policy (Policy CL4) where any future Heat Network Zoning takes place, which follows the London Plan's example – please refer to that section of our representations for further details. The Policy also includes requirements for information for "all development", including the consideration of providing solar PV and energy storage, and for applications to be supported by an energy assessment. Whilst we are supportive of the principle of this, "all development" is very broad and we feel the requirements of the Policy would not be applicable to all development, e.g. energy-related development. We are therefore seeking to include some wording to note that the policy would apply to most developments but that energy related developments would generally be given an exemption given the focus should be on generation rather than their own requirements. Example wording could be: "All proposals (with the exception of energy-generating uses) should…". To note – we are supportive of the Policy's acknowledgement of, and support for, retrofitting of sustainable energy efficiency measures including for heritage assets.
198				Do you agree with our	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
				Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	
198		Infrastructure, Green Wedge, Climate	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	Policy EN6 seeks to protect Green Wedges, limiting development on these sites to specific uses including renewable energy facilities and climate change mitigation measures, provided it can be demonstrated that an alternative suitable site cannot be identified. This is supportive and provides a positive policy position for the development of an energy centre on a Green Wedge, supported by a site selection exercise that takes into account a reasonable location around the site and required distances to customers, etc. The Policy goes on to say that development in the renewable energy category (among others) must be, “small scale, essential and ancillary to the operation of the main use”. Whilst this makes sense for other development types that are also considered acceptable (e.g. ancillary educational / sports / residential buildings associated with an existing education / sport or recreation / residential site) clearly this is not applicable to renewable energy developments. As such, we request that the policy makes clear these criteria will not apply to renewable energy developments. It is therefore proposed to amend the wording from “The built development associated with categories 3 – 6 will be small scale, essential and ancillary to the operation of the main use” to “The built development associated with categories 3, 4 and 6 will be small scale, essential and ancillary to the operation of the main use”.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198				Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
198				Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
198		Climate, Employment Land, Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	Policy E6 retains SmartParc's allocation for employment development and notes that proposals for supporting energy generation or decentralised green energy production will be supported where serving the site or forming part of a wider network. This is a supportive position for the development of an energy centre on that site to support a wider heat network and does not necessarily require heat energy to be used on-site. As such, the Policy as drafted is supported.
198				Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
198		General Development Principles, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	We support this policy but feel that there is an opportunity to amend it to support the development of important infrastructure for which there are no corresponding site allocations – for instance energy centres to support district heating networks. To do this, we propose to include commentary on the site selection exercise for unallocated developments. This would provide an opportunity to build a case around why certain sites have been chosen that would be backed up by planning policy. We would seek to include some policy wording around the Council's support for the site selection exercise. Some proposed wording would include: "Where bespoke forms of development are not supported by specific site allocations but are proposed on other allocated or designated sites, applicants will be expected to provide information demonstrating the site-selection process undertaken. The Council will work proactively with applicants to support this".
197	241			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
168		Employment Land, Green Wedge	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	At Raynesway to support expansion of the Submarines Campus there are proposals to relocate the Alvaston & Boulton Cricket Club to the former Ramarena on the opposite side of the A5111 Raynesway. A change in policy that allowed development of the current ground but safeguarded the new ground in the green wedge would help in supporting growth and expansion of Rolls-Royce pie.
168				Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
168		Economy, Employment Land	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	Infinity Park is developing into a mature business location covering a range of activities. It is home to the Nuclear Skills Academy that is operated jointly with the University of Derby, as well as the former Nuclear AMRC that is now operated by the University as the Infinity Prototyping Centre. Neither use falls into a Class B2 'General Industrial' Use but these form key components of the growth across the Nuclear sectors of our business that are centred on Derby. We have concerns over the proposals to limit Class B8 'Storage or Distribution' Uses to 50% of the floorspace as this not only conflicts with market demands but also limits the capability of Infinity Park to provide growth. In recent years we have relocated two businesses to Infinity Park that have been essential for growth at Raynesway. BOC are an industrial gas supplier and in planning terms a Class B8 Use. Similarly for Star Micronics, who supply and support complex machine tools, who are a Class B2 Use. Both provide a range of employment and their use is complimentary to other uses on Infinity Park. There is a need for a flexible policy that encourages growth in the complete range of employment uses in line with market demands that exist, as we leave the first quarter of the 2pt century. Further, it is helpful that the policy encourages the further growth of the area with the South Derby Growth Zone and Infinity Garden Village, along with the linked A50 Grade Separated Junction. This will form a key area of employment opportunity and economic growth for the city as well as the wider region, linking to the Trent Arc in the growth plans for the Combined East Midlands Authority.
168				Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
168		Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 161?	The threat of flooding is a major business risk to so many in the area and we support the policy to expand the protection of the city and surrounding areas by the OCOR project.
168				Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes
168		Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 101?	As an occupier of premises here that support our wider business operations, we support the policy to protect employment in this location.
168				Do you agree with our policy for the Indurent Park Employment Allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
168		Employment Land	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 91?	We support the policies that include our Raynesway and Sinfin business operations. We ask that the policy for Sinfin Aerospace Campus is widened to cover also the Raynesway Campus. Both are key to Rolls-Royce plc, so policy that supports investment and growth is welcomed.
168				Do you agree with our policy for Existing Employment Locations?	Yes
168		Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 73?	It remains in our growth planning to relocate the current operations to the wider Sinfin Campus and therefore support this policy that will further support the Osmaston regeneration.
168				Do you agree with the Elton Road Works allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
167		Spatial Strategy	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Our records do not indicate the presence of any coal mining features at surface or shallow depth, which may pose a risk to surface stability and public safety, within the Derby City area. On this basis the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on this consultation document.
167				Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment	Support	Please provide comments on the Sustainability Appraisal.	Habitat Regulations Assessment - Screening Natural England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Derby City Local Plan. We are satisfied that the Screening Report follows accepted methodology and is in line with appropriate legislation and guidance. We can therefore confirm that we agree with the HRA report's conclusions that the Derby City Local Plan would not be likely to have a significant effect on a European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and no further assessment work is required. Sustainability Appraisal Regulation 18 Interim Report Natural England generally welcomes this SA interim Report and acknowledges that it follows accepted methodology and legislation. We note that the SA has included an assessment of plan alternatives which consider the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan and have been satisfactorily described and evaluated. We also consider that the objectives and appraisal criteria that have been used in the SEA/SA framework are appropriate and cover Natural England's interests in the natural environment. We note that at paragraph 1.7.4 a data gap is acknowledged regarding the Derbyshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). This document has now been completed Homepage - Derbyshire's Nature Recovery Strategy. We look forward to seeing the added detail regarding sites and opportunities for Biodiversity Net Gain in the next iteration of the SA.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				We have published a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which examines the potential impact of the Local Plan. Do you wish to comment on the SA?	Yes
165		City Centre, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 219?	We welcome the provision for tree planting and greening of the public realm in this policy.
165				Do you agree with our North Castleward policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment, Design, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 217?	Natural England consider that this site is a great opportunity to design the station and its surroundings as an exemplar for green infrastructure within an urban environment and we are pleased to note point (p) which aims to make a significant contribution to the greening of the City Centre.
165				Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	Yes
165		Environment, Open Space, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 213?	The River Derwent is a key green/blue corridor within the GI network of the City. Natural England welcome this policy particularly point (e) and (u) which aim to create new green spaces and nature conservation areas along the River Derwent.
165				Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 209?	Natural England welcome the provision in this section to improve access to nature, enhance links to the GI network and integration of SuDs. We suggest that planting of city trees should also be included. Trees in urban areas planted along streets and in parks to create shade, clean the air, sequester carbon, reduce flood risk, and provide sensory interaction with nature. We draw your attention to the Tree Equity Score UK - NHS Forest - Tree equity ensures all people, regardless of income or race, enjoy the health, climate, and economic benefits of trees. It addresses the disparity where lower-income, urban, and minority neighbourhoods often have fewer trees, resulting in higher temperatures, pollution, and poorer health.
165				Do you agree with our Streets and Spaces policy?	Yes
165		City Centre, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 191?	Natural England generally welcomes this policy particularly point (5) which encourages the greening of streets and buildings. We encourage building in success factors including: planning for ecological effectiveness (e.g. tangible ecological gain) and strong engagement of city residents for effective buy-in and pride in place. We also suggest that cross reference should be made to Policy EN1 to encourage the use of the Urban Greening Factor to focus on the provision of green roofs & walls, urban trees and connecting green infrastructure.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	Yes
165		Infrastructure, Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 183?	Linkages should be made between urban areas and surrounding countryside to improve access to nature for all e.g. improved Public Rights of Way (PRoW), access by public transport and active travel routes. We suggest a route to the Peak District along the Derwent valley should be considered within this policy.
165				Do you agree with our Protected Routes policy?	No
165		Community Facilities, Transport, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	Embedding green infrastructure into walking and cycling routes can encourage the uptake of active travel, supporting increased physical activity, improved air quality and the reduction in vehicular traffic. Creating green corridors assists with urban cooling and increases people's opportunities to connect with nature and improve mental wellbeing. For more information we refer you to page 76 of the Natural England Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide and The Healthy Streets approach. Natural England would like to see green and safe active travel options to key nature conservation sites within Derby, particularly improved access to Allstree Park as it is currently separated from the city by the A38.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	No
165		Environment, Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 161?	Natural England supports this policy and is pleased to note that it will seek opportunities to provide environmental enhancements along the River Derwent Corridor, including enhancements to green infrastructure and biodiversity networks and will link in with the City's existing green network.
165				Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Flood Risk, Climate	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 159?	The policy should positively contribute to reducing flood risk through SuDS (sustainable urban drainage systems), incorporating these as part of green infrastructure. A multi-functional approach to SuDS should be encouraged and take opportunities to incorporate features that enhance and maintain biodiversity as part of a coherent green and blue infrastructure approach. GI reduces flood risk, improves water quality and natural filtration, helps maintain the natural water cycle and sustainable drainage at local and catchment scales, reducing pressures on the water environment and infrastructure, bringing amenity, biodiversity, economic and other benefits. Sponge Cities - Your authority may be interested to refer to the concept of "Sponge Cities" – this term comes from the idea that parts of urban areas can be designed to absorb and store rainwater, like a sponge, both to slow down surface water flow into drains (thus reducing the risk of storm event flooding), and to keep water available for the planting in green spaces to thrive in hotter summers. This capacity for storage is a sustainable way to tackle the challenges of climate change including the mitigation of urban flooding and higher temperatures. This approach utilises various green infrastructure elements which support the absorption, storage and reuse of rainwater, including: rain gardens, permeable pavements, urban trees and wetlands. This approach is also reflected in Natural England Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide 2023.
165				Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 153?	Emissions from increased road traffic resulting from new development, transport schemes, or industrial developments can impact biodiversity as well as people's health. Green Infrastructure makes places more resilient and adaptive to climate change and helps to meet zero carbon and air quality targets. Trees can also play a vital role in improving air quality by reducing pollution through absorbing harmful gases and particles in the air. Your authority may be interested to use to Tree Equity Score which links tree coverage and health and how air quality can be improved with greater tree equity Tree Equity Score UK - NHS Forest
165				Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	No
165		Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	Natural England welcomes this policy and the comprehensive guidance it includes in both the policy wording and the accompanying text. We welcome the reference to the Derbyshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy.
165				Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	Natural England welcomes this policy. The Urban Tree Canopy Cover Standard set out within the Green Infrastructure Framework could also be referred to in the policy text.
165				Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	Natural England generally welcomes this policy which establishes a framework for the protection of designated nature conservation sites across the Plan area. We suggest that the application of the mitigation hierarchy i.e. that development should first avoid, then mitigate, and as a last resort compensate for adverse impacts on biodiversity, should be made clearer within the policy wording. The current wording gives the impression that the mitigation hierarchy would only be applied to local sites. The following sentence could be used within the policy wording: If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission will be refused. We acknowledge that the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has been mentioned across the Plan notably in Policy EN1 but we consider that it should also be mentioned here for the context. The Nature Recovery Network is a major commitment in the UK Government's 25-Year Environment Plan and intends to improve, expand and connect habitats to address wildlife decline and provide wider environmental benefits for people. Your authority may consider making specific reference to LNRS section iv. Description of potential opportunities for nature recovery in Derby City (DE1 to DE6) which outlines ways to enhance nature within this urban area.
165				Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Green Gap, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	Natural England particularly supports the point that Green Gaps should include Nature conservation and off-site Biodiversity Net Gain enhancements, including improvements which provide multiple benefits to Derby's Green Infrastructure network, or which link the Green Wedge to the wider Green Infrastructure network.
165				Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
165		Green Wedge, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	Natural England particularly supports the point that Green Wedges should include nature conservation and off-site Biodiversity Net Gain enhancements, including improvements which provide multiple benefits to Derby's Green Infrastructure network, or which link the Green Wedge to the wider Green Infrastructure network.
165				Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
165		Environment, Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	We suggest that this policy should include provision to positively enhance land within the Green Belt and consider opportunities for habitat enhancements and potentially off-site sites for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	No
165		Community Facilities, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 117?	Natural England welcome this policy and the acknowledgement that they are an important resource for local food production, support biodiversity and promote sustainable and healthy communities. We also agree that they should connect to the wider Green Infrastructure network. The provision of community gardens and urban food-growing spaces (such as allotments) offer opportunities for physical activity and promotes mental health and well-being. These spaces encourage social interaction and social cohesion, including more opportunities for doorstep or nearby nature access for communities with highest social need. For information about food growing sites, we refer you to p71 of Natural England's Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide and p30 of Spatial Planning for Health.
165				Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Leisure And Culture, Open Space, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 115?	Natural England advises the new Accessible Greenspace Standard could also be considered within this policy which is included within the Green Infrastructure Framework and replace the ANGSt standards. We suggest that there should be a cross reference to the Green Infrastructure policy as Open Spaces form part of the GI network.
165				Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	No
165		Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 113?	Natural England supports this policy and the protection it would offer to nocturnal species and wildlife corridors.
165				Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes

165		Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	Natural England generally welcomes this policy and supports its content but we advise that it should make reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards Green Infrastructure Home (naturalengland.org.uk). The Framework, published in January 2023, follows from the commitment within the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan and outlines principles and standards for delivering good green and blue infrastructure (GBI) as part of new development. It is accompanied by a GI Planning and Design Guide, underpinning the National Design Guide, setting out detailed guidance for incorporating GBI within development proposals, which should be considered at the outset of scheme design. We are very supportive of the inclusion of the recommendations to use the Urban Green Factor standard points (j, k &l and paragraph 430). Where the baseline biodiversity is low, the Urban Greening Factor can ensure development still promotes more nature-rich environments that increase the functionality, sustainability, and climate resilience, particularly in dense urban areas. We would however also like to see reference to the other standards set out within the Green Infrastructure Framework - The five Headline Green Infrastructure Standards are: S1: Green Infrastructure Strategy Standard S2: Accessible Greenspace Standard S3: Urban Nature Recovery Standard S4: Urban Greening Factor Standard S5: Urban Tree Canopy Cover Standard These standards can provide the output measures so that developers have certainty over what green infrastructure is needed on site. They can be included as site specific and area-based requirements in site allocation policies. To help the GI standards to be delivered local authorities should set green infrastructure targets. These should include delivery levels over time. For instance, the % of people having good quality publicly accessible greenspaces within 15 minutes' walk from home by 2030. A GBI Strategy or Plan will be required to be submitted for all major development proposals, demonstrating how the development will deliver the GI Framework's 15 GI Principles and local GI Standards. GBI delivered within, or associated with, new developments should be managed, maintained and monitored for a minimum of 30 years. We are pleased to note at point (b) that this policy requires that development should help deliver the aims and objectives of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Derbyshire. We also draw your attention to the Nature Towns & Cities programme Home - Nature Towns & Cities. This is a major UK initiative launched in 2025 to transform urban landscapes by embedding nature into the heart of communities, addressing the fact that 47% of people currently lack easy access to green space within a 15-minute walk of their home. Led by a

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					coalition including Natural England, The National Lottery Heritage Fund, and the National Trust, the 10-year mission aims to improve mental/physical health, boost local economies, and create climate-resilient cities.
165				Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	No
165		Environment, Leisure And Culture	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 107?	Natural England welcomes sustainable tourism that would benefit communities and visitors and which enhance rather than damage Derby's green and blue spaces. Well planned, cultural offers such as festivals and markets, as mentioned at point e, can provide valuable health and wellbeing benefits through connection with Derby's natural environment.
165				Do you agree with our policy for Tourism and Culture?	Yes
165		Environment, Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 101?	This proposed site is immediately adjacent to the River Derwent, which is a Local Wildlife Site and the Sanctuary Local Nature Reserve is on the opposite bank. We reiterate the importance of protecting and enhancing Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves and incorporating them into the wider green infrastructure network of the area.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our policy for the Indurent Park Employment Allocation?	Yes
165		Environment, Employment Land	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	We advise that the development of this site should demonstrate that the proposal would contribute to the extension and enhancement of the green infrastructure network. We suggest that opportunities are taken to enhance green linkages to the River Derwent.
165				Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	Yes
165		Employment Land, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	Natural England welcomes the provision set out in point e to protect and enhance the biodiversity resources and rights of way within the site and the amenity of the surrounding residential areas and a network of green infrastructure throughout the site.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	Yes
165		Environment, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 85?	Natural England notes that this site is a green area in a high-density housing area within the high deprivation index. We therefore suggest that this site could offer an opportunity to create a valuable area of green space or linear walkway incorporating the deciduous tree which bound the site and help achieve the “Green in 15” target.
165				Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Ivy House School?	Yes
165		Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 83?	We agree that BNG would be required on the site and the deciduous trees retained. The site would offer an opportunity to improve GI links within this area of high-density housing and help achieve the “Green in 15” target.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our Kitchener Avenue/Browning Street housing allocation?	Yes
165		Housing, Environment, Open Space	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 81?	We note that this site was is an area of green space within a high-density housing area we therefore suggest that any future housing development should incorporate a high quality green space with connecting green infrastructure that is accessible to local residents.
165				Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Beaufort Business Centre?	Yes
165		Housing, Open Space	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 79?	We note that this site comprises open space including football pitches and the intention is retain an element of this in the area. We advise that it is important that as much green space is retained in this location which is an area of high-density housing and would offer an opportunity to improve GI links and help achieve the "Green in 15" target.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with the Bembridge Drive housing allocation?	No
165		Housing, Environment, Open Space	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 77?	We note that this site was originally intended to include an area of open space we therefore suggest that any future housing development should incorporate a high-quality green space with connecting green infrastructure that is accessible to local residents.
165				Do you agree with the housing allocation to the North of Sinfin Moor Lane?	Yes
165		Housing, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 75?	We agree that the deciduous trees on the site should be retained. The site would offer an opportunity to improve GI links within this area of high-density housing and help achieve the “Green in 15” target.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 69?	The site would offer an opportunity to improve GI links within this area of high-density housing and help achieve the “Green in 15” target.
165					Yes
165		Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	All the housing allocations should incorporate opportunities for Green Infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement. We recommend that the guidance within the Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards (Green Infrastructure Home) is followed to support planning for good quality GI and that this is considered at the earliest stages of the planning process. Whilst we welcome the inclusion of the large green infrastructure areas shown on the illustrated layouts (HA1 – 7), such as green buffers and corridors, we emphasise that green infrastructure should also be connected throughout the proposed built-up areas to allow residents easy access to green spaces and to provide ecological links for wildlife. We would also advise that BNG should be considered at the outset of the development proposals and should be delivered on the development site where possible. We also emphasise the importance of agreeing the future management of green spaces within new developments so that it can be maintained at a high quality. It is suggested that if local communities are involved at the outset of development during the planning of local green spaces that his can help to reduce behaviours such as littering and boost involvement in care of green space. This in turn, has the potential to reduce maintenance costs.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No
165		Environment, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	Natural England emphasise the importance of considering Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gain at the earliest stages of a masterplan so that they are fully integrated into the design of the development.
165				Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Open Space, General Development Principles, Health	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	Natural England welcomes this policy and acknowledges that it references the provision of access to the natural environment and the importance of life-affirming infrastructure such as green spaces. Green infrastructure supports active lifestyles, community cohesion and nature connections that benefit physical health, mental health & wellbeing and quality of life. Green infrastructure also helps to mitigate health risks such as urban heat stress, noise pollution, flooding and poor air quality. Increased access to green and blue spaces The Environmental Improvement Plan sets a commitment that everyone should live within 15 minutes' walk of a green or blue space. An analysis of accessible green space in England is available through Natural England's Mapping Database, with the Accessible Green Space Standards detailed in Chapter 2 of its Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide. Spending time in green and blue spaces has been shown to encourage physical activity and promote better mental health and wellbeing. Such spaces create opportunities for recreation, community gatherings, connecting with nature, and social interaction. For more information, see Natural England's Review of Nature Exposure and Human Health and Wellbeing, the Natural and Sustainable Environments chapter of Spatial Planning for Health, and The Nature Connection Handbook. We note that in paragraph 146 of the explanatory text that social determinants of health are discussed. We suggest that you may want to reference the Green Infrastructure Map (naturalengland.org.uk) and GI Mapping Analysis (naturalengland.org.uk) that can be used to help assess deficiencies in greenspace provision linked with social deprivation indices and identify priority locations for new GI provision.
165				Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Health, Environment, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	We suggest that within this policy that accessible places and inclusive environments are also understood in terms of the natural environments of Derby to allow and encourage access to parks, landscapes and accessible green infrastructure in the city for the well-being of residents.
165		Environment, General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	Natural England welcomes this policy particularly the Nature section (j to m). We would emphasise the importance of Green Infrastructure being considered at the outset of development and fully incorporated into the design of a masterplan. Natural England recommends that reference should be made to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide 2023 GI Design Guide. This Guide provides details of what good GI design looks like linked to the ten characteristics of well-designed places as set out in the National Model Design Code and the National design guide. It provides evidence based practical guidance on how to plan and design good green infrastructure and can be used to help planners and designers develop local design guides and codes with multifunctional green infrastructure at the heart. This will help to inspire the creation of healthier, nature-rich, climate resilient and thriving places to live, learn, work and play. We suggest that the co-benefits of joining up health care centres/ schools combined with good quality green space provisions that can be activated through the community provision of nature-based health initiatives should be considered.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
165		Green Wedge, Spatial Strategy, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of paragraphs 92, 94 & 95 within the explanatory text which set out the protection of Green Wedges and the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure and wildlife.
165				Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Plan Objectives, Environment, Climate	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	It should be clearer what the reference to the “Council Plan Objective” means and how the “outcome measures” fit in with the Local Plan. 63. OBJ2 - We suggest adding in the list: ‘natural greenspace’ rather than just open space. 64. OBJ3 - Whilst Natural England welcomes this objective, we suggest that it should include nature-based solutions for climate change resilience. 68. OBJ7 - As well as improving biodiversity and nature recovery there will be other benefits to health, recreation and flooding alleviation. OBJ8 - Natural England supports this objective OBJ9 - Natural England supports this objective OBJ11 - Natural England supports this objective OBJ13 Add ‘green’ i.e. ‘practical green and attractive active travel routes’. OBJ14 Natural England supports this objective
165				Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	No
165		Environment, Outside City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	Within this section of the overall vision, we particularly welcome the ‘Our City Our River’ which will be a catalyst for further nature recovery and green infrastructure provision, including the provision of parks and wetlands.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes
165		Environment, Spatial Strategy, Derby City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	We welcome the aspiration set out in this section to create a vibrant and inclusive city. We would like to see GI linking throughout the city centre and easy access for residents to high quality connected green spaces. We suggest that within paragraph 55 there could be greater reference to creating a healthy environment using Nature-based solutions. These include measures such as city trees, strategic sustainable drainage solutions (SuDS), urban rain gardens as well as additional greenspace and natural habitats which reduce urban heat, improve air quality and reduce flooding, to create a more liveable urban environment. GI should be prioritised in areas where most needed in areas of High index multiple deprivation for benefits to health and well-being. We also suggest that the Local Plan may be an opportunity to highlight the Nature Connectedness Network, led by Derby University. This is the lead on nature connection research and practise development and encourages nature connection for nature recovery and human wellbeing HOME | Nature Connectedness Network.
165				Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Spatial Strategy, Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	Natural England welcomes this vision particularly paragraphs 46 – 48 which envisages a greener city with connected green and blue infrastructure with ecological links beyond the city boundaries helping to build resilience to climate change. In paragraph 42 we would like to see a greater emphasis of green infrastructure as critical for the city's future, for example: "By 2043, Derby will be an attractive, thriving, green, healthy, lively city of growth, opportunity and innovation for all." We would also value an ambition for natural environment to be part of the tourism offer and for Derby to be 'recognised as a regional centre for tourism led by an international reputation for creativity in technology and the arts, and as a gateway to the Peak District'. We would also like to see stronger reference to the Nature Recovery Network which is one of the specific aims of the Environment Act 2021 and will underpin the approach to the enhancement of nature. We suggest the wording in paragraph 47 could include the following addition: "The green network will have been extended beyond the City's boundaries, providing ecological benefits and contributing to the Nature Recovery Network whilst improving access to the countryside and important areas within it."
165				Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165		Environment, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Natural England welcomes the Summary table presenting a spatial portrait of characteristics of Derby's city, people and environment. We recommend strengthening the inclusion of the natural environment within the Opportunities section of the table with the following points: 'Addressing unequal access to natural greenspace, experienced particularly by those in areas of deprivation, has the potential to alleviate health, social and economic inequalities. "Ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) offset sites are retained within the City area to connect with the green infrastructure network and enhance nature recovery for local benefit."
165				Do you agree with our Summary?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
166				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	The Draft Local Plan was written before the recent publication of the proposed National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) reforms and so we think the text can be improved by including the following from those reforms: "How can developments incorporate features which support priority or threatened species? The National Planning Policy Framework expects development proposals to bolster wildlife by incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs. The use of swift bricks is particularly important in this context because swifts rely on urban cavities for nesting, and the national loss of suitable nesting sites through building renovation has been part of the reason for the species' decline. Developments should include integrated nest boxes (commonly known as swift bricks) where possible, with the general aim across a development of a minimum of one nest box per unit. Nest boxes can provide important habitat for other species as well as swifts, such as starlings and sparrows. Extensive guidance is available on wildlife friendly features, including the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code which illustrate how well-designed places can support rich and varied biodiversity by facilitating habitats and routes for wildlife. More specific support for the selection and installation of swift bricks can be found in the British Industry Standard BS 42021:2022 the Future Homes Hub Homes for Nature Guidance, and the RSPB's Guide to Nestboxes. Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 8-017-20250609"
161		City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 219?	Makes sense

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		Economy, Housing, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 217?	Greater consideration should be given to residential use as workers may simply be tempted to arrive by train, work at or near the Station and go home on the train creating no benefit to the businesses in the PSA. If you reverse that and put the businesses in the city centre, they will use the PSA at lunch times and in the early evening.
161				Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	Yes
161		City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	The proposals are supported
161				Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		City Centre, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 213?	The proposals are agreed in principle but the proposed re-development of the Darwin Loop will further degrade the car Parking offer despite assurances from [Redacted] that this would mitigate the loss of parking at the Assembly Rooms site and that additional signage and welcome lighting would be installed.
161				Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	Yes
161				Do you agree with our Quiet Zone policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		City Centre, Transport, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 209?	The principle is agreed but the proposed removal of car parking spaces on The Strand in favour of pedestrianisation would be the death nell for those businesses on The Strand, Sadler Gate and those others benefitting from the proximity of those spaces. They are the nearest thing the Cathedral Quarter has to click and collect parking and they serve an invaluable role. The Strand is traffic controlled at either end, is a short stretch of road with a bend in the middle akin to those designed into residential estates to slow vehicles and so there can be no justification for the removal of those spaces. I was interested to note that the neither the businesses nor the Cathedral Quarter BID were consulted in this before going to formal consultation. Whilst it is contained concealed within the Public Realm Strategy proposal it is far too important for it not to be the subject of consultation quite separately in its own right and in the absence of this I reserve the right to refer the matter to a higher authority if required.
161				Do you agree with our Streets and Spaces policy?	Yes
161		City Centre, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 207?	The proposals are welcomed by the Cathedral Quarter as being a positive move.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161				Do you agree with our Active and Inclusive Frontages policy?	Yes
161		City Centre, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 205?	This support is welcomed by the businesses in the Cathedral Quarter.
161				Do you agree with our Shopping, Eating and Drinking policy?	Yes
165		Health, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Within this section, natural England would like to see the natural environment embedded into the text in paragraph 30: 'The Health and wellbeing of Derby residents is influenced by social determinants of health such as income, education, living conditions, natural environment, and employment opportunities.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
165				Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	No
161		City Centre, Economy	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 203?	There is no office market in the city centre because there are no new or modern offices with adequate car parking in the city centre. My message is consistent - no parking = no demand for offices.
161				Do you agree with our Business, Creativity and Learning policy?	Yes
161		City Centre	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 201?	I was part of the group who wrote the guidelines although the consent for the new apartment building on Full Street was not what I envisaged.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161				Do you agree with our Tall Buildings?	Yes
161		City Centre, Transport	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 199?	I agree with the principal but we should not under any circumstances look to pedestrianise the city further. Rather than making the areas feel safe, they create pockets of space for anti-social behaviour. St Peters Cross is an ideal example of what happens when people are allowed to gather; drug dealing, etc Pedestrianisation is sterilisation and must not be pursued further.
161				Do you agree with our policy for Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		Infrastructure, City Centre	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 197?	Chapel Street multi storey car park is vitally important to the future of the Cathedral Quarter and priority should be given to the replacement of the same built to suit modern requirements. There is no reason why the site, to include the former Queen Street Baths, could not include a variety of other uses, including residential but the car park is the Cathedral Quarters only high profile, visible and easily accessible multi-storey car park and is an asset that we cannot afford to lose. Conversely, the current surface car park is significantly under-used, largely because no-one wants to park there and concentration on alternative residential should be focused here together with adequate public realm works to improve the feel of the location. I accept that you might see it as serving the Vaillant but, honestly, would you park there?

164	211	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	Dear Sirs I write in regard to the councils planned implementation of an authorised traveller residency site at Pride Park, Wilmorton. In doing so, I also share some hopefully useful insight that I personally gleaned from working alongside the Traveller Liaison teams during my time employed by two city councils of very similar size to Derby City Council. You'll all be far more versed than I that decision making within local government is all about measuring Risk vs Reward, and I would put it to you that the Risk's here are both very real and infinately greater than the scale of any likely Reward. [Redacted] gained some quite eye opening and rounded insight into the challenges that the traveller community face, as well the challenges and impact they have on the immediate and wider community. [Redacted]. Both of these local authorities made informed decisions to locate authorised traveller residency sites on the periphery of their respective city's due to a whole host of considerations such as land cost, planning, infrastructure (being close to open roads as opposed to built-up areas), local resident objection levels, and equally financial importantly impact. In terms of the latter the Traveller Liaison teams within both of these authorities openly advised that authorised traveller sites impacted negatively on the value of local homeowners properties, along with their ability to move. Additionally they and local partners such as the police advised that increased levels of localised crime were unfortunately also a reality, with my sitting in several meetings where this was openly conveyed and discussed. I believe the planned site is intended to cater for around just 20 traveller families, however its location is directly adjacent to the largest business park in the entire city, along with 700 properties which I would assume to be worth around £200,000 on average. In terms of these 700 properties, the figure that was often banded around in these meetings was a 35% impact on house prices if authorised traveller residencies were to be placed near to areas of housing. As such, if the council proceed with the 'Reward' of housing 20 traveller families in the heart of Wilmorton/Pride Park, then in doing so your decision is most likely going to negatively impact (the 'Risk') the local housing market by £49 million! Unfortunately, Derby City Council has rightly or wrongly gained a reputation within the East Midlands for getting some pretty big calls seemingly wrong in recent years. Namely the spending of circa £70 million on the Derby Arena and the redeveloped Derby Market, both of which have drawn quite significant levels of negative media spotlight. My assumption is that none of those involved in the decision making here either live in Wilmorton or have businesses on Pride Park, and as such I would implore the council to not make what I believe will be another

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					very costly decision that comes with infinitely more Risk than potential Reward.
161		City Centre, Housing	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 195?	Whilst I agree with the essence, the proposal will, no doubt see an increase in footfall but I am not convinced that large scale development of flats to let will have a significant impact on spending in the city centre
161				Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		City Centre, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 191?	Paragraph 6.82 above is inaccurate, untrue and factually incorrect and is likely to have a significant impact to the responses to this consultation. The statement that "many called for a reduced reliance on cars" is entirely inaccurate of the 559 respondents only 209 'called' for this. 209 is less than half of the respondents and nearer to one third. This should have been picked at Cabinet before this consultation took place. Although, I agree with much of the remaining text, it would be a huge error of judgement to suppose that there will be a significant take of of offices, Garde A or otherwise, without adequate on-site car parking.[Redacted]. Do not make the same mistake as you did with the current Law School on Agard/ Ford Street. The lack of uptake by an office user, due to the lack of adequate car parking, sent alarm bells ringing with landowners that there was no demand for offices in Derby city centre. This is the sole reason that we haven't had any new offices since. We have another chance to rectify this and to drive an office market but this will fail once again if you do not accept that car parking is king. You will never be able to encourage businesses from Pride Park and the Wyvern Business Park if you do not. I understand that you want to reduce congestion but the thousands of cars that you see on the major A roads coming in to the city show that people are already making a choice and that congestion is part of that journey. How many buses do you think it will take to reduce congestion significantly - too many. I would refer to my earlier comments regarding proposed multi modal transport hubs and would once again implore you to keep multi-storey car parking at Chapel Street. Removal / relocation would be extremely damaging to the Cathedral Quarter and is contradictory to the stated aims of this Local Plan and to the revitalisation of the City Centre in particular.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 193?	It appears to make sense
161				Do you agree with our policy for Defining the City Centre?	Yes
161				Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	No
161				Do you agree with our Transport Mobility Hubs policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		Infrastructure, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 187?	It is understood that the current sire of the Chapel Street multi storey car park has been identified as a potential location for a multi-modal hub and that an alternative multi-storey car park is proposed on the current Abbey Street car park site. This is entirely unacceptable to the Cathedral Quarter businesses (approximately 325 businesses in all). Chapel Street car park is the only presence we have which is visible and easily accessible as it is located immediately adjacent the inner ring road. It is understood that the current car park is reaching the end of it's useful life and instead of the replacing it with a hub, it should be redeveloped in conjunction with adjoining sites to create a replacement multi-storey car park (with the same number of spaces as are currently enjoyed) together with a multi-modal hub. If you take away Chapel Street car park, the Cathedral Quarter will die - not an exaggeration. It is vitally important to the CQ businesses. We have been competing with Derbion since it opened its doors 20 years ago, they have access to good quality car parking immediately off the ring and the Chapel Street multi-storey is our equivalent, or at least it will be when it is up dated to meet modern needs. If you are serious about revitalising the city centre, that must include the cathedral Quarter and taking away the Chapel Street car park will be a huge blow to those businesses. Abbey Street is entirely unsuitable as the approach to the city centre is awful, the area does feel safe and it is not visible, or accessible from the ring road. Neither should Abbey Street be used as an excuse to reduce space numbers at Chapel Street car park. I implore you not to follow through with this plan - it will be the death of the Cathedral Quarter and where there were plans to merge two BIDs into one, this will not be possible as a more focused approach will be needed due to the damage that this proposal will have on the Cathedral Quarter and its businesses. This proposal does not comply with your plans to revitalise the city centre. In fact it will serve as quite the opposite.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		Transport	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 183?	Whilst I agree with the principle, you will not achieve the number of cyclists which you might be led to believe and they will not access the city in the numbers you might wish for.
161				Do you agree with our Protected Routes policy?	Yes
161				Do you agree with our Servicing, Accessibility and Parking policy?	Yes
161		Infrastructure, Transport	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	No further comment

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		Economy, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	The statement at 6.40 is simply not true. Only 209 of 559 respondents referred to this which is less than half. It states that 'Many' respondents expressed a desire to reduce their reliance on private cars for travel - Many suggests a majority which is factually incorrect and untrue. Less than half, and nearer one third actually made reference to this. This is entirely misleading and will hugely impact the qualitative response to this consultation which should now be null and void. [Redacted]. If you build offices in the centre with no, or limited, parking, it will fail and I do not need anymore empty buildings in the Cathedral Quarter. When the copper building, now the Law School, on Agard Street was built with a ridiculously low car parking provision, I predicted that the only possible occupier would be the University as they would nor require car parking and that an office user would not be interested. The property was marketed for some time before eventually the University took it. We will never encourage office occupiers to look at the city centre whilst there are offices with an abundance of car parking outside their doors on Pride Park and the Wyvern Business Park. The first question I am asked by an office enquiry is 'how much parking is there?'. The failure to let the office on Agard Street sent out the wrong message to landowners that there was no demand for offices in the city centre and they sought either to shelve any proposed development or to look for alternative uses. This was a huge missed opportunity. Luckily, we have a second opportunity, which most cities don't get. Please, for goodness sake, do NOT make the same mistake again. If you seek to reduce cars coming into the city, it will die. Simply look at the number of cars on retail parks and in neighbourhood parades - this is the evidence base you should be looking at. These are all in competition with the city centre and if you restrict cars, they will simply not come in and will go elsewhere where private car drivers are welcome. This is a negative policy for the city centre.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161				Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	No
161				Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
161		General Development Principles, Transport		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	It is essential that modes of transport is a choice driven and not an enforced
161				Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	I agree with the prinicples
161		General Development Principles, Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	The principles are agreed
161				Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes
161		Community Facilities, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	Agreed in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161				Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
161				Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
161		General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	Agreed
161		General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	All agreed

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161				Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes
161		General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	It is important to ensure that any new development fits in with it's surroundings
161				Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
161		Design, General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	The above encourages essentials for good quality design
161				Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	No comment
161				Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	No
161				Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes

163	208	Community Facilities, Housing, Infrastructure, Transport, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	I strongly and unequivocally object to the proposed allocation of land west of Pride Parkway for a permanent Traveller site. Wilmorton is already a densely populated and heavily developed area. Local infrastructure is under sustained pressure, including roads, schools, GP services and policing. Pride Parkway is a major route that already experiences congestion, and adding a development of at least 17 permanent pitches will inevitably increase traffic, service demand and overall strain on the area. There is no clear justification that this location has the capacity to accommodate further high-density residential use without negatively affecting existing residents. As a council tax payer, I contribute substantially toward the upkeep of local services and the wider community. It is unacceptable for further pressure to be placed on those services without clear evidence of infrastructure upgrades or additional funding. This proposal has direct financial implications for residents who are already facing rising living costs and increasing council tax. Crime and anti-social behaviour are already significant concerns locally. Residents are deeply worried that intensifying residential use in this already pressured area will increase demand on policing and community safety resources. The potential for increased disturbance, conflict and ongoing disruption to the settled community cannot be dismissed. There is also a clear question of site suitability. An established permanent Traveller site already exists at Imari Park in Osmaston. Expanding provision closer to an existing site, where infrastructure and management arrangements are already in place, would be far more logical and less disruptive than introducing a new site into an already built-up residential neighbourhood. At a time when Derby faces a well-documented shortage of affordable housing and increasing levels of homelessness, it is difficult to justify allocating council-owned land in this way. Many Derby residents are in urgent need of secure, affordable housing, and this should be the Council's overriding priority. Finally, there is serious concern regarding the impact on property values and the long-term desirability of the area. Residents have invested their life savings into their homes. A decision of this nature carries real financial consequences for ordinary families. For all of these reasons, this proposal is inappropriate for this location and should be reconsidered. The Council must identify a more suitable site that does not further burden an already stretched and concerned community Kind regards [Redacted]

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
163	208			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
162	207	Community Facilities, Gypsies And Travellers, Housing, Transport, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	I do not agree with the proposed allocation of this site for a new Traveller site for the following reasons: 1. The area is already heavily populated Wilmorton and the surrounding area are already densely developed, with significant residential housing and existing community pressures. Adding a permanent site of at least 17 pitches in this location will further increase strain on local infrastructure, including roads, schools, GP services and local amenities. Pride Parkway already experiences high traffic levels, and further development may worsen congestion and access issues. 2. There is a more suitable alternative location There is already an established Traveller site at Imari Park in Osmaston. Allocating additional provision closer to an existing Traveller site would appear more logical and sustainable, allowing for shared infrastructure, support services and community integration. It would reduce the impact of introducing a new site into an already built-up residential area. 3. Derby urgently needs housing for local residents Derby faces a growing need for affordable housing and accommodation for residents who are currently living in temporary accommodation or rough sleeping. Council-owned land should prioritise addressing this urgent housing need. The allocation of this site for Traveller use instead of general affordable housing does not reflect the pressing demand for homes for Derby citizens. 4. Impact on property values Introducing a Traveller site in close proximity to existing residential streets may negatively impact local house prices and the confidence of homeowners in the area. Many residents have invested their life savings into their properties, and there is concern that this development could lead to financial loss and reduced desirability of the neighbourhood. For these reasons, I do not support the proposed allocation and would ask the Council to reconsider alternative locations or prioritise affordable housing provision for the wider Derby community.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
162	207			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
161		Transport, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	If we are to build new residential space within the city there are no steps required to reduce reliance on private cars as those residents won't require cars to access the city centre. I am sorry but the theme of reducing private cars into the city smacks more of a government directive (local or otherwise) which is entirely unnecessary. I am aware that of the 263,000 population of Derby only 559 responded to the consultation and of those only 209 asked for more active travel and wheeling equating to 0.0008% of the population. The Local Plan is said to be evidence based and yet if one stands on the islands on the A6, A38, A52 and A50 you will witness thousands of visitors and commuters who COULD choose to use public transport, adopt active travel or walk simply do not and that evidence is plain to see every single day of the week!
161				Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161		Plan Objectives, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	Whilst I agree with many of the objectives, visitors should be provided with a choice of travel options and cars should not be alienated from the city centre. I for one could not do my job if I couldn't park within easy walking distance of the property I am surveying. By 2030 only EV's will be sold as new and yet paragraph 73. OBJ12 seeks to reduce reliance on the private car. Hydrogen cars are on the brink and yet decisions are being made based upon today's technology for tomorrows world which is entirely incorrect. How will you achieve this without taking away 2,500 car parking spaces serving the Derbion whilst encouraging people to leave the Shopping Centre to visit other parts of the city? Answer, you can't.
161		Outside City Centre Vision, Green Wedge	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	Whilst I agree with the vision, its a shame that protection of the green wedge wasn't exercised at Boulton Moor.
161		Derby City Centre Vision	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	I see this more as aspiration than a vision

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161				Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
161		Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	I agree with this as a vision for the future
161				Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
161		Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Derbion provides a threat to the more traditional shopping areas including the Cathedral Quarter. In it's various guises it has lured businesses in from other parts of the city. None of them are still trading today which suggests to me that Derbion you are placing too many eggs in the Derbion basket.
161				Do you agree with our Summary?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
161				Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
161		Spatial Strategy	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Your description seems largely accurate
121	161	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	Largely supportive.
121	161			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
121	161	Spatial Strategy, Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	Contradicts earlier commitments to the green wedges/green belt but in this section states the Green Belt will be retained 'in principle'. This section also states; 'strong focus on the City Centre, seeking to promote this location as the main area for retail, commercial and visitor activities', however, this is not backed-up with evidenced development and an alternative strategy to obtain these benefits but through 'housing' regeneration should be explored.
121	161			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	No
121	161	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	Impact of LGR not anticipated and impact of housing in Erewash not considered
121	161			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	No
121	161			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
121	161	Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	The vision completely fails to recognise the issues that impact on communities outside the city centre in relation to housing development green spaces. These communities, in the main, are established and were designed to support smaller populations, the infrastructure to support current residents is highly stressed and where new developments are proposed any (albeit limited) enhancements are at the behest of the highly ineffective S106 commitments.
121	161			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No
121	161	Derby City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	Again there is much to commend the vision which is highly ambitious but does the current assessment does not reflect the reality of the city centre. Although there are pockets of success there are some overarching issues that require attention e.g., crime/criminality/drug abuse. There is a public perception that the city centre is not the destination of choice for residents that it was and this relates to a host of issues and more could be done to understand this view and listen to residents remedies.
121	161			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
121	161	Green Belt, Green Wedge, Housing, Spatial Strategy	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	There is much of the vision I agree with and is to be commended, if the leadership is committed and necessary change is championed. I believe there is insufficient critique of the existing encroachment into the green wedge/belt and not enough emphasis on the regeneration of the city centre through housing. An undue emphasis is on retail regeneration of the city whereas I consider housing and other business development are the key catalysts. Housing regeneration though affordable, care-leaving, assisted living and temporary accommodation combined with that aimed at younger adults combined with SME tailored business/innovation properties should be the way forward.
121	161			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	No
121	161	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	The assessment, at a high level, is balanced and identifies most of the key issues
121	161			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
121	161	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	The portrait is largely accurate as an overview of the City and its development.
121	161			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
116	156	Brook Farm, Flood Risk, Green Wedge	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 57?	Oregon way is already busy and liable to flooding. The services in the area are over stretched. I support the derby City Council local plan retaining the North Oakwood Green wedge as it is currently proposed int he draft document
116	156			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
112	151	Housing, Infrastructure, Environment, Stoney Lane, Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Far to much traffic in Spondon already. We can not cope with more cars on small roads. And what about all the wildlife that will be lost
112	151			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
111	150			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	Yes
111	150			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	Chaddesden Wood and the field north of it, are in the footprint of the The Heartwood Community Forest, so ths is anothe reason why I support the Derby City Council Local Plan to retain the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
111	150	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document, particularly as it is adjascent to an SSSI.
111	150			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes
111	150			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
111	150	Green Gap	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	Green Gaps are important for nature and should be protected and not squandered by developers lookin for a quick buck!
111	150			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
111	150	Green Wedge, Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. This will free up the field North of Chaddesden Wood to be used for leisure purposes, as it was during COVID, being the one of the few places where residents of Oakwood could get out into the open, without bumping on to others.
111	150			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	Yes
111	150	Open Space, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 115?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. This will free up the field North of Chaddesden Wood to be used for leisure purposes, as it was during COVID, being the one of the few places where residents of Oakwood could get out into the open, without bumping on to others.
111	150	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
111	150			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
111	150			Do you wish to comment on the Evidence Base?	Yes
111	150	Green Wedge	Support	Please provide comments on the Evidence Base	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document andfor the protection of DE001 - Chaddesden Wood LNR and the surrounding land.
111	150	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
111	150			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
111	150			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes
111	150	Housing, Green Wedge, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	Yes, but great care MUST be taken to preserve the Green Wedges, TPOs and the natural environment.
111	150	Plan Objectives	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan objectives, particularly OBJ8.
111	150	Outside City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	I agree with the vision for the parts of the city outside the City Centre, providing nature is fully supported and all or Green Wedges and natural landscapes are preserved for future generations.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
111	150			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes
111	150			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
111	150			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
111	150	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	Derby needs to look forward and lay down a strong vision for it's future. We can not just rely on past glories, but make a city that is fit for all, whilst celebrating our assetts, including the Green Wedges.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
111	150	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	The reasoning is quite clear and lays out the positives and negatives clearly.
111	150			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
111	150			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
110	149	Transport, Housing, Green Belt, Stoney Lane, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	The land identified is Green Belt, used by the local community for the public footpaths that link Spondon to Ockbrook, the loss of yet more green belt land in/around Spondon whilst increasing traffic flow will have a negative impact on existing residents. There is also a number of other issues relating to this selected site; 1) Access to the identified land being exceptionally close to the A52 junction, traffic leaving the A52 and turning right into the development would likely cause traffic to back onto the A52 causing a hazzard, traffic joining the A52 at this junction already causes an issue to to the short slip road. 2) Leaving Spondon via Willowcroft road is already heavily congested, with the Dale Road (Bloor Homes) development going ahead this traffic will increase leaving the residents of Willowcroft road to deal with yet more pollution from cars stuck in traffic. How can Derby council approve this without a traffic study being done after the Dale Road development has been completed? - https://www.rcp.ac.uk/news-and-media/news-and-opinion/air-pollution-linked-to-30-000-uk-deaths-in-2025-and-costs-the-economy-and-nhs-billions-warns-royal-college-of-physicians/ 3) Derby council argued against the development on Dale Road due to a lack of school spaces and congestion within Spondon, unless there is a plan in place to increase the size of Westpark School and add additional access roads in and out of Spondon how can they now approve a plan to increase the number of residents. The proposal to add 400 homes which will no doubt increase traffic and the requirement for school places, doctors surgeries etc. without increasing these will leave existing residents suffering the consequences. Whilst I understand the need to increase housing, using green belt land in an area that already has heavy traffic and over subscribed schools in negligent to the existing residents and I can only assume that they were against the Dale Road development as they would not be in receipt of the council tax.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
110	149			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
102	139	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 167?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with the Embodied Carbon policy?	Yes
102	139	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 165?	I'm in full support of low carbon energy development. Existing building roofs should be used for solar. I am encouraged by the recycling of food waste into bio gas

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes
102	139	Climate, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 163?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes
102	139	Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 161?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes
102	139	Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 159?	Thw additional housing estates to the north of the city have had a drastic impact on water run off and flooding in lower lying villages. Very careful consideration is needed for any housing developments around Derby.
102	139			Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	Yes
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 157?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our Pollution policy?	Yes
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 155?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Land Contamination policy?	Yes
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 153?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Retail, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 151?	The current appearance of rhe high street is poor. Attention ia needed to attract people back to the city centre
102	139			Do you agree with our Shopfronts policy?	Yes
102	139	Retail, Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 149?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Advertisements policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 147?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Historic Parks and Gardens and Designed Landscapes?	Yes
102	139	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 145?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Archaeology policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 143?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Uses Within Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance?	Yes
102	139	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 141?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our Heritage Statements of Significance policy?	Yes
102	139	Historic Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 139?	There needs to be consequences when these measures are not taken. Derby hippodrome!
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes
102	139	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 137?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Conservation Areas policy?	Yes
102	139	Historic Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 135?	Much more could be made of this area. An evening night spot, shops or summer location. The closure of rhe temporary bridge has further impacted the area and a long term solution needs to be found

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Darley Abbey Mills?	Yes
102	139	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 133?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site policy?	Yes
102	139	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 131?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for the Historic Environment?	Yes
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes
102	139	Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	This needs to be more tightly controlled. More often than not, trees and hedgerows which shouldn't have been removed are removed by developers and there is no consequence. Housing developments are built far too close to sensitive habitat. A greater margin needs to be left. Insufficient measures are taken to protect against light pollution once residence move i to their new home. There is no control of homes adding bright security lights to their garden which add to light pollution

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	Yes
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	I'm in full support. More emphasis needs to be placed on this
102	139			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes
102	139	Green Gap	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. Separate between Cahddesden and Spondon, Oakwood and Breadsall, spondon and ockbrook etc etc needs to be maintained.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
102	139	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. Separate between Cahddesden and Spondon, Oakwood and Breadsall, spondon and ockbrook etc etc needs to be maintained.
102	139			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
102	139	Green Wedge, Green Belt	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. Separate between Cahddesden and Spondon, Oakwood and Breadsall, spondon and ockbrook etc etc needs to be maintained.
102	139			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 117?	Homes should also be encouraged/incentive to keep their gardens as green space and not hard surfaces. This would encourage home grown produce and reduce surface run off/flooding
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	Yes
102	139	Leisure And Culture, Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 115?	Where sport facilities use artificial surfaces, additional natural green space should be implemented where possible.
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 113?	I am in fully support. Light pollution is a big problem. When safe to do so, it should be considered to tuen some lights off in the middle of the night.
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes
102	139	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	I'm in full support of the blue and green policy. I love the idea of incorporating habitat into developments. Any greenery incorporated needs to be maintained and this needs to be included in the future sustainment strategy. Reusing water run off can only be a good thing!
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 109?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Managing the Proliferation of Specific In-Centre Uses?	Yes
102	139	Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 105?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Main Town Centre Uses Outside of Centres?	Yes
102	139	Economy, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 103?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Defined Centres policy??	Yes
102	139	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 101?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for the Indurent Park Employment Allocation?	Yes
102	139	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	Yes
102	139	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	Yes
102	139	Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 95?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Office Development?	Yes
102	139	Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 93?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Local Labour Agreements?	Yes
102	139	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 91?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Existing Employment Locations?	Yes
102	139	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 89?	Seems reasonable. Traffic in rush hour is terrible. This needs to be a major consideration

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for New Employment Locations?	Yes
102	139	Gypsies And Travellers	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 85?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Ivy House School?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 83?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our Kitchener Avenue/Browning Street housing allocation?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 81?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Beaufort Business Centre?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 79?	No additional comment
102	139			Do you agree with the Bembridge Drive housing allocation?	Yes
102	139	Environment, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 77?	Limited impact of wider environmental and wildlife

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with the housing allocation to the North of Sinfin Moor Lane?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 75?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with the Former Shaftesbury Leisure Centre allocation?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 73?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with the Elton Road Works allocation?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 71?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with the Bramblebrook House/Humbleton View allocation?	Yes
102	139	Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Urban sprawl and loss of identity. If future years, what will stop the sprawl continuing

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
102	139	Housing, Manor Kingsway	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 65?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with the Former Manor/Kingsway Hospital allocation?	Yes
102	139	The Hollow, Housing	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 63?	I dont know enough about this area to comment

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with the allocation at The Hollow?	No
102	139	Housing, Royal Hill, Environment	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	I dont know enough about the suitability of this area to comment. However I am opposed to the loss of vital environmental habitat.
102	139			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No
102	139	Housing, Environment, Moorway Lane	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 59?	I am opposed to the loss of this vital environmental habitat

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	No
102	139	Infrastructure, Brook Farm, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 57?	I am opposed to the loss of more green spaces. Plus, if this was built, the facilities and infrastructure are insufficient to support the additional population.
102	139			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	No
102	139	Rykneld Road, Housing, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 55?	Without significant investment is facilities, infrastructure and transport, this should not go ahead.
102	139			Do you agree with the Rykneld Road allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 53?	Although there should be a provision for traveller sites. They should not be put before permanent tax paying residents. Sadly, we have had repeated problems with travellers in our area. Antisocial behaviour, theft, littering. I am very aware that it is not all travellers, but it it is some/majority (in my experience). Any permanent sites should not be located near existing residential areas to limit the impact of those residents health and wellbeing.
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	No
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 51?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Self-Build, Custom Build and Community Build Homes?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 47?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 45?	There needs to be the appropriate balance of accessible accommodation to support the limited population in need.
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 43?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	Yes
102	139	Green Belt, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	First time buyers and affordable homes should be focused where resources and transport networks are sufficient. Green belt should not be used to provide this. City centre and existing developed land should be used.
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	No
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	No additional comments

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes
102	139	Green Wedge, Housing	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	The release of any more green field sites concerns me. We should only now be considering redeveloping existing sites that were once occupied. I am however in full support that Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. The use of HMOs should be limited. These properties are often poor and do not offer suitable accommodation for the residents. In addition, sufficient parking and outdoor space is usually not considered.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No
102	139	General Development Principles, Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	There are already far too few facilities and infrastructure (health, social, road networks) to support the current housing developments and population or our area. Significant investment is required before additional housing and population growth to our region is considered.
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	Planning enforcement should be enforced. In agreement that the planning authority should work with developers to understand requirements and if a suitable compromise can be achieved for some cases.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	During the pandemic, open space and green space for exercise and wellbeing was vital. Time should not be forgotten. Profit over housing needs should not be priority. Sufficient space in accommodation should be considered to ensure they are not too small.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	Antisocial behaviour is on the rise. Any measure to reduce or eliminate should be taken. This also includes driving behaviours
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	Accessibility is very important to inclusiveness. This does need to be balanced with affordability and percentage of population with very specific restrictions.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	In agreement with agent of change principle
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	No additional comments
102	139			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
102	139			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
102	139	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. All green wedge, green gap and green field should be protected. Once it is lost it can never be recovered
102	139			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	No further comments
102	139	Plan Objectives	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	Investment in Derby city centre is required to attract more foot fall. A vibrant city is desirable. Lower cost housing for first time buyers being located in the city centre would significantly benefit the city centre. First time buyers usually want night life coffee shop culture and shopping. As first time buyers mature and have families they usually move to larger more expensive properties in the suburbs to raise families.
102	139			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
102	139			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Outside City Centre Vision, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	I specifically support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. If these designated areas are lost, all the individual communities will merge and lose their identity. The detrimental impact of wildlife and green corridors will be drastic and never be recovered.
102	139			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
102	139	Derby City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	Many if us who live in the Derby suburbs want it to remain that way. Certain areas need to grow, however Derby does not need to compete with large cities in the region.
102	139	Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	It is vital that our communities are defined and distinct. Separation via green spaces is required so we all have our own identities. The large employers are vital for our community and for revenue. However we also need to invest in smaller more diverse employers.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
102	139	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Because I agree with the areas of strength and weakness identified
102	139			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
102	139	Infrastructure, Environment, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Because it gives a good overview of the strategy and the different elements. I am passionate about the environment and believe it is vital for the future. I fully support the green wedge requirement. Infrastructure is also extremely important. Growth and progress cant be achieved without suitable Infrastructure.
102	139			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
69	105	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	ACCESSIBILITY DEFICIENCIES SHOULD BE FULLY ADDRESSED Policy T1 is analogous to Policy 14 in the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP). But GNSP Policy 14 says "where accessibility deficiencies exist, these will need to be fully addressed". I.e. where there are deficiencies in access by walking, cycling and public transport, these will need to be fully addressed. I suggest that - into Policy T1 - you insert a clause such as "where there are deficiencies in access by walking, cycling or public transport, these will need to be fully addressed". NEW EDITION OF "NPPF" The new NPPF advocates a change from a "predict and provide" approach to transport-planning to a vision-led approach. If developers aren't told what "the vision" is, they may invent their own (e.g. "predict and provide is OK provided it's with electric vehicles"). I suggest that you insert a clause such as "when the NPPF says "vision-led approach", developers must interpret 'vision' as meaning this Policy T1".

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
69	105	Transport, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	GETTING THE LCWIP UPDATED "Coordination between land-use planning and transport planning" is generally essential. "Coordination between updating the Local Plan and updating the LCWIP" is a particular case. From the point-of-view of Para 8.7 of the DfT's LCWIPs Technical Guidance, [3] the "Derby Local Plan" will be "a significant change in local circumstances … new policies or strategies" specifying "major new development sites". So – in theory – the LCWIP's custodians should recognise that publication of the "Local Plan" implies that they will need to make significant updates to the LCWIP. In practice, the LCWIP's custodians may not be aware of the Derby Local Plan, or may not recognise that the Plan implies "significant changes" which ought to imply correspondingly significant updates to the LCWIP. I suggest that – into Policy T2 – you insert another "initiative", namely "Alerting the custodians of the LCWIP to the new Derby Local Plan, and to the need to update the LCWIP accordingly. In particular, alerting the custodians to the need to plan cycling/walking infrastructure for the catchments of the developments specified in Policies E5-E9 and HA1-HA16". Reference [3] Department for Transport, "Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plans - Technical Guidance for Local Authorities," April 2017. [Online]. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/908535/cycling-walking-infrastructure-technical-guidance-document.pdf.
69	105			Do you agree with our Transport Infrastructure policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
69	105			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	No
64		Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	Defiantly build on Brown sites first
64				Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
64				Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	we need housing

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
64				Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes
64		Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	we need housing
64				Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
64		Plan Objectives	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	If it happens it would be fabulous
64		Outside City Centre Vision, Flood Risk	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	Your city flood defences have already had an impact, please think of communities downstream. Big development now planned at Foston being built on Flood plain.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
64		Derby City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	Concentrate more on people who have lived here for years, stop brining in all these different cultures who expect us to live by their rules, crime is becoming a massive problem and the City Centre is dying on its feet
64		Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	The infinity Garden Village proposed School has just been withdrawn how can we have faith in what you are promising. There is no funding available for Medical services, there is a national shortage of Doctors how are you proposing to staff a ne medical centre. Reading point 50 I am guessing you will bring the city boundary to the A50 in south Derbyshire???
64		Flood Risk, Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	We need to protect valuable agricultural land and not fill it with Solar renewables, all new build properties and industrial sheds need to have solar as standard. Is flooding taken into consideration when building all these large scale warehouses on flood planes, have sewer systems been updated.
64		Stoney Lane, Housing, Community Facilities, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Its based on facts. We are however very concerned about provisions for Secondary education and medical services in South Derbyshire. You keep building all these houses and allowing more and more people into the area but no extra provision of facilites

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
64				Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
41	78	Stoney Lane, Infrastructure, Transport, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Dangerous location for entrance to site; right at the A52 junction. What is the impact of the development on the already stretched resources in Spondon: Doctor, Dentist, and so forth. Still nothing is being done to improve the severely congested vehicle access to Spondon.
41	78			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
25	59			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
25	59	Transport, Housing, Infrastructure, Stoney Lane, Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Our objections to the Stoney Lane proposal, Policy HA7 are the following: 1. This is one of several proposed new housing estates for Spondon, including one from the neighbouring authority. It appears that with all of these, no consideration has been given to the supporting community services such as doctors, dentists, schools, etc, that are already stretched to capacity. 2. Vehicle access to the estate, which is close to the A52 slip road, appears to be dangerous. Vehicles coming off the A52 waiting to turn into the estate, may cause traffic to back onto the A52, due to queueing vehicles on the on slip road. 3. Should the single vehicle access be blocked, such as by an accident or roadworks it would result in the entire estate of 400+ homes being cut off from traffic, including emergency services. 4. Spondon village is already overwhelmed by traffic and this, together with the other proposed new estates, will only add to this.
23	57	Stoney Lane, Housing, Spatial Strategy, Open Space, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Spondons infrastructure will not cope with all of this new housing. It is difficult getting in to and out of Spondon as it is, especially at peak times! We cannot get a doctors appointment as it is! People need green spaces for good physical and mental health. This green space should remain as it is.
23	57			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
23	57	Stoney Lane, Housing, Royal Hill, Flood Risk, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	Spondons infrastructure will not be able to cope with all of these houses that are proposed. Acorn Way already floods. Where is all the water going to go when all these houses are built! People need green open spaces for good physical and mental health. This green space should remain as it is.
23	57			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No

22	56	Transport, Housing, Stoney Lane, Health, Infrastructure, Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Roads will not be fit for purpose – Stoney Lane and Sandringham will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic that will be using them. Willowcroft Road is already grid locked now without any more housing in the equation – don't forget we get all the traffic coming from Kirk Hallam and Ilkeston who want to get onto the A52. Public transport is no better – buses do not have bus lanes that they can slip into and trains hardly ever stop at Spondon train station, therefore people are reliant on the roads. Pollution from grid locked roads will get a lot worse. People on Willowcroft Road already have an issue with the dirt from engines. This will be awful for the people who live near there – what about the health issues that all of this traffic will cause? Some people may get straight onto the A52 (towards Nottingham), use the slip road at Ockbrook to get off and then get back onto the A52 towards Derby – this will grid lock the roads for people who live in Ockbrook and cause more pollution for people living next to the slip road with queuing drivers. Drivers and articulated lorries from Kirk Hallam and Ilkeston are already using Ockbrook as a cut through as Spondon is currently grid locked. You talk about the buffer/noise attenuation – so you know that there is currently an issue with this and will get worse – surely mentioning a buffer tells you that this will be an issue for current residents and future residents. Improvements to current roads, ie, Sandringham Road, Stoney Lane, Willowcroft Road – cannot happen. These road are already built up so how can improvements be made to carry all of the new traffic from the new houses? The roads cannot get wider! Islands or traffic lights cannot be built – this will only cause more pollution problems for residents if these are installed. Why are you building on green belt when there are so many other grey and brown belt sites that could be built on? Who and why did you decide that this green belt be re classified to grey? Schools – where are all the children going to go to school? Schools have already been extended and cannot extend physically any more. Even if they can – where are you going to get the teachers from to teach in all the new classrooms? This means that parents will need to travel to take their children to schools and cause more traffic and pollution problems. I thought the government had sustainability goals? What has happened to these goals or are they not considered when housing companies are making money? What special circumstances have been used to designate this green belt as grey? Just need more housing is not good enough. Doctors and dentists – how do you propose that people will be able to be seen by local Doctors and dentists? Have you even thought that far in the future? We struggle now so how will that look when these houses are built? Does anyone care about

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					this? For years this area has been a beautiful walk over to Ockbrook for many residents and also dog walkers who live in the local area - why would you destroy this beautiful countryside that we are so proud of and love. A reason to live in Spondon and the main one for me is that we get both - city life and country side life. We don't want to live in a sprawling urban town - this is a village and needs to remain that way. Wildlife - so much wildlife live in the hedgerows and trees will be destroyed. Loss of agricultural land - we cannot lose any more land and do not want to have to buy our food from abroad - how ridiculous that this is being allowed. We got rid of alot of manufacturing and now farm land. Will UK produce anything in the future or will it all be bought in at a cost to us all?
22	56			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
21	13			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
21	13	Infrastructure, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	I do not think that anyone can deny that we do not need more houses for the growing population but the infrastructure needs to be there for them also

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
21	13			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	Yes
20	54	Stoney Lane, Community Facilities, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	[Redacted] there are 4 proposed new developments with approximately 1000 houses being built. This is far too many for a village on the edge of a city. There is no increase to infrastructure such as schools, doctors and there could be 3,000 additional cars trying to get through the village which is already difficult and queues awfully every morning with access limited by the A52 cutting through. Surely there are better sites in terms of traffic and access. This developments should only go ahead if the developers are going to pay for new and improved road structures and new facilities such as schools, doctors, leisure activities.
20	54			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
19	52			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
19	52	Royal Hill, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Too many extensions to the already crowded village with more and more traffic congestion
19	52			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
18	50	Gypsies And Travellers	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	Hopeful this would prevent illegal campsites on carparks parks private land
18	50			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 85?	This is redevelopment of derelict area which would be an improvement
18	50			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Ivy House School?	Yes
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 81?	This is redevelopment of derelict area which would be an improvement
18	50			Do you agree with the Bembridge Drive housing allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Open Space, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 79?	Loss of green open space
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 77?	This is a small development that would not have significant impact on local area
18	50			Do you agree with the Bramblebrook House/Humbleton View allocation?	Yes
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 71?	This is redevelopment of derelict area which would be an improvement

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 71?	This is redevelopment of derelict area which would be an improvement
18	50			Do you agree with the Elton Road Works allocation?	Yes
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 73?	This is redevelopment of derelict area which would be an improvement
18	50			Do you agree with the Former Shaftesbury Leisure Centre allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 75?	This is redevelopment of derelict area which would be an improvement
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 69?	This is redevelopment of derelict area which would be an improvement
18	50				Yes
18	50	Community Facilities, Open Space, Stoney Lane, Transport, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	Risk of accidents due to access point traffic turning into Stoney lane from A52 Increased traffic on Stoney lane and through Spondon Village which is already congested with the addition of all proposed developments around Spondon Loss of open green space that is used by local residents The construction traffic through the village Not seen any proposal for increased doctors school places Negative impact to houses near to development noise increased traffic and disturbance to day to day life.
18	50			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	Need for affordable housing priority needs to be given to local residents first
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 45?	Growing older population that needs appropriate accomodation to meet needs
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	Student support local economy
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 47?	As long don't take over the local neighbourhood to the detriment of local residents

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	As long as within planning permission agree with being able to improve your own home
18	50			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
18	50			Do you agree with the Former Manor/Kingsway Hospital allocation?	Yes
18	50			Do you agree with the allocation at The Hollow?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Transport, Housing, Royal Hill	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	Royal hill road is narrow this development will cause a lot of congestion especially around school times. Congestion through the village will increase making it even more difficult to get out of Spondon.
18	50			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	Yes
18	50			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
18	50	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	Building large housing developments onto villages does not provided high quality living for local residents Large numbers of HM O in one area can have negative impact on local community

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Housing, Open Space, Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	Need to look at building larger numbers of housing in 1 area without improving infrastructure looking at the impact this will have on local residents. Loss of open green spaces
18	50			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	No
18	50	General Development Principles, Community Facilities	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	Not seen any planned new infrastructure for Spondon schools doctors. Only planning for traffic management is traffic lights on Adsa Island or filter light on Willocroft road

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	General Development Principles	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	Blood homes are planning to build on green belt land in Spondon
18	50			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
18	50	General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	If the council do look at the impact of new developments to local residents
18	50	General Development Principles, Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	Planned developments around Spondon will not enchace the area it will reduce green spaces increase congestion have negative impact on services

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	General Development Principles	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	Derby will soon be part of Nottingham with all the development going on
18	50	Green Belt, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	City center needs development to encourage people to want to visit Green belt needs protecting to allow open spaces for people soon there will only be streets to walk
18	50	Green Belt, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	Need to protect green belt land to maintain Derby open spaces not looking at this as a place to build
18	50			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	Green spaces need protecting for people's well being. If current level of development around Spondon there will be no green spaces around the village just small parks.
18	50	Transport, Stoney Lane, Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	With all planed development around Spondon there will be no green spaces around Spondon it will be joined to Chaddesden and Ockbrook before long. It will lose its village feeling become a congested space
18	50			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	City center needs revamping at present time it's not a place to vist
18	50			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Stoney Lane, Outside City Centre Vision, Housing, Community Facilities, Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	Housing is being built on all green spaces With Locko estate selling land to blood homes around Spondon with no plans for schools doctors to provided services to these homes
18	50	Green Belt, Spatial Strategy, Flood Risk, Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Lack of affordable housing City center in decline lot of closed shops Building of homes on green belt at stoney lane will increase congestion in Spond leading to increased pollution in the area Risk of flooding increases due to reduced green belt
18	50			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
18	50	Spatial Strategy, Green Belt	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Need to protect green belt and open spaces Keep Derby separate from Nottingham
18	50			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
17	48			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No
17	48			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No

17	48	Community Facilities, Royal Hill, Transport, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	This development and other proposed developments such as Stoney lane, Spondon, around Spondon Cricket club, as well as the approved Spondon wood development (which has not made significant infrastructure improvements in Spondon as its in Erewash on the boundary of Spondon) are leading to approx. 1000 new homes and a increase of around 20% in the area of Spondon. The Increased population of 2500 also increase the population of Spondon by 21% there are also increased traffic from other developments in Erewash, and the business developments in the former Celenese works. Spondon has limited entrances and exits leading to high congestion already. The current infrastructure development plan does not address this, and this plan notes that this still needs to be updated. Proposal for houses should included any updated infrastructure plan to account for the extra population. There needs to be a plan to holistically address these issues or the quality of life and economic damage due to productivity will increase. Traffic modelling for the Spondon wood development has confirm the very high levels of congestion on Willowcroft road and such large increase will only make this worse. Such congestion affection buses and cycles and increases the level of pollution. Such large increases in population and area required studies on major upgrades to the infrastructure such as bypasses, which would also route HGV away from Spondon centre, before planning permission is given a wholistic plan needs to developed to address these uses given the unique bottlenecks in Spondon. To avoid massive increases some of these improvements need to be in place before building starts. This could also holistically develop off road cycle lane to join Spondon up with paths such as the river cycle path. This should be joined up with assessments of congestion in other areas to see if development is better elsewhere if the costs of solutions such as bypasses are prohibitive. There is a similar problem with school infrastructure which currently full with no plans to allow for the increase in population of 21%. Doctor surgeries are also struggling to offer timely appointment even without the population increase of 21%. The sewerage infrastructure also is struggling to cope with the current population. Holistic plans to address these should be developed, and costings need to be developed such that the most economic areas for housing development are identified in Derby, before developments and planning for housing are started in Spondon - ie the plan needs to drive development not the offer way around. This is not in the current plans, and the current infrastructure plan still needed to be updated. These plans need to be reviewed when it is updated. This development is on green wedge land, which sets a high bar against development given the lack of supporting

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					infracture plans above mentioned above.
17	48			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No

17	48	Stoney Lane, Community Facilities, Transport, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	This development and other proposed developments such as Royal hill road, around Spondon Cricket club, as well as the approved Spondon wood development (which has not made significant infrastructure improvements in Spondon as its in Erewash on the boundary of Spondon) are leading to approx. 1000 new homes and a increase of around 20% in the area of Spondon. The Increased population of 2500 also increase the population by 21% there are also increased traffic from other developments in Erewash, and the business developments in the former Celenese works. Spondon has limited entrances and exits leading to high congestion already. The current infrastructure development plan does not address this, and this plan notes that this still needs to be updated. Proposal for houses should included any updated infrastructure plan to account for the extra population. There needs to be a plan to holistically address these issues or the quality of life and economic damage due to productivity will increase. Traffic modelling for the Spondon wood development has confirm the very high levels of congestion on Willowcroft road and such large increase will only make this worse. Such congestion affection buses and cycles and increases the level of pollution. Such large increases in population and area required studies on major upgrades to the infrastructure such as bypasses, which would also route HGV away from Spondon centre, before planning permission is given a wholistic plan needs to developed to address these uses given the unique bottlenecks in Spondon. To avoid massive increases some of these improvements need to be in place before building starts. This could also holistically develop off road cycle lane to join Spondon up with paths such as the river cycle path. This should be joined up with assessments of congestion in other areas to see if development is better elsewhere if the costs of solutions such as bypasses are prohibitive. There is a similar problem with school infrastructure which currently full with no plans to allow for the increase in population of 21%. Doctor surgeries are also struggling to offer timely appointment even without the population increase of 21%. The sewerage infrastructure also is struggling to cope with the current population. Holistic plans to address these should be developed, and costings need to be developed such that the most economic areas for housing development are identified in Derby, before developments and planning for housing are started in Spondon - ie the plan needs to drive development not the offer way around. This is not in the current plans, and the current infrastructure plan still needed to be updated. These plans need to be reviewed when it is updated. This developments is on current green belt land down graded to grey belt, which still set a high bar against

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
					development given the lack of supporting infrastructure plans above mentioned above and the erosion of the green belt to grey belt and increase in urban sprawl.
17	48	Environment, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	Housing development on greenfield sites are favoured by developers, as they are cheaper by a large factor - no site clearance, dealing with waste etc. The plan gives no strategy to counter these economics. If this is not done greenfield sites will be overwhelming developed contrary to the green, wedges, and urban sprawl/green belt strategy. However, I support the protection of green wedges and green field sites. I think some infracture planning needs to be done up front to see if there are areas that need investment to meet the required housing - this may mean some areas require alot more investment than other for the same level of housing - which may have an impact on the most cost effective ways to meet the housing needs.
17	48	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	Cyclepaths are not gritted - in icy, snowy conditions private car transport needs to be provisioned for this - it it economically favored then to use the private car at othertimes. Consideration should be given to grtting cycle routes.
17	48			Do you agree with our Transport Infrastructure policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
17	48	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	Cyclepaths are not gritted - in icy, snowy conditions private car transport needs to be provisioned for this - it it economically favored then to use the private car at othertimes. Consideration should be given to grtting cycle routes.
17	48			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	No
13	33			Do you agree with our North Castleward policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Quiet Zone policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Streets and Spaces policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Active and Inclusive Frontages policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Shopping, Eating and Drinking policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Business, Creativity and Learning policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Tall Buildings?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Residential Led, Mixed Use Site Allocations policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Defining the City Centre?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Safeguarded Areas around Aerodromes policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Transport Mobility Hubs policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Protected Routes policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Servicing, Accessibility and Parking policy?	Yes
13	33	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	A38 Derby Junctions Grade Separation scheme should be scrapped as it will encourage more traffic and have an unacceptable cost. It will be a waste of money. I support initiatives b to f.
13	33			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Communication Infrastructure policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Education Provision?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Cemetery policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with Social and Community Facilities policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with the Embodied Carbon policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Pollution policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Land Contamination policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Shopfronts policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Advertisements policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Historic Parks and Gardens and Designed Landscapes?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Archaeology policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Uses Within Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Heritage Statements of Significance policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Conservation Areas policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Darley Abbey Mills?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for the Historic Environment?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Managing the Proliferation of Specific In-Centre Uses?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Tourism and Culture?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Main Town Centre Uses Outside of Centres?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Defined Centres policy??	Yes
13	33			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	With 75 ha remaining to develop this site provides more than the baseline need for the whole of the city. Part of this area this be allowed for other uses e.g. housing and green space.
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Office Development?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Local Labour Agreements?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Existing Employment Locations?	Yes
13	33	Employment Land, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 91?	Too much land being allocated for employment at the expense of housing and green space. The alllocation is 84% over the baseline requirement and 47% over the baseline requirement plus the flexible margin.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Ivy House School?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Kitchener Avenue/Browning Street housing allocation?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Beaufort Business Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with the housing allocation to the North of Sinfin Moor Lane?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Former Shaftesbury Leisure Centre allocation?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Elton Road Works allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with the Bramblebrook House/Humbleton View allocation?	Yes
13	33				Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Former Manor/Kingsway Hospital allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with the Rykneld Road allocation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Self-Build, Custom Build and Community Build Homes?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	Yes
13	33	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	More needs to be done to get more affordable housing. For example, the 5% target on city centre sites should be increased to 10%.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	No
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	Yes
15	44	General Development Principles, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
15	44			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes
15	44	General Development Principles, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
15	44			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
15	44	Green Wedge, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
15	44			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
15	44	Housing, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
15	44			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes
15	44	Green Wedge, Plan Objectives	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
15	44			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
15	44	Outside City Centre Vision, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
15	44			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes
15	44			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	Sounds good
15	44			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
15	44	Green Wedge, Outside City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
15	44			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
15	44	Green Wedge, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
15	44	Spatial Strategy, Green Wedge	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
15	44			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
15	44			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
14	42			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
14	42	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
14	42	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
14	42	Green Wedge, Policy EN 1	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
14	42			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
14	42			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	Yes
14	42	Housing, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
14	42	Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	Green spaces need to be maintained

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
14	42			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No
14	42			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
14	42	Derby City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	Yes but this doesn't commit you to anything specific.
14	42	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	Sustainability at the forefront

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
14	42			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
12	39			Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes
12	39	Environment	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 159?	Balancing ponds should have to be designed with a shallow slope on at least one side to make them useful resources for wildlife. Current balancing ponds are very steep sided and as well being extremely dangerous, they are of limited use to wildlife as they are inaccessible to mammals such as hedgehogs and deer or as a water source for birds, except water fowl. A simple change of design could make them really beneficial
13	33			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
12	39	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	Point 474 is a very good step

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
12	39			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes
12	39	Environment, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	You are again changing the intentions of NPPF paragraph 193 which states that Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons The "wholly exceptional reasons" is what is missing from your plan, and you have replaced it with "public benefits of the development clearly outweigh the loss", the NPPF has your 'public benefits' statement as a footnote (70) to the main point which is refusal of planning permission.
13	33	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	Brownfield and city centre first is an excellent strategy
13	33			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
12	39			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	No
12	39	Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	This seems like a watering down of existing Planning law which states that: Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of protected habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons The whole of paragraph 193 NPPF 2024 should be stated and applied, the wording of your policy EN8 does not seem to be a true summary of the NPPF intentions and protections regarding irreplaceable habitats. Also, you speak of what will be exceptionally permitted, rather than what will be not be permitted. The emphasis away from proper protection and towards permission is troubling.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33	Green Wedge, Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	Total area of green wedges and gaps should be retained and not reduced to provide housing. Any loss of green areas should be compensated for with new green areas.
13	33			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No
12	39			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
12	39	Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	I agree with the the Green Wedges being retained and [Redacted] I am passionate about the North Oakwood Green Wedge being protected from further development.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
13	33			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
12	39			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
13	33			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
12	39	Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	Watering down of environmental protection of Green Belt land to allow development is not in the interest of biodiversity, climate mitigation and nature connectivity.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
12	39			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	No
12	39	Open Space, Community Facilities		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 117?	There is no provision I can see to guarantee the rent charged at an alternative allotment site would be the same as that charged at the site being lost. Privately provided allotments are charging enormous rents that are far higher than council owned allotments.
12	39	Policy EN 1	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 113?	I agree that measures like these are necessary for wildlife. It is important to consider that if eg. housing is built near to bat roosts and foraging areas there will be uncontrolled and unregulated light pollution from house security lights, garden lighting and car headlights. These sources of light spill are not included, not measurable before building and not regulated.
12	39			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
12	39			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
12	39	Spatial Strategy, Housing, Policy EN 1	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	Protecting the city's green infrastructure is important. There should be a mandate that all new development should retain any existing hedgerows and trees, new developments often begin by ripping out environmentally important hedges and replacing them with wooded board fencing that always gets covered in graffiti creating a terrible eyesore and making the city look rundown eg. new estate at Alvaston just past the Thurlston island. Could this not become a condition of building permission?
12	39			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
12	39			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
12	39	Spatial Strategy, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	I agree with all of this, however, how can you meet OBJ8 if you are allowing the narrowing and development across Green Wedges as stated in 3.3 59? You can't really be valuing the opportunities stated in 2.5.1 if you then backtrack on those statements by saying that these Green Wedges can be carved up for building. I strongly support redevelopment of unused buildings and brown field sites.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
12	39	Green Wedge, Outside City Centre Vision	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	You have identified the Green Wedges as opportunities to increase biodiversity and access to nature and here you are now stating that they will be narrowed and built over. That makes no sense and contradicts the previous declaration that they will be preserved and protected. You can't maintain a Green Wedge by building over it and it's potential for habitat creation is destroyed forever.
12	39			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	No
12	39	Derby City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	It would be a good outcome if possible, but the town centre is nothing like this at the moment. In particular I think so much more could be done with the asset of a river in the city centre, yet it has been blocked from view by every recent planning decision eg. Premier Inn. Most cities with a riverside location make it a real feature of the city, for example Lincoln where the riverside is a destination.
12	39			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
12	39	Spatial Strategy, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	A firm presumption against building on Green Wedges and enhancing biodiversity will be a good step for the local plan.
12	39			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
12	39	Green Wedge		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	You identify Green Wedges as an opportunity for habitat creation, this is absolutely correct. However, you do not specifically state the threat to the very existence of these Green Wedges from residential development. These important spaces for nature are being built over by developers. They must be retained in their entirety and not reduced further by planning decisions such as at Royal Hill Way in Spondon.
12	39	Green Wedge, Spatial Strategy, Historic Environment	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I strongly agree with the statement about the importance of Green Wedges to mitigate flooding and increase biodiversity, they are vitally important to the city

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
12	39			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
11	37			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	No
10	36			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
10	36			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
10	36	Green Wedge, Historic Environment, Design, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I do agree overall. I would also like more care to be taken of our green wedge which appears to be generally under threat from building and , with respect to architecture, of the beautiful Georgian buildings in areas such as Friargate and also the bridge.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
9	35	Green Wedge, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	I support the plan to maintain the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. I am glad to see the value of the natural environment is fully recognised in the proposals to maintain and enhance green wedges and the green belt. The North Oakwood Green Wedge in particular is such an important habitat for a wide range of species and provides valuable natural open green space for residents. The amenity value to the people of Oakwood is huge. The North Oakwood Green Wedge contributes to the physical and mental wellbeing of so many people as well as supporting biodiversity and protecting wildlife.
9	35	Spatial Strategy, Green Wedge	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I support the plan to maintain the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document. I am glad to see the value of the natural environment is fully recognised in the proposals to maintain and enhance green wedges and the green belt. The North Oakwood Green Wedge in particular is such an important habitat for a wide range of species and provides valuable natural open green space for residents. The amenity value to the people of Oakwood is huge. The North Oakwood Green Wedge contributes to the physical and mental wellbeing of so many people as well as supporting biodiversity and protecting wildlife.
9	35			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	Yes
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	Yes
8	24	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 43?	I agree
8	24			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	I do not agree with the % of affordable housings bands
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	No
8	24	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	Sounds sensible
8	24			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	I do
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes
8	24	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	The Green Wedges must be retained . Developers need to contribute to community amenities that are required when additional houses are built
8	24			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24	Infrastructure, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	Let's hope DCC implement these policies…..developers seem to get away with doing nothing for the community
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
8	24	Design	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	I agree
8	24			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	All sounds sensible
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
8	24	Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	These are important policies to implement
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	I agree with them
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
8	24	Design, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	Because I agree with them
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24		Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	All sounds positive
8	24	Design, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	All sound like sensible policies
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes
8	24	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	All sounds positive and a good approach

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
8	24	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I agree with the brownfield site approach and retention of the Green Wedges
8	24			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
8	24	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	Seems sensible
8	24			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24	Plan Objectives	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	All sound wonderful objectives. Let's hope DCC can make them happen
8	24			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
8	24			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes
8	24	Green Wedge, Outside City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	The Green Wedges are vital. In particularly the retaining of the North Oakwood Green Wedge as currently proposed. Oakwood is already too large for the amenities, schools and Doctors. It must not be allowed to grow any bigger and we must also protect our wildlife and Green spaces

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	All sounds very good but what are DCC going to deliver it as today the city centre is a million miles away from this vision!
8	24			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
8	24	Derby City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	I agree with the vision, just hope DCC can deliver it
8	24			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
8	24	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	Because I agree with the summary

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
8	24			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
8	24	Green Wedge, Historic Environment	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Derby needs to keep the Green Wedges. I fully support the DCC Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge as is currently proposed in the draft document. This is so important for the future of Derby residents.
4	11			Do you agree with our North Castleward policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	The university has done a good job along Markeaton Brook, making it an attractive route to walk towards the city centre. It would be good to see them expanding on their good work.
4	11			Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	Yes
4	11	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 213?	I agree, as long as you adhere to the statement; 'have regard to the nature conservation and landscape value of the River Derwent, including its role as a Wildlife Corridor'. In its history, both the Derwent and Markeaton Brook were highly industrialised, polluted waterways, depleted of wildlife. We need to move forward by recognising the importance of them as wildlife corridors.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Quiet Zone policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Shopping, Eating and Drinking policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Residential Led, Mixed Use Site Allocations policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Defining the City Centre?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Transport Mobility Hubs policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Protected Routes policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Transport Infrastructure policy?	No
4	11	Transport, Infrastructure	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	I'm not yet convinced by the National Highways A38 Derby Junctions Grade Separation scheme. I wonder if the money would be better spent on improving local transport services (I realise that this would be from a different budget). I fear that the short term consequences of the traffic congestion which will occur during the work will make accessing the city centre from the northern suburbs impossible.
4	11			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	I greatly appreciate the role that the university has in making great use of many of our unused old buildings and the attractive design of its new builds. [Redacted], I appreciate the efforts made by the university to encourage its students and staff to use pubic transport, but am aware that some students and staff still park their cars in areas clearly signposted as 'no parking for the university'. Any expansion of the university must ensure that adequate parking is available on site for those who have to use cars.
4	11			Do you agree with the Cemetery policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with Social and Community Facilities policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	Yes
4	11	Design, Retail	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 151?	I think much of our city centre would look much more attractive if the signage on shops was more uniform - it would be great to limit the colours to just 2 or 3 shades. In Derby, if we look upwards to the first floors of buildings, the scene is usually much more attractive than at ground level! Unfortunately if we have lots of empty shops, it doesn't matter how attractive the others are, the street looks uncared for.
4	11			Do you agree with our Shopfronts policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11	Health, Open Space	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 147?	Derby residents are very fortunate to have so many wonderful parks - the Arboretum, Darley Park and Markeaton Park in particular. Preserving these spaces will be essential for wellbeing, fitness and increasing biodiversity as we move forward.
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Historic Parks and Gardens and Designed Landscapes?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Archaeology policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Uses Within Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Heritage Statements of Significance policy?	Yes
4	11	Historic Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 139?	Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. - Smith's Clocks on Irongate needs urgent action.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Conservation Areas policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Darley Abbey Mills?	Yes
4	11	Historic Environment, Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 135?	I look forward to the reopening of at least a pedestrian bridge across the Derwent in Darley Abbey, so that the businesses can survive by benefitting from increased footfall. I thank the councillors and [Redacted] MP for their work in trying to get something done!

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site policy?	Yes
4	11	Historic Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 131?	Ensure that neglected and vulnerable heritage assets, including those ‘at risk’ are returned to long term, sustainable use - I assume this means that incredibly important assets such as Smith's Clocks (Flamsteed/ Wright) will be suitably adapted for long term use - it could eb such a great tourist attraction. No other city would just ignore it! We also have several empty properties which have been neglected for decades- such as the house at the top of St Helen's Street - which this statement commits the council to 'ensure' is returned to long term sustainable use.
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for the Historic Environment?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	No
7	30			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
7	30	Spatial Strategy, Green Wedge	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	I support the Derby City Council Local Plan retaining the North Oakwood Green Wedge, as is currently proposed in the draft document.
7	30			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
7	30	Green Wedge, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	I wish to ensure that our green wedge habitats and Chaddesden wood in particular is maintained without being surrounded by development - it is vital for the ongoing viability of a crucial piece of ancient woodland that wildlife can have access to the wood and can exit from it into undeveloped land .

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
6	25	Green Wedge, Policy EN 1	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	I support the plan to protect the green wedge north of Chaddesden woods
6	25			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 219?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our North Castleward policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Transport, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 217?	Agree in principle but public transport from the railway station/derby city/outer areas of derby must be improved. At present living in oakwood there is no direct public transport to the railway station. Would definitely use rail more if there was as at present its expensive taxis so not really an option or a very very long walk from corporation street which isn't practical if travelling with luggage.
5	21			Do you agree with our Railway Station Quarter policy?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 215?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our University of Derby, City Centre Hub policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	City Centre, Policy EN 1	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 213?	Agree in principle. Promotion of high quality restaurants, bars, shops & activities along the riverside will attract more visitors but they must be high quality & not fast food outlets.
5	21			Do you agree with our Derby Riverside policy?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 211?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Quiet Zone policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 209?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Streets and Spaces policy?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 207?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Active and Inclusive Frontages policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Retail, City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 205?	Agree in principle as long as more independent retailers are encouraged & there is a reduction in fast food offering but an increase in proper restaurants & bars provide high quality offerings like fresh locally produce produce.
5	21			Do you agree with our Shopping, Eating and Drinking policy?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 203?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Business, Creativity and Learning policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 201?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Tall Buildings?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 199?	Agree in principle as long as regeneration brings high quality establishments to attract more visitors & not fast food outlets.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Non-Residential Regeneration Opportunities?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	City Centre, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 197?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Residential Led, Mixed Use Site Allocations policy?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 195?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our City Centre Living policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 193?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Defining the City Centre?	Yes
5	21	City Centre	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 191?	Agree in principle but several things need to be in.proved. firstly public transport in & out of the city centre to all parts of derby need to be reliable, frequent & provided late at night & possible all night over weekends. Secondly action to reduce the number of fast food outlets & encourage proper restaurants offering freshly cooked, local produce. Encourage a variety of night time venues for all tastes & age groups. Visability of Police & public safety to improve footfall & safety of those out later at night.
5	21			Do you agree with our City Centre Strategy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 189?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Safeguarded Areas around Aerodromes policy?	Yes
5	21	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 187?	If you help to provide a reliable, efficient & comprehensive public transport system that meets residents needs they wont need to rely on cars to get around.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Transport Mobility Hubs policy?	No
5	21	Transport	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 185?	Not a fan of electric vehicles. They are much heavier than petrol cars & do damage to roads which then need repairing. This is not cost effective. Promote & support petrol cars & their drivers.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities?	No
5	21	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 183?	Agree I principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Protected Routes policy?	Yes
5	21	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 181?	Agree in principle but all developers must meet & fund all transport infrastructure needs & these must be completed when developments are completed.
5	21			Do you agree with our Servicing, Accessibility and Parking policy?	Yes
5	21	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 179?	Agree in principle but public transport/road networks/cycle routes need to be accessible, reliable, frequent & service all areas that residents need to access.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Transport Infrastructure policy?	Yes
5	21	Transport	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 177?	Agree in principle but public transport needs to increase & meet the needs of all residents in & around derby to access the city & all services & more frequently. No new development should be allowed until improvements in public transport & road infrastructure are met to met the needs of the new residents.
5	21			Do you agree with our Active and Sustainable Transport policy?	Yes
5	21	Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 175?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Communication Infrastructure policy?	Yes
5	21	Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Higher and Further Education policy?	Yes
5	21	Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 173?	Agree in principle but with any new developments the developer should bare the costs of building new schools as part of the development or provide funding for extending present provision. This must be done by completion of developments.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Education Provision?	Yes
5	21	Community Facilities	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 171?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with the Cemetery policy?	Yes
5	21	Community Facilities, Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 169?	Agree in principle but Oakwood is losing the park medical practice which will have a massive detrimental effect on the health & wellbeing of the residents of Oakwood. The council should work with all parties to ensure a new park medical or other surgery can be established in Oakwood as the the one remaining surgery in Oakwood can not cope with demand & is not fit for purpose. Also fight any developments on the Oakwood boards where valuable Oakwood resources & infrastructure would be used by those not paying council tax in derby city.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with Social and Community Facilities policy?	Yes
5	21	Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 167?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with the Embodied Carbon policy?	Yes
5	21	Climate, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 165?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Renewable and Low Carbon Energy policy?	Yes
5	21	Environment, Spatial Strategy, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 163?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Sustainable Design and Construction policy?	Yes
5	21	Climate, Flood Risk	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 161?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with the Our City Our River policy?	Yes
5	21	Flood Risk, Climate	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 159?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Flood Risk and Water Management policy?	Yes
5	21	Environment, Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 157?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Pollution policy?	Yes
5	21	Environment, Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 155?	Agree
5	21			Do you agree with our Land Contamination policy?	Yes
5	21	Health, Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 153?	Agree in principle. Having absolutely no development on greenspace, green wedges & green belt land as well as protecting all trees, woodlands & hedgerows will also help with this.
5	21			Do you agree with our Air Quality policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 151?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Shopfronts policy?	Yes
5	21	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 149?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Advertisements policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 147?	Yes in principle but absolutely no development on historic parks, gardens & designed landscapes.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Historic Parks and Gardens and Designed Landscapes?	Yes
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 145?	Agree
5	21			Do you agree with our Archaeology policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 143?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Uses Within Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance?	Yes
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 141?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Heritage Statements of Significance policy?	Yes
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 139?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Historic Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 137?	There should be absolutely no development allowed on any conservation sites
5	21			Do you agree with our Conservation Areas policy?	No
5	21	Employment Land, Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 135?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Darley Abbey Mills?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 133?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site policy?	Yes
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 131?	Agree
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for the Historic Environment?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes
5	21	Environment, Policy EN 1	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	No development on green space & no loss of trees & hedgerows should be allowed
5	21			Do you agree with our Trees and Hedgerows policy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes
5	21	Green Gap	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Green Wedge	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	Absolutely no green wedges should be used for development. The council should actively support & assist in ensuring that the land adjacent to chaddesden wood can be purchased by friends of Chaddesden Wood & partners to extend & enhance the ancient woodland for the benefit of the natural wildlife & the residents of Oakwood.
5	21			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	No
5	21	Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	Absolutely no green belt land should be at risk of any development under any circumstances
5	21			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	No
5	21	Open Space	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 117?	No allotments or community gardens should be lost under any circumstances

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	No
5	21	Open Space	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 115?	No green space should be built on under any circumstances
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	No
5	21		Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 113?	Agree

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes
5	21	Policy EN 1, Environment, Open Space, Green Wedge	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	All green wedges/green belt/green spaces must be preserved & enhanced. These are of exceptional value to all residents & must be nurtured, maintained, enhanced & protected.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	No
5	21	Employment Land, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 109?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Managing the Proliferation of Specific In-Centre Uses?	Yes
5	21	Leisure And Culture	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 107?	Agree in principle. Derby city needs less fast food offerings & more proper restaurants serving fresh/locally sourced produce. Improved public transport offering more frequent service especially during evenings & weekends & late or through the night to service the night time economy
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Tourism and Culture?	Yes
5	21	Retail, Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 105?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Main Town Centre Uses Outside of Centres?	Yes
5	21	Employment Land, Retail	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 103?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Defined Centres policy??	Yes
5	21	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 101?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for the Indurent Park Employment Allocation?	Yes
5	21	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 99?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our Smartparc Employment Allocation?	Yes
5	21	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 97?	Agree in principle. Any cost for infrastructure should not be borne by derby city tax payers.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Land South of Wilmore Road?	Yes
5	21	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 95?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Office Development?	Yes
5	21	Employment Land, Economy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 93?	Agree

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Local Labour Agreements?	Yes
5	21	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 91?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Existing Employment Locations?	Yes
5	21	Employment Land	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 89?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for New Employment Locations?	Yes
5	21	Housing, Gypsies And Travellers	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 87?	Not appropriate
5	21			Do you agree with our Gypsy and Traveller allocation?	No
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 85?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Ivy House School?	Yes
5	21	Kitchener Avenue, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 83?	Should not build on a green space
5	21			Do you agree with our Kitchener Avenue/Browning Street housing allocation?	No
5	21	Housing		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 81?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our housing allocation at the Former Beaufort Business Centre?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 79?	Not appropriate to build on open green space
5	21			Do you agree with the Bembridge Drive housing allocation?	No
5	21	Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 77?	Absolutely no building on green belt land

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with the housing allocation to the North of Sinfin Moor Lane?	No
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 75?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with the Former Shaftesbury Leisure Centre allocation?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 73?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with the Elton Road Works allocation?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 71?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with the Bramblebrook House/Humbleton View allocation?	Yes
5	21			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 69?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21				Yes
5	21	Stoney Lane, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 67?	All infrastructure build & costs to be borne by developers. No damage/encroachment onto green belt land.
5	21			Do you agree with the Stoney Lane allocation?	No
5	21	Manor Kingsway, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 65?	All infrastructure building & costs to be borne by developer at same time as development. No infrastructure for development to be borne by derby tax payers
5	21			Do you agree with the Former Manor/Kingsway Hospital allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	The Hollow, Housing		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 63?	All infrastructure build & costs borne by developer as part of development.
5	21			Do you agree with the allocation at The Hollow?	No
5	21	Royal Hill, Housing		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 61?	No development on any green wedge/green belt land. No development without full build & costs borne solely by developer & delivered along side development.
5	21			Do you agree with the Royal Hill Road allocation?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Moorway Lane, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 59?	Only allow development if developer bares full cost & building of all needed infrastructure & service at same time as development. No building or damage to any green belt/green wedge or green site.
5	21			Do you agree with the Moorway Lane allocation?	No
5	21	Brook Farm, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 57?	No development without new infrastructure built & paid for by developers at same time as development. No damage or use of any green belt/green wedge or green field sites.
5	21			Do you agree with the Brook Farm allocation?	No
5	21	Housing, Rykneld Road	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 55?	Development should only go ahead if all infrastructure is built & paid for by developers & completed at the same time as development. No costs to be borne by council tax payers or added pressure put on existing infrastructure.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with the Rykneld Road allocation?	No
5	21	Gypsies And Travellers, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 53?	No additional sites for gypsies/travellers.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	No
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 51?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Self-Build, Custom Build and Community Build Homes?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	Agree
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 47?	Agree in principle but HMOs only for local derby people.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 45?	Agree
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 43?	Agree

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	Yes
5	21	Green Wedge, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 41?	Agree in principle but absolutely no building on green field/green wedge/green belt land.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	Yes
5	21	General Development Principles, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 39?	Agree in principle

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
5	21	Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 37?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes
5	21	Gypsies And Travellers, Green Wedge, Housing	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 35?	Disagree. Absolutely NO building on green field or green wedge sites. No HMOs unless they are for local derby people. No gypsy sites.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Housing Delivery policy?	No
5	21			Please say why you gave the answer to Question 33?	Agree in principle. No development should be allowed without full commitment & cost to be borne by the developers & only be allowed with secure commitments to an agreed ti.w time line. Failure to do this should result in the developer baring full cost & compensation to the council & its tax payers/residents.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions?	Yes
5	21	General Development Principles, Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 31?	Agree in principle. Any breaching of policy should not be tolerated & all cost to mitigate the breaches should fall on those breaking it & not on derby city tax payers/residents.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 29?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	Agree in principle. The council should actively reduce the unhealthy/fast food options in the city & promote proper food restaurants offering healthy & freshly cooked/locally sourced food. This will help to improve the health & wellbeing of derby residents.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 25?	Agree
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 23?	I agree

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Accessible Places?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 21?	Yes agree in principle. Developers should take full responsibility for ensuring policy is adhered to & bare all costs. No development should be to the detriment of existing residents or infrastructure.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Amenity?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 19?	Agree in principle
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Character and Context?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Spatial Strategy, Infrastructure	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	I agree but any new developments should only be allowed if local infrastructure such as local health services, public transport & road infrastructure can meet the needs of these increased number of residents. If new infrastructure is needed it should be the developers who pay for ot & should guarantee is built/provided at the same time as any new development & not at the cost of derby city tax payers. If they fail to do this they should receive the full force of the law to make them provide it & Bare all costs.
5	21			Do you agree with our policy on Placemaking Principles?	Yes
5	21	Environment, Spatial Strategy	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	Absolutely NO building on any green field land anywhere for any reason. Only use brown field sites or areas used previously for building. We cannot sacrifice green field land for any sort of housing.
5	21			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	No

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Spatial Strategy, Housing	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 13?	Agree but councils bordering derby city are continually trying to pass planning for new housing developments right on the boarders where those new residents would be paying council tax to those councils but using derby city residents local amenities. This is totally unexceptable & derby city should fight this at every turn. It is also taking away rural green land which is to the detriment of all people not just in derby city but in the whole of derbyshire.
5	21			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 11?	I agree in principle. I strongly believe No building on any current or future green wedges. Utilising industrial or previous developed land but absolutely no new building on any green wedges or in areas when there is no new infrastructure also built to cater for the new housing residents. Definitely no more building in Oakwood which doesnt have enough suitable infrastructure for its currant residents & absolutely no building on the land adjacent to chaddesden wood.
5	21			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Outside City Centre Vision, Green Wedge	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 9?	There should definitely be NO loss of green wedges, this should be non negotiable. A prime example is the green wedge by chaddesden wood. It is imperative this remains for the health & wellbeing of the people of Oakwood. Also Oakwoods infrastructure cannot cater for any more new housing. A loss of the park medical surgery in Oakwood as an example is devastating to the people of Oakwood.
5	21			Do you agree with our Vision for parts of the City outside of the City Centre?	Yes
5	21	Derby City Centre Vision	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 7?	Agree but also feel the city centre has too many unhealthy/fast food options & desperately needs more healthy & proper food restaurants to support better health & wellbeing for its residents.
5	21			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21	Green Wedge, Derby City Centre Vision		Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	Agree but also strongly believe that preservation of all green wedges are essential to improving thr health & wellbeing of the people of derby.
5	21			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
5	21	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	I agree with the strengths & weaknesses, opportunities & threats.
5	21			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
5	21	Historic Environment	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	Reflects Derby city as I see it

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
5	21			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes
4	11	Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 129?	Perhaps developers can be encouraged to plant hedges rather than fences?
4	11			Do you agree with our Biodiversity Net Gain policy	Yes
4	11	Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 127?	Planning permission which will result in the loss or deterioration of an ancient woodland or veteran tree will be refused, unless the public benefits of the development clearly outweigh the loss - I fear that the council will not hold the line firmly enough on this point. Planting young trees is laudable but can never replace the ecological interactions of mature woodland. Ancient woodland cannot be replaced, so its destruction should be avoided at all costs.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11	Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 125?	So, basically the answer is 'no' to planning unless there is a huge benefit to people, but I am fearful that the council will not hold the line firmly enough.
4	11			Do you agree with our Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Green Gap policy?	Yes
4	11	Green Gap	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 123?	Green gaps are so important to wellbeing and biodiversity. I understand the need for 'Public utilities, renewable energy facilities and climate change mitigation measures where it can be demonstrated that a suitable site outside of the Green Wedge is not available', but don't understand why we don't cover car parks and new buildings and factories with solar panels, instead of impacting green wedges or green belt.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11	Green Wedge	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 121?	Green wedges are so important to wellbeing and biodiversity. I understand the need for 'Public utilities, renewable energy facilities and climate change mitigation measures where it can be demonstrated that a suitable site outside of the Green Wedge is not available', but don't understand why we don't cover car parks and new buildings and factories with solar panels, instead of impacting green wedges or green belt.
4	11			Do you agree with our Green Wedge policy?	Yes
4	11	Green Belt	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 119?	Loss of green belt should include loss of agricultural land by covering it in solar panels too.
4	11			Do you agree with our Green Belt policy?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Allotments and Community Gardens?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Buildings?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Dark Infrastructure?	Yes
4	11	Environment	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 111?	I sincerely hope that the council adopts these strategies. I have seen no evidence of green walls or rooves on recent developments so hope that they become much more visible soon! How many swift boxes and bee bricks have been installed in city centre properties so far? How many would the council hope to see in the next 5/10 years?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Green and Blue Infrastructure?	Yes
4	11	Retail, Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 109?	Point 409 is of great importance!
4	11	Historic Environment, Leisure And Culture	Oppose	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 107?	There is so much opportunity for expansion in this area. Derby has never been good at self-promotion - to such an extent that many 'locals' have no idea of its importance historically. The Heritage Centre, Derby Museums and Electric Daisy are doing their best, but it feels as if we are still wasting opportunities to link things together. For example: on the 'Visit Derby' website, there are tours for Real Ale, Dracula and Railways, so a trail of local historical buildings could be added, and there is no mention of St Mary's Church, designed by Pugin and open every day; something must be done to develop the old Smith's Building (no other city would ignore a house of Flamsteed and the story of Derby mean Time, let alone Joseph Wright). Underlying all of this is the sorry site of so many empty shops on Iron Gate, which really detracts from the attractiveness of the Cathedral Quarter. The outdoor café culture is making a positive impact in the Cornmarket, but when Primark leaves its current site, what are the plans for redevelopment of the site?

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11	Historic Environment	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 49?	I think the University of Deby has done a great job in repurposing old buildings and redeveloping former industrial sites. The buildings look attractive and respect the heritage of our city. Well done!
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for Student Accommodation?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy for HMO's?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy on Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our policy about Looked After Children?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy on Affordable Housing?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our House Extension policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy on Residential Development - General Criteria?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy on Comprehensive and Coordinated Development?	Yes
4	11	Health	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 27?	The negativity associated with obesity and lack of activity may lead to a downward spiral in wellbeing, leading the people feeling trapped in their current situation. Maybe Derby can break the trend and focus on the positive impact of physical activity and healthy eating, as it may encourage more people to become involved? Making walkways safe and attractive, encouraging community gardens, providing safe playgrounds in the centre of developments, providing skateparks and outdoor gyms right at the heart of communities etc will help.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our policy on Health and Wellbeing?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our policy on Resilient Places and Community Safety?	Yes
4	11	Environment, General Development Principles	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 17?	Maximise opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure and biodiversity and protects habitats - I hope this includes 'living walls', 'green roofs or solar panels on roofs', tree planting in the city centre, as we see in many forward-looking cities in Europe. The recent planting on Victoria Street has been a very welcome addition and will hopefully set the minimum standard for further development. I also hope all new homes will, whenever suitable, include swift boxes (as these birds were common in my childhood in the city centre).
4	11	Spatial Strategy	Neutral	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 15?	I agree that it is desirable to make use of the city centre and brown field sites for development as much as possible, whilst incorporating green space to promote greater biodiversity and wellbeing. I'm fearful that green spaces and opportunities for green walls etc will be missed. I also hope that long-term empty properties can be made use of for development.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with the City's Spatial Strategy?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with the Housing Market Area Context?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Plan Objectives?	Yes
4	11			Do you agree with our Vision for the City Centre?	Yes
4	11	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 5?	Points 45-47 are particularly important and may present the greatest challenge in view of point 50.

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
4	11			Do you agree with our Vision for Derby City?	Yes
4	11	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please say why you gave the answer to Question 3?	I agree with the summary
4	11			Do you agree with our Summary?	Yes
4	11	Spatial Strategy	Support	Please tell us why you gave the answer to Question 1?	It appears be factually correct.
4	11			Do you agree with our Spatial Portrait?	Yes

Rep ID	Respondent ID	Tags	Attitude	Question text	Answer text
1	1			Do you agree with our Enforcement policy?	Yes