

TRAFFIC, TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL

Increased Congestion on Moorway Lane

A principal ground for objection to the proposed development is the anticipated worsening of congestion on Moorway Lane, which already experiences high traffic volumes, especially during peak hours such as school drop-off and pick-up times. Local campaigns and groups like Greener Littleover have highlighted ongoing bottlenecks, queues, and unsafe driver behaviour linked to current traffic levels. The addition of several hundred new dwellings, as outlined in the developer's plans, will substantially increase regular commuter and service vehicle trips. This intensification is projected to overwhelm the lane's capacity, cause longer journey times, and increase the risk of blockages at critical junctions with Blagreaves Lane and other main routes. Department for Transport statistics confirm that similar roads in Derby operate at or near saturation during busy periods, leaving little spare capacity for such a large development. The narrow width and residential character of Moorway Lane, alongside a lack of alternative routes, mean congestion cannot be dispersed and will disproportionately affect local journeys. Many residents already face difficulties navigating the lane, with frequent standstills impacting air quality and well-being. Without major infrastructure upgrades or strategic traffic management, introducing hundreds of new homes will erode quality of life, compromise emergency access, and undermine sustainable transport goals. Evidence from official traffic counts and local consultation makes it clear that this development would exceed sustainable congestion thresholds and harm community functioning and safety.

Strain on Blagreaves Lane as a Main Corridor

Blagreaves Lane serves as a key corridor for movement between Littleover and wider Derby, used by commuters, school traffic, and public transport. Recent planning applications and news reports highlight that the lane already suffers from high daily vehicle flows, queuing, and slow-moving traffic during rush hours. Any substantial new development will further increase traffic on this critical route, worsening congestion and raising the risk of road safety incidents. The Average Annual Daily Flow for similar corridors in Derby meets or exceeds regional norms, so extra demand from new residential access will quickly push the route to saturation, where demand exceeds available capacity. The cumulative impact is intensified by the lane's role in connecting Littleover to major routes such as the A38. Reports of increasing journey times and frequent gridlock reflect the current strain. Traffic management reviews have already been undertaken by local authorities, recognising that even minor increases can have significant impacts. Approving the development without substantial prior improvements to the road network would constitute a failure of infrastructure planning and risk hazardous overloading. The proposal should be rejected due to inadequate provision for

increased traffic and the need to maintain Blagreaves Lane’s functionality for existing users.

Constraints and Safety Risks on Bakeacre Lane

Bakeacre Lane is constrained by its narrow carriageway, limited footways, and rural character, as noted in multiple planning assessments and site viability studies. Local and county planning documents describe Bakeacre Lane as unsuitable for high traffic volumes, especially HGVs, service vehicles, and increased peak car flows. The lane’s configuration makes it ill-equipped to serve as a primary access to a large residential scheme. Even modest traffic increases could heighten collision risks at pinch points, restrict safe passage for pedestrians and cyclists, and obstruct farm and domestic access. Department for Transport guidance stipulates minimum standards for sight lines, turning areas, and footways that are not achievable without major intervention or land acquisition. Previous site assessments have found access constraints on Bakeacre Lane to be significant and difficult to resolve, particularly with the traffic volumes expected from the development. Increased use risks new accident blackspots and could hinder agricultural and emergency vehicles. These shortcomings are a critical objection under planning policy and a direct threat to health, safety, and public amenity. Unless comprehensive, independently approved upgrades are implemented—which may be prohibitively costly and impact local character—the development should not proceed due to severe transport risks.

Persistent Congestion and Roadworks on Hillsway

Hillsway experiences frequent congestion, lengthy queues, and regular interruptions due to ongoing roadworks and utility interventions, compounded by neighbouring routes feeding extra traffic into the system. In the past three years, substantial sections of Hillsway and nearby roads have faced road closures, lane restrictions, and traffic controls. Roadwork and travel news platforms report that several major projects are ongoing or scheduled through 2025–2026. Residents and commuters have reported increased journey times, unpredictable delays, and the diversion of traffic onto quieter residential streets, diminishing amenity. Adding more residential traffic from a major development would place unsustainable pressure on an already fragile road system. The cumulative effect of roadworks and new trip generation has not been fully assessed by the applicants and would likely result in more delays, reduced reliability, and further erosion of public confidence in local infrastructure. Approving the scheme would be contrary to commitments to maintain journey reliability and effective traffic management. Hillsway’s current and projected congestion makes the development inappropriate without significant, proven improvements and traffic reduction strategies.

Severe Impact on School Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

The development would have a severe impact on school traffic patterns and increase risks to children and families using Littleover's schools. Reports and parent advocacy groups document daily congestion and dangerous parking during school runs, with junctions like Rushdale Avenue and Lulworth Close particularly affected. These problems inconvenience residents and undermine child safety, with concerns about ambulance access and difficulty crossing blocked roads. Enforcement measures have been intermittent and do not address the underlying issues. Additional family homes will further increase car-based drop-offs and pick-ups, worsening congestion and safety problems. Evidence from Derby's School Safe Haven Zones shows that vehicle restrictions can displace issues onto nearby streets, increasing frustration and risk. Any proposal that does not offer robust mitigation or strategies to reduce car-based school trips risks more traffic incidents and a decline in the area's reputation for child safety. The existing combination of commuting, school runs, and inadequate infrastructure presents an ongoing hazard, providing clear grounds for planning refusal.

Pressure on Strategic Commuting Routes and Regional Connectivity

Commuter traffic on Moorway Lane, Blagreaves Lane, Hillsway, and connecting roads is vital for the local economy, connecting residents to workplaces and supporting reliable journey times. Derby is a net exporter of labour, so the resilience of key commuter routes is central to economic health and residents' daily convenience. The proposed development, by generating hundreds of additional commuting trips, would undermine this balance. Census data and congestion reports show that peak-hour congestion on these roads is already near or beyond capacity. Journey reliability on Derby's A roads has declined, with more frequent delays and greater vulnerability to incidents. Any significant new traffic would compromise these strategic links and disproportionately affect residents and inbound workers. This loss of reliability is a failure to maintain statutory standards for accessibility and mobility. The lack of a credible, independently verified plan for managing commuter impacts is a fundamental deficiency, making the application incompatible with Derby's economic and infrastructure strategies.

Heightened Risks to Pedestrian Safety and Increased Accident Potential

Significant new residential traffic will inevitably increase risks to pedestrian safety in Littleover. Official data and anecdotal reports indicate that even modest increases in vehicle movements have cumulative effects on safety for walkers and cyclists. Recent casualty reports highlight growing incidents involving pedestrians, especially children, and stress the need for targeted interventions. Existing pedestrian infrastructure on Moorway Lane, Bakeacre Lane, and side roads is already strained, with narrow or incomplete footways, poor sightlines, and frequent obstructions. School Safe Haven trials show that while restriction zones outside schools improve local safety, they can displace risks to nearby streets, making them more hazardous. Community petitions

have highlighted poor parking practices and inadequate infrastructure. The proposed development, lacking detailed pedestrian safety measures such as wide, continuous footways, controlled crossings, and enforcement, will exacerbate these deficits. With statutory requirements for safe routes to school and commitments to active travel, this represents a direct policy conflict and an increased risk of injuries or near-misses. On grounds of foreseeable risks to public safety, the application should be refused.

Inadequate Public Transport Integration and Accessibility

A critical objection is the poor integration of the proposed development with public transport, threatening to reinforce unsustainable, car-dependent travel patterns. Littleover is served by a limited number of bus routes, such as the V3 and 5A, which face operational constraints during busy periods. Council timetable and frequency data show that, for most new residents, alternatives to car use are infrequent or indirect, especially during peak times. The catchment for high-frequency buses is uneven, and increased congestion threatens to further reduce reliability for all users. As a result, the new development is likely to increase car dependence, contrary to local and national transport and climate goals. Access for those with limited mobility, without vehicles, or for the elderly and young will be weakened. This does not meet the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements for public transport in large developments. With no detailed, independently reviewed plans for better bus services or improved links, the application risks creating long-term accessibility problems for Littleover and should be refused on this basis. Active Travel require a frequent bus stop to be within 400m, this is not the case.

Inadequate Public Transport Provision and Bus Service Frequency

The development is compromised by limited public transport and insufficient bus frequency. While plans claim bus stops are within walking distance, analysis shows significant issues with routing, frequency, and reliability. The main service, the Villager V3, operates hourly for much of the day, and only the Harlequin route achieves up to every 20 minutes at select times. Policy requires frequent, high-quality bus services within 400m of all homes, but the site's western section falls outside this catchment, as acknowledged in technical responses. Promised future service improvements are speculative and unquantified. With a large residential population, including those with limited mobility, the current and projected public transport offer falls short of policy and real travel needs. Consequently, many journeys for commuting, education, and health will remain car-dependent. . Active Travel require a frequent bus stop to be within 400m, this is not the case.

Exaggeration of 800m Walking Catchment—Inaccessibility for Many

The often-cited 800-metre walking catchment is impractical for many, especially in suburban family-oriented settings like Littleover. Inclusive Mobility standards and

Department for Transport research indicate that a large proportion of people with walking impairments cannot walk more than 50–200 metres without rest. . Active Travel require a frequent bus stop to be within 400m, this is not the case. Public health data show that only a subset of the population regularly walks 800 metres, with rates lower among older adults, disabled people, and families with young children. Environmental factors further reduce willingness to walk. In Littleover, an ageing population and the design of family homes mean that even those within “catchment” are likely to rely on cars for everyday trips. The “catchment” for active travel is therefore overstated, and much of the site will be car-dependent.

Poor and Inconsistent Pedestrian Infrastructure

Pedestrian experience in Littleover is undermined by inconsistent infrastructure, surface damage, and obstructions. FixMyStreet reports and footpath audits reveal widespread problems: potholes, cracked pavements, overgrown vegetation, illegal parking, and blocked rights of way. National guidance requires pedestrian routes to be wide, continuous, step-free, and well-lit, but many local footways are narrowed by overgrowth, ad hoc repairs, and parked vehicles. Maintenance and enforcement are lacking, making sections unusable for wheelchair users, pushchairs, and visually impaired residents. Without enforceable, sustained upgrades, claims of walkable design and robust pedestrian infrastructure are unsubstantiated.

Unsafe and Fragmented Cycling Environment

Cycling is unattractive and unsafe in Littleover and Blagreaves due to hostile road conditions, poor connectivity, and minimal dedicated infrastructure. Most “routes” are on-road and unmarked, forcing cyclists to mix with traffic. DfT’s Local Transport Note LTN 1/20 requires high-quality, continuous, direct cycle routes, which are lacking here. Cycling levels are below average, with data showing car traffic dominates and cyclists face persistent safety concerns. The road environment deters families from cycling for everyday journeys.

Lack of Secure, Well-Lit Bicycle Parking

Where cycling is feasible, secure, accessible, and well-lit cycle parking is absent at many key destinations. The installation of a few new bike corrals is inadequate for a large new development. Standards require secure, overlooked, and well-lit parking within 15–25 metres of entrances. Most shops, healthcare, schools, and community venues in Littleover and Blagreaves have limited, unsecured stands with no lighting or CCTV. This deters cycling, especially in the evening or winter. Without a binding plan for ample, secure cycle parking, claims of promoting cycling are unsubstantiated.

Poor Road Safety Perceptions Discourage Cycling

Perceptions and realities of poor road safety, especially on main corridors like Rykneld Road and Littleover Lane, deter cycling and walking. While serious injuries are rare, traffic volumes and speeds exceed comfort thresholds for family cycling. Consultations reveal high concern about speed and volume, and intersections are particular risk points. Cycling remains a minority pursuit, with most households perceiving it as unsafe for children. Without continuous, protected infrastructure, expectations of increased cycling are unfounded.

Distances and School Journeys—Car Dependency for Primary Education

The development's reliance on private car travel for school journeys is driven by distances to suitable schools and the lack of safe, continuous active travel links. Many families are outside primary catchments due to oversubscription or lack of direct, safe routes. Even those within catchment often drive due to trip chaining, carrying young children, and busy roads. School Safe Haven Zones have not been widely adopted, and parental car use remains high. Actual walking rates are much lower than official statistics suggest, especially for developments beyond the school perimeter or with unsafe routes. Without actual, safe, and attractive conditions, the development will formalise new daily car journeys, increasing congestion and safety risks.

Failure to Prioritise High-Quality Active Travel Networks

The application does not meet requirements for high-quality, integrated active travel networks. Policies require new developments to deliver permeable pedestrian and cycle routes and connections to the wider network. The submitted plans only propose limited improvements, often contingent on securing additional land or funding, and fail to address missing links, crossings, and maintenance. The strategy relies heavily on off-site provision and lacks enforceable delivery schedules. Pedestrians and cyclists are expected to share space with car access points, increasing risk and reducing usage. The application entrenches car dependency at a time when proactive active travel planning is needed, undermining local and national objectives for modal shift, decarbonisation, and public health.