

South Derbyshire Issues and Options Part 2 Local Plan Review Paper Response Form

Your reviews are being sought on the South Derbyshire Issues and Options Part 2 Local Plan Review and the Local Plan Part 2 Review Scoping Report.

The consultation documents can be viewed at
www.southderbyshire.gov.uk/issuesandoptionsPart2Review

This form can be used as an alternative to the online questionnaire. Responses should be submitted to the Planning Policy Team by email at local.plan@southderbyshire.gov.uk or via post to Planning Policy, Planning Services, South Derbyshire District Council, Civic Offices, Civic Way, Swadlincote, Derbyshire, DE11 0AH

Comments must be received by 5pm on 30th January 2026, late comments will not be accepted.

Part A: Your Details

Organisation: Etwall Parish Council

Organisation:

*indicates required field

Future notification

The District Council will retain your contact details to inform you of future consultations on the Local Plan. If you do not wish for your contact details to be added to the consultation database, please email local.plan@southderbyshire.gov.uk

Privacy Notice - How is your information used?

Representations will be made publicly available following the close of the consultation however personal details (personal address, signature and contact details) will NOT be made publicly available but will be kept in a secure database and used to notify you of the Plan's progress.

Who has access to your information?

South Derbyshire District Council Planning Services. Personal information is not shared with any other department or agency, will not be sold and will not be used for any other purpose.

For further information, please visit our Privacy section of our website at www.southderbyshire.gov.uk/privacy where you can see a full copy of our privacy notice. Alternatively, you can request a hard copy by emailing local.plan@southderbyshire.gov.uk

Question 1: Should the Council produce a Local Plan Part 2 Review under the existing planning system, or should a single full Local Plan Review be undertaken under the new system? (please tick one)

- ☒ Produce a Local Plan Part 2 Review under the existing system
- ☐ Produce a single Full Local Plan under the new system
- ☐ Other

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

As we already have Part one complete, we should attempt to get Part 2 completed prior to any re-organisation. This will ensure that our views can be enforced and not give developers the chance to exploit the situation.

Question 2: Where should the housing needs be met?

(Please provide site details including projected delivery timescales and the specific need being met).

We are concerned with the proposed expansion of Derby South into South Derbyshire. This concern relates to extra pressure being applied to the services and infrastructure in Etwall Parish. Traffic congestion, due to school pupils travelling to the Primary and Secondary Schools and lack of healthcare infrastructure for residents are of significant concern. We note that within Part one, the development proposals are extremely close to Burnaston Parish. The gap between the built-up area and the semi-rural setting of Burnaston and Etwall Parish should be protected and made as broad as possible.

We would refer you to the draft Etwall Parish Neighbourhood Plan which, when adopted, will allow reasonable development whilst protecting the village and its conservation area.

The draft Etwall Neighbourhood Plan contains the following provisions which may apply to other areas:

A Housing Needs Assessment concluded that Etwall Parish needs between 206 and 310 new homes by 2041 to meet the needs of Etwall residents. We believe this need can be substantially met by the proposal for 2500 homes south of Mickleover in the adjoining parish of Burnaston.

As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should be located where travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised, should minimise additional travel demand through the use of measures such as walking and cycling links and integration with existing infrastructure and they will not cause detrimental impact (additional congestion and queuing) upon the existing road network in accordance with Policy INF2.

Question 3: Are there other mechanisms that the plan should consider to securing housing delivery in addition to allocating specific sites (e.g. identifying indicative broad locations/areas for future growth adjacent to existing settlements, extending settlement boundaries, supporting certain Changes of Use)?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

It is necessary to control where development is considered acceptable and identify Brownfield sites which are acceptable. The use of prime agricultural land must be opposed.

Question 4: Are there any other issues that the Council should consider when ensuring the timely delivery of the right homes in the right places (e.g. policy criteria for looked after children, re-allocating unimplemented employment allocations)?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

The location of children's homes etc. needs control, Etwell has had recent proposals for small children's homes in properties which are in unsuitable locations both for the children and local residents.

Unimplemented sites should be considered for alternative development if suitable.

The draft Etwell Neighbourhood Plan contains the following provisions which will proportionately apply to other areas:

Additional development should minimise increasing surface water run-off and sewage discharges and should, where necessary, include flood management, or other infrastructure offering improvements that lower the risk of flooding, subject to the proposal not resulting in an increase in flood risk elsewhere.

Development proposals should not adversely affect the character of areas identified as having landscape sensitivity or being Key Views as defined in neighbourhood Plans. Development in these locations should be designed to respect the landscape sensitivity and safeguard relevant Key Views.

Development proposals that involve the removal of hedgerow boundaries and trees, including those that contribute to the street scene, should include a landscape plan, tree survey and arboricultural assessment. Street trees and hedgerows should be replaced with local native species at a ratio of 2:1.

Development in the Heartwood Community Forest is required to demonstrate how it has taken into account the specific landscape requirements, increasing woodland planting accordingly.

Development proposals should not have significant negative ecological impacts unless appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures are incorporated in the overall development package.

New development should either preserve or enhance the special interest and setting of any listed buildings or Non-designated Heritage Assets. If harm has been identified, this must be given special regard in the consideration of any exceptional circumstances outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework within any planning balance.

Planning permission should only be granted where Severn Trent has confirmed, to the satisfaction of SDDC, that adequate sewage connections will be provided and that there will be no additional discharge into Etwall Brook or other watercourses.

Transport considerations:

To demonstrate that developers have considered all relevant issues, an appropriate proposal with significant transport implications should be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan in accordance with SDDC Policy INF2.

Development proposals should include, as part of their scheme:

- a) walking /cycling routes that connect to existing or create new routes for example linking to the Key Cycle Network or Local Cycle Network to increase connectivity
- b) contributions towards improvements in accordance with SDDC and DCC policies.
- c) proposals are required to contribute towards improvements to the bus network.

Proposals should demonstrate a consideration of their impact on local infrastructure (including schools, GP services, highways, local services and community facilities) and how any required works would mitigate the identified impacts in a satisfactory way in accordance with national regulations (s106, s278 and Community Infrastructure Levy where applicable).

Question 5: What specific accommodation needs should the Local Plan address through allocations (e.g. extra care accommodation for older people, care home provision for looked after children etc.)?

(Please provide details)

There is a need to provide accommodation for older people where they can have independence but still have access to care facilities, possibly residential care home with adjacent flats / single storey accommodation the home can “service”. Ideally these will be located close to existing village / town facilities such as local shops, community centre etc. so the residents are not isolated.

The draft Etwall Neighbourhood Plan contains the following provisions which will proportionately apply to other areas:

Development proposals will be supported which provide a mix of housing types and sizes with a particular focus on 2-3 bed dwellings and properties suitable for older people (bungalows or level access low rise - max 3 storey - flats)

Affordable housing schemes should be fully integrated with market housing and be consistent in the quality of design and provision of private and public spaces to create mixed and sustainable communities.

Question 6: What could the Council do to speed up delivery on strategic allocations?

(Please provide details)

A key challenge in the development of larger developments is the requirement for improved infrastructure. One of Etwall's Councillors has had previous experience where the Homes and Communities Agency (known as English Partnerships at the time) carried out initial site preparation for large development areas such as the initial road / service infrastructure. Once complete, developers can then carry out individual developments within the overall site. The cost of the prime facilities could be recovered by Section 106 commitments or the sale cost of the land if appropriate. Examples the Councillor worked on are several sites in Milton Keynes, Lightmore village, Telford and the former Avenue Coke Works, Wingerworth, Chesterfield.

Developers should ensure that they provide support to existing services and improve the infrastructure to allay the fears of existing residents that they will not be negatively affected by new development.

Question 7: Should the Council allocate land South of Mackworth for development within the plan period?

☐ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Etwall Parish Council expects that the 2500 homes proposed for building south of Mickleover will meet the majority of the needs for the Housing Area which includes Etwall.

Any development to the south of Derby City must not put additional strain on the infrastructure and services available to residents of Etwall. Additional development which increases the number of pupils travelling to John Port Spencer Academy is not acceptable.

Investment in the infrastructure and services available will be essential to ensure there is no negative effect on local residents

Question 8: Are there other steps that the Council could take to accelerate housing delivery on other sites?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

We are not aware of any specific proposals, but would support reasonable attempts to accelerate sites with Planning approval.

Developers should ensure that they provide support to existing services and improve the infrastructure to allay the fears of existing residents that they will be negatively affected by new development

Question 9: Do you agree that settlement boundaries should be drawn around the urban edge of Derby, Drakelow and Stanton and any new allocations?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

After construction of the proposed additional development around Mickleover, we believe any future Derby development should be paused in this area by the use of a settlement boundary.

In respect of the areas around Drakelow and Stanton, we do not know these areas in sufficient detail to comment in detail, but a settlement boundary would seem appropriate

Question 10: Do you agree with the principles for assessing the settlement boundaries, as set out in Appendix 1?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

The principles appear to reasonably restrict excessive growth of a village etc. Etwall Parish Council is concerned that the current government policy on housing will over-ride these reasonable restraints and approve, on appeal, large developments outside the settlement boundaries.

Question 11: What issues regarding the settlement boundaries should the Council consider?

(Please provide a comment)

Etwall Parish Council believes that the issues set out in the text and appendix meet their requirements.

The draft Etwall Neighbourhood Plan contains the following provision:

Development boundaries that adjoin the open countryside should include trees and hedgerows to allow a soft transition to the surrounding fields.

Question 12: Do you agree with the retail hierarchy?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

The areas for major retail development are away from Etwall so will have no effect on the village. In Etwall and many villages, small shops are spread out and meet the needs of local residents

The draft Etwall Neighbourhood Plan contains the following provision:

Applications for hot food takeaways and fast-food outlets should be refused in accordance with NPPF (paragraph 97). Applications should also be refused where the new facility would have a negative effect on local residents.

Question 13: Should the Council redefine the retail centre in Swadlincote as a commercial centre which would allow for a wider range of uses?

☐ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Etwall Parish Council has no view on retail in Swadlincote as it is not an area where residents will shop due to travel constraints. Other more extensive retail areas are much easier to get to (Derby and Burton-on-Trent)

Question 14: What issues regarding Swadlincote Town Centre redevelopment should the Council consider?

(Please provide details)

As Question 13, Etwall Parish Council has no view on retail in Swadlincote

Question 15: Should the Council define the boundaries of all of the retail areas within the District?

☐ Yes

☒ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

As noted in Question 12, retail in villages does not need to be in a defined area.

Question 16: Should the Council include a locally specific Green Belt policy (beyond the NPPF policy) that defines what appropriate development is within the context of 'disproportionate' and 'limited infilling'?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Etwall Parish Council is in favour of Green Belt or similar restrictions around villages. An example is the current West of Mickleover proposal almost joining the small rural village of Burnaston to Derby. Villages are also at risk of being joined together, for example SHLAA sites 163 and 202 together with the Freeport will effectively join Hilton and Etwall together.

The draft Etwall Neighbourhood Plan contains the following provisions:

Residents of Etwall have made it clear that it is essential to maintain the separation between the village and neighbouring villages.

Infill proposals should not significantly reduce the privacy or amenity of adjoining properties.

Outside the Settlement Boundary, infill development will be limited to one or two dwellings to fill a small, restricted gap in an existing frontage within small groups of housing in accordance with LPP 2 BNE5. Exceptionally, where the proposal is adjoining the Settlement Boundary and is for up to 25 affordable dwellings, this would be in accordance with LPP 1 H1.

To minimise impact on the landscape, development on the edge of a built-up area should include a soft green boundary to the open countryside (potentially including native hedges and native trees).

Question 17: If you answered yes to question 16, what should the policy consider?

As noted in question 16, the aim of the policy should be to keep separate the unique character and community of individual villages etc. Villages becoming enveloped into an urban sprawl must be prevented

Question 18: Should the Council undertake a Green Belt review with a specific objective of identifying what, if any, Grey Belt exists within the district?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Unless current rules on Grey Belt are amended (unlikely) identification and the subsequent control of development of Grey Belt is required

Question 19: What other sites and/or options should the Council consider for providing Gypsy and Traveller accommodation?

(Please provide details)

Etwell Parish Council has no view on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation – we question “are current publicly funded provisions used”?

Question 20: Are there any other issues that the Council should consider when meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers?

(Please provide details)

Etwall Parish Council has no view on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation – we question “are current publicly funded provisions used” – if not no further provision is required

Question 21: Are there any additional policies/other issues that the Local Plan should address?

☐ Yes

☒ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Etwall Parish Council currently has no thoughts on the need for any additional policies.

Question 22: Are there any amendments required to the existing policies to reflect implemented changes to national planning policy, policy guidance or Regulations?

☐ Yes

☒ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

S106 and S278 monies should be prioritised to be spent in the parishes where the development will take place. If a community can see the benefits being invested in their community, they are more likely to agree to new developments.

Consider giving a grant per household to the relevant Parish (or to the nearest Key Service Village) where development will take place to allow investment in the local community (e.g. £1k per house)

The draft Etwall Neighbourhood Plan contains the following provisions:

Whilst Etwall Parish Council supports the implementation of renewable energy initiatives and the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification), proposals for large-scale installation of photovoltaic panels should be directed to areas with lower quality soils.

Question 23: Are there better/alternative mechanisms that the Council should use to secure the required infrastructure?

☐ Yes

☒ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Greater use should be made of the existing S106 and S278 mechanisms to ensure provision of the necessary extra infrastructure, services and facilities needed to support new development.

Consider ensuring that developers pay these requirements earlier in the process making greater use of stage payments.

Question 24: Where there is the potential need for long-term management / maintenance of open space, SUDS or other infrastructure, should the Council introduce a policy requiring these to be adopted by a public authority unless there is clear evidence that this is not feasible.

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Where these are provided as part of a development, it is essential that provision is made for a proper maintenance regime to be established. Whilst section 106 agreements generally place this as the responsibility of the development leaseholders via a management company, a back-up policy is required as we understand that some management companies currently set up are for individual developments and have limited expertise.

Question 25: Do you have any further/additional comments?

(Please provide details)

No