View Response

Response #1306976

From	Howard Sharp & Partners [redacted]
Date	Started: 29 Jan 2026 17:38. Last modified: 29 Jan 2026 17:43
Status	Complete
First Name	[redacted]
Last Name	
Organisation	[redacted]
Visibility	Unknown.

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 option and provide a reason for your answer)

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

Please enter any additional comments

Our preferred approach is conditional on Part 1 examination outcome.

The optimal route forward depends on whether the fundamental strategic deficiencies in the emerging Part 1 Review can be remedied through

examination. A Part 2 Review would be the most efficient approach if the Part 1 Review is substantially modified through examination to include:

• Strategic policies that recognise and respond to the needs of Key Service Villages across the District, not only to the Derby urban fringe

• Allocations of medium-sized sites across the settlement hierarchy, to meet the needs closest to where they arise within and adjoining existing sustainable settlements. The December 2025 NPPF consultation document includes reference to medium development, strengthening the emphasis on the importance of a range of development scales and types to be allocated in a Plan.

• A more balanced spatial strategy that does not depend disproportionately on a small number of very large strategic sites

Fundamental Part 1 Strategy Weaknesses- As presently drafted, the Part 1 Review is unlikely to be sound because it:

1. Over-relies on very large strategic allocations on the Derby urban fringe. The two strategic sites (STRA1 and STRA2) are projected to deliver approximately 3,450 homes – roughly 24% of the overall requirement. This concentration creates significant risks:
• Delivery certainty depends on a small number of schemes with lengthy lead-in times and complex infrastructure requirements
• If either site slips in delivery, the entire housing supply trajectory is compromised
• This approach fails to meet the NPPF requirement to "allocate a mix of sites" and provide resilience in supply

2. Fails to respond to South Derbyshire's own district-wide housing needs. The strategic sites are explicitly allocated to respond to unmet Derby City needs, not to needs arising within South Derbyshire itself. Key Service Villages (Etwall, Aston-on-Trent, etc.) experience location-specific housing needs that cannot be met by allocations on the Derby fringe. This contradicts NPPF paragraph 63, which requires the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community to be assessed and reflected in policy.

3. Undermines the settlement hierarchy principle. The adopted Local Plan designates Key Service Villages as appropriate locations for growth, yet the Part 1 Review directs the vast majority of new housing to the Derby fringe, not to these sustainable villages. This represents a fundamental departure from the adopted strategy with no clear justification.

4. Creates a five-year supply crisis. Recent appeal decisions (including Melbourne) confirm that the district cannot maintain a five-year housing land supply with the current allocation strategy where the smaller and medium sites have reached or are reaching completion, demonstrating that the approach is already failing.

These deficiencies are so fundamental that they are unlikely to be resolved through minor modifications at examination. The Part 1 Review should acknowledge that:

• Additional allocations in Key Service Villages are required to meet locally arising needs and support the vitality of existing settlements. The Key Service Villages support other settlements further down the hierarchy too, but currently the strategy does not look beyond the Derby fringe.
• Medium-sized sites must be distributed across the settlement hierarchy
• Over-reliance on strategic Derby fringe sites is not soundly justified

If the Part 1 examination cannot secure these modifications, then a comprehensive single Local Plan review would be the most appropriate route. A piecemeal Part 2 approach would perpetuate the Part 1 deficiencies and would waste resources that should be deployed on a comprehensive strategy revision.

However, if the Council is to proceed with a Part 2 Review, it must allocate housing across the district to meet location-specific needs, particularly in Key Service Villages, not simply address a theoretical minimum shortfall of 57 homes.

2.

Where should the housing needs be met? (Please provide site details including projected delivery timescales and the specific need being met).

Housing needs should be met through a balanced portfolio comprising:

1. Strategic Derby fringe sites responding to unmet Derby City need; and
2. Proportionate allocations in the District's Key Service Villages responding to location-specific needs.

The Council has already confirmed that the headline 57-home shortfall is a theoretical minimum and that additional allocations may be required to provide flexibility and meet location-specific needs (page 8: "may be circumstances where additional homes are needed to address a shortfall of a specific type" and "may be need to address a specific need in an area").

The Council's evidence notes "the risk of lower delivery from 2032 onwards as allocated sites build out" and identifies an option "of allocating additional sites to the middle/latter period to maintain a consistent supply and provide protection from speculative development" (page 9). Allocating a broader range of deliverable sites in Key Service Villages (including Etwall and Aston-on-Trent) would diversify supply, reduce reliance on a small number of strategic sites with longer lead-in times, and address the five-year supply deficit evidenced by recent appeals.

Etwall has independently commissioned a Housing Needs Assessment by AECOM, which finds a requirement for between 206 and 310 dwellings. The emerging Development, comprising the Part 1, Part 2 and even the emerging Etwall Neighbourhood Plan for which the HNA was carried out, do nothing to provide for these identified needs. A similar exercise for each Key Service Village would generate an appropriate housing figure for each settlement. For example applying the same methodology for Aston on Trent generates a figure of between 149 and 195 dwellings to find up to 2040. The proposed strategy does not meet these needs in the location where they arise.

The adopted local plan has demonstrated a successful strategy of meeting housing needs in the locations where they arise, with medium sized allocations in the more sustainable settlements across the District. The

emerging plan only relies on the Derby urban fringe allocations and finding 57 more homes through this Part 2 will not achieve sustainable development for South Derbyshire as a whole.

Etwall – Land off Peregrine Avenue and Willington Road – SHLAA sites 001, 043 and 044

Location and relationship to settlement - Providence Land promote two sites at Etwall, both to the south east of the village at Peregrine Avenue and Willington Road (043 and 044, with a further parcel 001 at Willington All. Both are:

• Adjoining the existing built-up area, with clear physical and functional relationship to the village, enclosed by the A50 and the Toyota factory.
• Well located to access primary and secondary education, village centre facilities and public transport
• Outside the Green Belt, reducing pressure on protected land

The sites form logical, modest extensions in line with the settlement boundary principles in Appendix 1 of the consultation document, which favour including land whose curtilage and character clearly relate to the built form of the settlement, and which avoid "incongruous" protrusions into the countryside.

Scale and mix - collectively, the Etwall sites can deliver around 210 dwellings, including:

• A full policy-compliant 30% affordable housing (63 units), with the ability to emphasise Social Rent consistent with NPPF paragraph 64
• A material component of smaller market and affordable homes for younger households and first-time buyers
• A meaningful proportion of bungalows and accessible homes, responding to an ageing population and NPPF expectations on accessible and adaptable housing (NPPF paragraphs 63 and 83; Draft 2025 NPPF policy HO5)

This mix is directly aligned with the Etwall Housing Needs Assessment (July 2024), which demonstrates a clear need for:
• Smaller family homes (1-3 bedrooms) and affordable tenure products

• Accessible/single-storey accommodation for older households that cannot be met within the current, tightly drawn settlement boundary

Delivery timescales - the Etwall sites are in single, promotable ownership with no abnormal constraints. They can:
• Commence delivery within 2–3 years of allocation, making a material contribution to the five-year housing land supply
• Build out at typical Key Service Village rates, supporting the NPPF's emphasis on small and medium-sized sites that are often built out relatively quickly (paragraph 73)

In contrast to complex strategic sites, Etwall has no large, up-front strategic infrastructure requirements that would delay first completions.

Specific needs being met - the Etwall sites are particularly well placed to deliver:
• Local needs identified in the Etwall HNA
• Affordable housing to meet parish-level requirements, potentially with local lettings priorities
• Housing for older people and those with disabilities, consistent with NPPF paragraphs 63 and 82
• Additional population to support the vitality of Etwall's centre and community facilities, in line with NPPF paragraph 83 (supporting rural services and the vitality of rural communities)

Aston-on-Trent – Land at Moor Lane (SHELAA sites 047 and 048)

Location and relationship to settlement - land at Moor Lane lies adjacent to the built form of Aston-on-Trent and can:

• Form a logical extension to the existing settlement in landscape and townscape terms
• Be accessed from the existing highway network without giving rise to unacceptable highway impacts
• Avoid environmental constraints

Under Appendix 1 principles, Moor Lane is typical of land which should be

considered for inclusion within an extended settlement boundary because it is physically and functionally related to the village and capable of accommodating proportionate growth.

Scale and mix - Moor Lane has the capacity to deliver a significant number of dwellings, including:

• A full 30% affordable housing
• Specialist and accessible accommodation for older residents

A settlement-level HNA for Aston, to the same methodology as AECOM's for Etwall, would almost certainly demonstrate needs that cannot be met within the existing boundary, given the tight envelope and scarcity of suitable infill land. Allocating Moor Lane allows the plan to respond positively to this likely evidence.

Delivery timescales- oor Lane is also capable of early delivery, with first completions realistically achievable within 3–4 years of allocation, again supporting the five-year supply and reducing reliance on a small number of strategic sites with long lead-in times.

Specific needs being met - the Aston site can deliver:
• Affordable housing for local households, helping to maintain community cohesion and inter-generational balance
• Bungalows and accessible homes for older residents, consistent with the district's ageing demographic profile in the SA Scoping Report
• Additional population to support Aston's local centre and services, contributing to the NPPF objective of enabling villages to grow and thrive (paragraph 83)

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)? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

Please enter any additional comments

NPPF paragraphs 82 and 83 are explicit that rural housing should reflect local needs and that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this supports services, including recognising that development in one village may support services in another nearby settlement.

Allocations at Etwall and Aston implement this national policy locally by:

• Meeting local housing needs where they arise
• Supporting existing education, health and community infrastructure
• Providing a more balanced spatial strategy than one dominated by Derby-fringe strategic sites

In addition to allocations, the plan should:

(i) Review and extend settlement boundaries for Key Service Villages including Etwall and Aston-on-Trent, in accordance with Appendix 1 principles, to enable appropriate village-edge development to come forward

(ii) Support small and medium sized sites and appropriate windfalls within existing settlements, including through the tools identified in NPPF para 73 (e.g. permission in principle, Local Development Orders, subdivision of larger sites)

(iii) Positive development management policies that support village-edge allocations and flexible settlement boundaries, so that sites such as Peregrine Avenue, Willington Road and Moor Lane can be brought forward without unnecessary delay

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)? (Please provide an answer to your question)

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please enter any additional comments

The Council's inability to demonstrate a robust five-year housing land supply, evidenced by a recent appeal decision at Melbourne, is a critical risk. To deliver the right homes in the right places:

• The Plan must not depend predominantly on a small number of large Derby-fringe sites with lengthy lead-in periods
• It should instead bring forward a wider mix of readily deliverable village sites, such as the Etwall and Aston sites, which can deliver within the first 5 years and provide the smaller, affordable and accessible homes that the NPPF identifies as needed for different groups in the community (paragraphs 63–64, 82–83)
• It should make full use of small and medium sites to support delivery and diversification, in line with NPPF paragraph 73

Allocating the Providence Land sites at Etwall and Aston would meaningfully improve both the quantum and the resilience of the Council's five-year supply.

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)

The Plan should allocate sites capable of delivering:

• Smaller market and affordable homes suited to younger households and first-time buyers in Key Service Villages such as Etwall and Aston
• Bungalows and accessible housing for older people, which is particularly relevant given evidence of an ageing population in the district (SA Scoping Report, section 2.4), with higher proportions of older residents in rural communities
• Specialist older persons housing, where appropriate and where local needs are demonstrated
• A full 30% affordable housing where viable

The Etwall Housing Needs Assessment provides direct evidence of these needs at that settlement. Similar evidence would justify allocations at Aston and other Key Service Villages.

6.

What could the Council do to speed up delivery on strategic allocations? (Please provide details)

Strategic allocations should be retained but supported, not substituted, by a wider distribution of smaller sites. To speed up delivery the Council should:

• Front-load key infrastructure planning and funding agreements for STRA1 and STRA2
• Phase strategic sites realistically, recognising their lengthy lead-in times
• In parallel, allocate and bring forward smaller village sites (Etwall, Aston and other Key Service Villages) that can deliver quickly and are less infrastructure-dependent

This dual approach will avoid over-reliance on a small number of complex schemes and provide early housing supply to meet the five-year requirement.

7.

Should the Council allocate land South of Mackworth for development within the plan period? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please enter any additional comments

Subject to ensuring coordinated delivery with adjoining land in Amber Valley and necessary infrastructure. However, South of Mackworth should not be seen as a substitute for village allocations. Strategic Derby fringe growth mainly addresses Derby's unmet need and must be complemented by allocations within South Derbyshire's own settlements to meet local needs in places such as Etwall and Aston.

8.

Are there other steps that the Council could take to accelerate housing delivery on other sites? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please enter any additional comments

The Plan should:

• Allocate a broader mix of small and medium sites across the settlement hierarchy, with particular emphasis on Key Service Villages such as Etwall and Aston where Providence Land's sites can deliver quickly and at scale

• Include clear, positively-worded policies to support appropriate village-edge allocations and flexible settlement boundaries, so that sites such as Peregrine

Avenue, Willington Road and Moor Lane can be brought forward without unnecessary delay

• Use the allocation process to confirm that sites meet NPPF soundness criteria (para 36) regarding reasonable alternatives and deliverability, providing certainty for early delivery

• Support self-build/custom build and subdivision of larger sites in village locations, consistent with NPPF para 73

9.

Do you agree that settlement boundaries should be drawn around the urban edge of Derby, Drakelow and Stanton and any new allocations? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please enter any additional comments

Defined settlement boundaries around Derby, Drakelow and Stanton and around any new allocations will help provide clarity. However, the same principle should apply consistently to all settlements, with boundaries reviewed and extended where necessary (for example at Etwall and Aston) to reflect on-the-ground development and to accommodate appropriate future growth identified through allocation.

10.

Do you agree with the principles for assessing the settlement boundaries, as set out in Appendix 1? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

Please enter any additional comments

Broadly yes, but the principles should be applied flexibly so they do not prevent proportionate extensions at sustainable settlements. In particular:

• Land that is clearly functionally and physically related to the settlement (as per Principle 3(a) and (c)) – such as the Etwall and Aston promoted sites – should be considered for inclusion within extended settlement boundaries where it helps to meet identified local needs and supports the settlement's role in the hierarchy
• The principles should not be interpreted as rigidly preserving outdated boundaries against evidence of new needs
• Principle 4(f) regarding "playing fields and areas of open space at the edge of settlements" should not be applied inflexibly where superior open space and green infrastructure can be achieved through well-designed development allocations

11.

What issues regarding the settlement boundaries should the Council consider? (Please provide a comment)

Key issues include:

• Outdated boundaries: Existing boundaries were set almost a decade ago and no longer reflect development, needs or housing land supply constraints

• Unmet local needs: Many Key Service Villages (including Etwall and Aston) cannot accommodate identified or likely needs within their current boundaries

• Five-year supply: Overly tight boundaries risk undermining the settlement hierarchy and pushing growth disproportionately to the Derby fringe,

exacerbating the five-year supply crisis

• Service provision: Boundaries should enable sufficient growth to support and maintain local services and community facilities, consistent with NPPF para 83

• Proportionality: Different settlements should have boundaries proportionate to their role in the hierarchy and their identified needs

The Part 2 Plan should revisit boundaries comprehensively, ensuring they enable, rather than restrict, sustainable village growth

12.

Do you agree with the retail hierarchy? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please enter any additional comments

The retail hierarchy is logical and reflects the current pattern of centres. Allocating new housing in Key Service Villages such as Etwall and Aston will support the long-term vitality of village centres by reinforcing local catchments and spending power.

13.

Should the Council redefine the retail centre in Swadlincote as a commercial centre which would allow for a wider range of uses? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- ( ) Yes

- [ ] No

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

14.

What issues regarding Swadlincote Town Centre redevelopment should the Council consider? (Please provide details)

«No response»

15.

Should the Council define the boundaries of all of the retail areas within the District? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

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'? (Please provide a

reason for your answer)

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please enter any additional comments

A locally specific policy could provide greater certainty for applicants and decision-makers. However, this should not distract from the main source of new housing supply, which should come from non-Green Belt locations identified through the Part 2 Plan, including sustainable village extensions such as Etwall and Aston.

17.

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

The policy should:

• Define "disproportionate" extensions and "limited infilling" in quantitative and qualitative terms, providing clarity

• Ensure that any Green Belt development remains genuinely small-scale and consistent with Green Belt purposes

• Be aligned with national policy so as not to weaken Green Belt protection where it is justified

18.

Should the Council undertake a Green Belt review with a specific objective of identifying what, if any, Grey Belt exists within the district? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- ( ) Yes
- (•) No

Please enter any additional comments

Effort is better focused on preparing a Part 2 Plan that allocates non-Green Belt land in sustainable locations to meet identified needs. A Green Belt/"grey belt" review would be resource-intensive and is not necessary to meet current housing requirements, given the availability of suitable sites at Etwall, Aston and other non-Green Belt locations.

19.

What other sites and/or options should the Council consider for providing Gypsy and Traveller accommodation? (Please provide details)

«No response»

20.

Are there any other issues that the Council should consider when meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers? (Please provide details)

«No response»

21.

Are there any additional policies/other issues that the Local Plan should address? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- (•) Yes

- [ ] No

Please enter any additional comments

Several policies relating to housing in the countryside and settlement boundaries will need to be revisited through the Part 2 Review to ensure they are consistent with the revised spatial strategy, new national policy and the need for proportionate growth at Key Service Villages. Policies should positively support allocations and appropriate infill in sustainable locations.

22.

Are there any amendments required to the existing policies to reflect implemented changes to national planning policy, policy guidance or Regulations? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

Please enter any additional comments

The Part 2 Plan should include updated policies on:

• Specialist older persons housing and accessible homes, particularly in Key Service Villages where older person accommodation needs are evident

• Design expectations in village extensions, to ensure high quality, context-responsive development in settlements like Etwall and Aston

• Village-edge development, positively framed to support proportionate growth in sustainable locations

23.

Are there better/alternative mechanisms that the Council should use to secure the required infrastructure? (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please enter any additional comments

The Plan should ensure that infrastructure planning recognises the role of Key Service Villages as growth locations. This includes:

• Education and healthcare capacity in villages experiencing allocations (Etwall in particular has identified needs)

• Walking and cycling links between new village developments and existing services and facilities

• Public transport connectivity from villages to Swadlincote, Derby and other employment centres

• Utilities and drainage, ensuring sufficient capacity for proportionate growth

• Digital infrastructure, enabling rural communities to access broadband and services

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. (Please provide a reason for your answer)

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

25.

Do you have any further/additional comments? (Please provide details)

The key issue is that a housing requirement for the Part 2 Plan of only 57 homes is insufficient given:

• The evidence of five-year supply deficit (recent appeals)

• Location-specific needs identified in the Etwall HNA and likely to be evident in other Key Service Villages

• The NPPF requirement to "significantly boost" housing supply and meet needs across all settlements

• The principle that housing should be allocated where local needs arise, to support settlement viability

The Part 2 Plan should make clear that this is not simply a minimum-compliance exercise but should deliver a spatial strategy that:

• Responds positively to identified village-level needs (paras 82–83, NPPF)
• Supports five-year housing land supply resilience
• Implements the settlement hierarchy principle
• Provides flexibility for plan changes

The Council should use the Part 2 Plan to deliver:

1. A balanced mix of housing allocations combining strategic Derby fringe sites with proportionate allocations in Key Service Villages

2. Allocations at Etwall (around 210 dwellings comprising Peregrine Avenue and Willington Road sites) responding to evidenced local needs in the Etwall HNA for smaller properties, affordable housing and older persons accommodation

3. Allocation at Aston (Moor Lane) to meet likely location-specific needs in this Key Service Village

4. Settlement boundary extensions at Etwall, Aston and other Key Service Villages to enable appropriate village-edge growth

5. Clear, positive development management policies supporting village allocations and enabling early, phased delivery

6. A more resilient housing supply with deliverable sites coming forward across 5-15 year period, not concentrated on strategic sites with lengthy lead-in times

NPPF Compliance - This approach would accord with the NPPF:

• Paragraphs 15–16: Planning for a sustainable future with positive, plan-led strategy
• Paragraph 36: Soundness criteria including reasonable alternatives and deliverability
• Paragraph 61: Significantly boosting housing supply with variety and choice
• Paragraph 63: Housing for different groups, including older people
• Paragraphs 72–73: Identifying sufficient land and maintaining 5-year supply, with allocation of medium-sized sites across the settlement hierarchy
• Paragraphs 82–83: Rural housing reflecting local needs and enabling villages to grow and thrive

Key

Site Boundary
7.93Ha

Public Open Space

Residential Development
Parcel 1 - 1 Ha - Circa 25 dwellings
Parcel 2 - 2 Ha - Circa 62 dwellings
Total - 3 Ha - Circa 87 dwellings
Dwelling numbers dependent on housing mix shown at 30dph

Aston Medical Centre
New GP Surgery with Parking

Existing Trees & Hedgerows
Source: Topographical Survey

Illustrative Landscape Strategy

Sustainable Urban Drainage System
Drainage Basins

Pedestrian/Cycle Routes
Vehicle free routes

Public Right of Way
Aston-on-Trent SD25/2 across site

Childrens Play Space
NEAP or LEAP

Trim Trail
Play route along PRoW

Pedestrian Connections
From the site to the wider settlement

Vehicular Site Access
From Elmands Close

Street Hierarchy
Street, Lane, Shared Private Drive

0 25 50 m

ASTON-ON-TRENT PRIMARY SCHOOL
DERBY ROAD
MOOR LANE
ELMANDS CLOSE
HEATHCLOSE
PUMP STATION
NEUTRAL GRASSLAND
NORTHERN PARK
EXISTING BOUNDARY REINFORCED
PARCEL 1
ASTON MEDICAL CENTRE
CENTRAL GREEN
PROW SD25/2
PROW SD25/1
RETAINED PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY
PROW SD25/1
PARCEL 2
MANOR FARM GREEN
MANOR FARM ROAD
SOUTHERN PARK
POTENTIAL COMMUNITY ALLOTMENTS / GARDENS
POTENTIAL COMMUNITY ORCHARD
LEAP/NEAP
JUNIOR FOOTBALL PITCH
VILLAGE CENTRE
LEAP
BASKETBALL COURT
CRICKET PITCH
PLAYING FIELD
ADULT FOOTBALL PITCH
PAVILION
SHARDLOW ROAD
SHARDLOW ROAD

Planning | Design | Environment | Economics | Heritage
East Midlands
www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Land off Elmands Close, Aston-on-Trent, South Derbyshire - Illustrative Masterplan

Date: 10/02/26 I Scale: 1:1250@A1 I DRG:P20-1923_005 Sheet No: 01 Rev:C I Client: Providence Land I

Pegasus Group

HOWARD SHARP
& PARTNERS

Limited Liability Partnership
Chartered Surveyors
Chartered Town Planners

[redacted]

Steffan Saunders Esq
Chief Planner
South Derbyshire Council
Civic Offices, Civic Way,
Swadlincote,
Derbyshire
DE11 0AH

11-2-20

Dear Mr Saunders,

Local Plan Part 2 Review. Land at Aston Phase 2 - Moor lane and Elmands Close.

As you know we submitted comments on time on the Part 2 Review.

We referenced community facilities but wish to emphasise that we are in touch with Doctors who want a new surgery within the site.

In particular references made to the submission we put in, the following sections are particularly relevant to this infrastructure/community provision.

Section 2	Reference to 'Aston's local centre and services'
Section 3	We refer to supporting health and community infrastructure.
Section 11	Settlement boundaries, see point 4. The Doctors' medical centre needs to be provided as part of the boundary reviews.
Section 23	We specially refer to healthcare. (see bullet point 2)

To explain and give back up to our submissions in respect of Aston, please find attached (enclosed) a master plan for the site.

Please see position of the medical centre located to serve both the existing development on Elmands Close and, hopefully the new development. We have met with the Senior Partner of the medical practice and been in active touch with the Health Service administrative team.

Therefore, we urge the Aston phase 2 site with the health provision is the right site to bring forward the surgery with adequate space around. The present surgery is very constricted, this was explained to us when we met the Senior Partner at the Doctors' practice.

If you need further information, please contact us. We have control over the site so can achieve implementation. The sooner we can start the detailed negotiations the better.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Dear all,

Didn't manage to look at the inboxes yesterday. It would appear that this is the Moor Lane Masterplan associated with the reps that were made by Howard Sharp and Partners that Amanda may have been looking for. I found their Reps yesterday, [redacted] but here is the plan which of course they could not upload themselves.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

South Derbyshire District Council

Shape our Environment | Drive our Economy | Support our Comm

Any advice is given at officer level only and does not prejudice any formal decision the Council makes in the future.

[redacted]

CAUTION! This Email was sent from outside SDDC. Only open links and attachments you're expecting. Report

Dear Mr Saunders,

Local Plan Part 2 Review. Land at Aston Phase 2 - Moor lane and Elmands Close.

As you know we submitted comments on time on the Part 2 Review.

We referenced community facilities but wish to emphasise that we are in touch with Doctors who want a new surgery within the site.

In particular references made to the submission we put in, the following sections are particularly relevant to this infrastructure/community provision.

Section 2 Reference to 'Aston's local centre and services'
Section 3 We refer to supporting health and community infrastructure.
Section 11 Settlement boundaries, see point 4. The Doctors' medical centre needs to be provided as part of the boundary reviews.
Section 23 We specially refer to healthcare. (see bullet point 2)

To explain and give back up to our submissions in respect of Aston, please find attached (enclosed) a master plan for the site.

Please see position of the medical centre located to serve both the existing development on Elmands Close and, hopefully the new development. We have met with the Senior Partner of the medical practice and been in active touch with the Health Service administrative team.

Therefore, we urge the Aston phase 2 site with the health provision is the right site to bring forward the surgery with adequate space around. The present surgery is very constricted, this was explained to us when we met the Senior Partner at the Doctors' practice.

If you need further information, please contact us. We have control over the site so can achieve implementation. The sooner we can start the detailed negotiations the better.

Yours sincerely,