



Safety Health and Environmental Information		A2								
The following risks are identified as unusual or unfamiliar to a competent contractor										
CONSTRUCTION RISKS There are no significant or unfamiliar risks										
DEMOLITION RISKS (FUTURE) There are no significant or unfamiliar risks										
It is assumed that all work will be carried out by a competent contractor working, where appropriate, to an approved method statement										
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; border-radius: 50%; margin-right: 5px;"></div> Existing Trees </div> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: yellow; border-radius: 50%; margin-right: 5px;"></div> Proposed Treess </div> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: green; border-radius: 5px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> Existing Hedges </div> <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: yellow; border-radius: 5px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> Proposed Hedges </div>										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">REV</td> <td style="width: 50%;">DATE</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>			REV	DATE						
REV	DATE									
 brownhill hayward brown chartered architects <small>01543 254357 - mail@bhbarchitects.co.uk</small>										
Land off The Castle Way, Willington Proposed Masterplan Central England Cooperative		DRAWING NO. 3447-06 REV DATE - Aug '19								
PLANNING		DRAWN CHECKED SCALE RRR MW 1:500 @ A2								
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>  ISO 9001 REGISTERED DATA </div> <div>  ISO 14001 REGISTERED ENV </div> </div>		PART OF 								

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

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

[Report](#)

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Please find attached the red line and concept plan for land south of Castle Way, Willington, which accompanies response #1307146 to the Part 2 Issues and Options consultation, on behalf of my client.

I'd be grateful if you could confirm receipt.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

South Derbyshire Part 2 Local Plan Review - Issues and Options

Your response on behalf of Mather Jamie on behalf of the Central England Co-operative Ltd has been received.

You can view your response at any time using the following link. You can also change your response at any time until the consultation closes.

[View your response](#)

View Response

Response #1307146

From [Mather Jamie on behalf of the...](#)

Date Started: 30 Jan 2026 12:04. Last modified: 30 Jan 2026 12:09

Status Complete

Title

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

We believe the Council should produce a Local Plan Part 2 Review, given the

advanced stage of their Local Plan Part 1 which is expected to be submitted to the Secretary of State circa Spring 2026, for Examination in Public. The Local Plan Part 1 has been based on evidence based housing numbers determined through a collaborative approach with the Housing Market Area councils of Derby City and Amber Valley. The figure of at least 14,500 dwellings to be delivered between the plan period of 2022 to 2041 reflects the needs of both the district and Derby City's unmet need. Although the Part 1 Plan is being progressed under the Government's transitional arrangements and the December 2023 version of the NPPF, because of this evidenced based approach to its housing requirements, the Part 1 Local Plan actually exceeds the new standard housing method's requirements for 606 homes per annum, by planning for 763 homes per annum. Therefore the Local Plan Part 2 will be, by extension, reflect this evidenced-based and up-to-date housing need also, despite the plan being progressed under the 2023 NPPF. Given that Local Government Reform will not be in place and fully operational until 1st April 2028 , and that reorganisation as big as that proposed is inevitably going to subject to delays and challenges, it is imperative that plan making continues under the existing system to ensure South Derbyshire has an adopted and effective Local Plan in place. To provide certainty to the planning industry we urge the Council to continue with its Local Plan Part 2 review.

2.

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

Housing within the district should be located in the most sustainable locations offering easy access to local community facilities, shops and public transport options, adjacent to existing built form.

We believe our client's site at land south of Castle Way, Willington, which sits at the western edge of Willington within South Derbyshire, is a logical extension to the village and to meet the District's remaining housing needs. The site, which extends to 2.66 ha (6.57 acres), comprises agricultural land bounded by residential properties to the north, a highway depot to the east, a small row of properties and farmland to the west and canal to the south. The

site is unconstrained and represents an opportunity to join the properties to the west and north along The Castle Way to the built form of Willington to the east.

The village itself is well serviced with a train station within a 5 minute walk that provides direct connections to Derby, Nottingham, Burton on Trent and Birmingham New Street. The site therefore offers a genuinely sustainable location for new housing development. Indeed, draft NPPF policy S5 (H) 'principle of development outside settlements' states that development for housing and mixed-use development should be approved where it is within a reasonable walking distance of a railway station. The site also within easy walking of a primary school, local shops and community facilities.

The site has capacity for around 25 homes and could help to meet South Derbyshire's housing needs.

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)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please enter any additional comments

We commend the Council's pro-active approach to meeting its housing need by considering that additional sites may need to be allocated beyond the minimum requirements, to ensure there is a consistent and certain land supply. This is especially the case given the Council's has recently been unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply (PINS Ref: APP/F1040/W/25/3368728).

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

No comment

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)

No comment

6.

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

No comment

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

No comment

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

Allocating sites is the key way to accelerate housing delivery in the District, to provide developers with certainty. The Council could also explore lighter touch PPAs for smaller less complex sites which offer a fast track and dedicated service for planning applications but do not attract the same burdensome costs as strategic scale sites. The drawn out lengthy timescales for obtaining planning permission is the single largest delay to housing delivery at present.

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

No comment.

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)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please enter any additional comments

We agree with the principles broadly set out. We agree that settlement boundaries should incorporate sites allocated for housing within the Local Plan Part 1 and 2.

11.

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

The Council should consider where boundaries should be extended in order to allow proportionate logical extensions to the built form to come forward through the planning system.

12.

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please enter any additional comments

No comment

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 comment

14.

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

No comment

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 comment

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

No comment

17.

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

«No response»

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

No comment

19.

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

No comment

20.

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

No comment

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

No comment

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)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please enter any additional comments

Local Plan policy should reflect the Government's focus on promoting development for housing around rail stations, as per policy S5 of the draft NPPF.

Additionally, the NPPF advises at paragraph 22 that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption, so there is very likely to be a need for the plan period to be extended beyond 2041. This would likely increase the housing shortfall further, which would need to be addressed.

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

For smaller sites below 100 homes, we feel s106 agreements represent the most proportionate route to secure the infrastructure required on or off site. We also welcome the Government's intention to prepare standardised templates for s106 agreements which we hope would speed up the process and provide greater financial certainty for smaller scale sites, and urge SDDC to consider utilising this should it be implemented.

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)

☐ Yes

☒ No

Please enter any additional comments

We do not think a policy is required to express this. If the local authority is willing to adopt open spaces, SUDs and other infrastructure then they should discuss and agree this through the s106 agreement. However, flexibility should be maintained within the planning system, and management companies should remain options for the long-term management of such spaces without a policy restricting this possibility.

25.

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

We would welcome the consideration of our client's site at land South of Castle Way, Willington which has the capacity to deliver around 25 homes in a logical and sustainable location within 5 minutes walking distance of a train station. A red line plan will be emailed across separately.