



View Response

Response #1306845

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

Date Started: 29 Jan 2026 13:38. Last modified: 29 Jan 2026 13:45

Status Complete

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).

We believe our client's site at land north of Derby Road, Melbourne, is well positioned to meet the District's remaining housing needs. The site extends to 2.07 acres of predominantly flat agricultural land benefitting from direct access off the Derby Road. Furthermore, it is immediately adjacent to application DMPA/2025/0438 which was recently allowed at appeal on 06/01/

2025, consenting up to 135 dwellings and thereby bringing the site adjacent to the settlement edge of Melbourne. Once built out, the site will be bound to the east by residential properties, with a small number of large residential properties already present to its south and west. The site is bound to the north by a small agricultural field and horticultural polytunnels.

It would form the next logical extension to Melbourne, a key service village within the District which benefits from an infant and junior school, vibrant retail centre and good community and green infrastructure.

The site can be accessed from the Derby Road, just off the B587, which provides onward access to the A453 (for East Midlands Airport and the M1 at Junction 23a) as well as northwards towards the Derby Southern bypass. The B587 also benefits from a bus route (Arriva Derby No 2 between Derby Bus Station and Swadlincote via Melbourne) along it, providing a genuine public transport offer within 200m of the site. The site has capacity for around 25 homes and does not have any constraints. It could therefore easily form a Part 2 Local Plan allocation to meet South Derybshire'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 support 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 has recently been unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply (PINS Ref: APP/F1040/W/25/3368728).

We consider the settlement boundary for Melbourne should be extended to include the appeal site as well as our client's land to the north of Derby Road, which together represent a logical north-western extension of the town.

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 and particularly principle 3 in that settlement boundaries should incorporate sites allocated for housing within the Local Plan Part 1 and 2. We also feel settlement boundaries should be drawn to include natural logical extensions to settlements to accommodate proportionate housing growth within the plan period.

11.

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

No more comments.

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

We note the draft NPPF published in December 2025 indicates that a clear distinction will be made between sites inside or outside of settlement boundaries. Under Policy S2, the draft policy intends that spatial strategies should (a) identify settlements and their boundaries, including any allocations that would ultimately form part of the settlement. We therefore encourage that Melbourne's settlement boundary is reviewed accordingly to enable development to come forward in accordance with expected future national

policy. As per draft NPPF policy S4, 'development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects'.

Conversely, policy S5 makes clear that the principle of development outside settlements is much more limited, and therefore it is crucial for the Council to pro-actively allocate Part 2 sites and amend settlement boundaries at this opportune moment in the plan making process.

Furthermore, 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 north of Derby Road, Melbourne, as a Part 2 allocation site which has the capacity to deliver around 25 homes in a logical and sustainable location which will soon abut the built extent of the town. A red line plan will be emailed across separately.

[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 for land north of Derby Road, which accompanies response #1306845 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]

South Derbyshire Part 2 Local Plan Review - Issues and Options

Your response on behalf of Mather Jamie on behalf of landowner at Derby Road, Melbourne 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](#)

VCID:3f3a363b-02a3-4690-8507-2c4bc87e3197.