

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

Respondent details

Name*: SAVE Secretary – [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Agent details (where applicable)

Name*: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

*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

- *Why? To protect us from unplanned speculative development locally.*

Question 2: Where should housing needs be met?

- *We would prefer to see Derby City's housing needs supported from brownfield development within the city instead of continuing development on greenfield developments in what remains of rural South Derbyshire. The East Midlands Mayor's fund for making brown field sites more developable should be used to encourage the use of brown field sites. That said, we are very comfortable with the council's strategy of large-scale strategic housing development, planned in parallel with the supporting infrastructure, leaving the rural villages to fulfil local needs on a windfall basis.*
- *This is a virtue borne of necessity! Aston and Weston have a legacy of decades of small to mid-sized developments layered on top of an infrastructure designed to support small rural villages. Our highways, sewerage and secondary schools are beyond capacity; health provision is constantly under pressure; and the sustainability of our claim to being rural villages is at severe risk with developers holding options on swathes of the remaining BMV fields - some of those fields have SHELAAs, others do not. Our remaining woodland, trees, hedgerows and the biodiversity they sustain - including rare species like Purple Emperor - are under constant threat. Public transport remains inadequate and safety is a constant issue given the number of cars in the villages, insufficient parking and the propensity of drivers to use the villages as rat runs. Increasing numbers of delivery vehicles are adding to the problem. Fleets of vans supply goods which cannot be purchased locally, or cannot be obtained by people who do not have access to retail outlets. Heritage properties with shallow foundations in and around Aston's conservation area risk being undermined by heavy traffic. Flooding from surface water is*

*an ongoing challenge. Noise is an ongoing and increasing problem. Noise pollution results from increased traffic at East Midlands Airport and the logistics infrastructure encouraged by the East Midlands Freeport. Increased noise levels are a result of 24 hour aircraft, road and rail operation. Light pollution is already challenging from the warehousing in NW Leicestershire, with the prospect of further logistical development proposed south of the A50 (SHELAA 61) right up to Weston's Parish Boundary and in Shardlow (SHELAA 199). We have few if any brownfield sites. Our position is that **neither Aston nor Weston can tolerate further housing beyond windfall developments within settlement boundaries until the challenges above are resolved and development can proceed sustainably***

- *We understand AECOM's Derby Housing Market Area (HMA) Growth Options Study to be the 'Growth Options Study' newly referred in the 12 SHELAA documents pertaining to proposed developments for the area. That document is an excellent resource within the evidence base and well comprehends the Trent villages in Aston Ward and beyond. Every one of these developments is on BMV agricultural land, outside settlement boundaries – 9 already have developer interest. They total 760-802 additional dwellings on 41.53ha of land that will be irredeemably lost to agriculture over 5-10 years. 10 of the 12 are marked as 'red' against the Growth Options Study. **SHELAA 80 and 107 are marked as 'Green' but it's hard to see why.** Beyond the issues noted above, SHELAA 80 is sited on Chellaston Lane with an inescapably narrow single-track bridge over the A50 – already a pinch point on what is a very busy road that acts as a 'rat run' between Chellaston and Aston. SHELAA 107 directly impacts the separation of the two villages and was already refused in 2017 and 2019 (Gladman Homes). Sometimes it feels like we're under siege!*

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)?

- *Settlement boundaries for Aston and Weston should remain as they are.*

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

Yes, it's hard to see how Planning can proceed in a rules-based direction without these basic tools. The settlement boundary for the urban edge of Derby is important for Aston and Weston

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

- *As previously advised in the Local Plan Part 1 review and prior, Aston's and Weston's positions in the settlement hierarchy must be corrected. Weston's available services do not warrant Weston being classified as a local service village – it is a rural village. Aston is also a small village as noted in the Growth Options Study, it cannot grow more than it already has without radically altering its rural character; developing north toward the A50 and becoming indistinguishable from any other suburb of Derby; or encroaching upon its neighbours in Weston and Shardlow. It's size and services also indicate it would be more accurately classified as a Local Service Village instead of a Key Service Village.*

Question 12: Do you agree with the retail hierarchy?

☒Yes & ☒No

- *Aston's position in the existing retail hierarchy is fair. Weston has no retail outlets so its inclusion in the retail hierarchy is unreasonable.*

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

☒Yes ☐No

Retail has an important part to play in the heart of Aston in particular. It is important that retail in South Derbyshire is categorised against the same structures as other areas to enable fair rules based planning going forward. (Should Weston's admittedly very small retail heart also be recognised?). Weston does not have any retail outlets, so there is no retail area. Until these exist it is unreasonable to include Weston in the retail hierarchy.

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)

Extension to the Green Belt should be considered to protect rural villages in the Trent Valley from the southwards development of Derby City. Without clarity, accidents will happen.

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

The Green Belt defined in Map 1; Nottingham-Derby Green Belt, should be extended southwards and westwards to protect the rural villages in the Trent Valley. Development of

the East Midlands Freeport has already encouraged the development of industrial and logistics sites in South Derbyshire and in neighbouring Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire. The East Midlands Mayor's "Irresistible to Invest: A Vision for Growth" strategy document identifies the Trent Arc as an area for investment focus. This area could see twice as much growth as all of the rest of Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire put together. These policies run the risk of creating an area of excessive development in the triangle between Derby, Nottingham and Leicester where each county dumps the development that is not wanted elsewhere. A strong Green Belt policy will give some protection to the rural communities in the Trent Valley.

AECOM's "Derby Housing Market Area (HMA) Growth Options Study" (August 2021) shows area D3: Derby A50 Corridor South Extension to be a suitable area for Strategic Growth. But the report goes on to say "Development south of the A50 Derby bypass is adjudged to be unsuitable due to the risk of increasing perceived sprawl of the city of Derby. There is also the possibility of coalescence between settlements south of the A50, such as Stenson, Swarkestone, Aston-on-Trent, Barrow-on-Trent and Weston-on-Trent." The report recommendations should be followed and no development allowed in Weston-on-Trent.

For this iteration of the Local Plan part 2, SDDC should only permit windfall developments within the settlement boundaries.

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Aston & Weston have seen several developments where smaller houses have been demolished and replaced by much larger and more expensive houses on the same plot. This has reduced the supply of more affordable housing. Increasing the requirements help to restore the balance. Weston & Aston centres are characterized by buildings of many different styles, with only a few small groups of identical buildings. New developments should follow this style and self-build and custom house building could contribute to this. Care needs to be taken to ensure a mix of house sizes so that there is a good supply of smaller, affordable houses. Housing density for any new development should match the existing housing density in Weston & Aston Village and Parish. Infill can lead to very cluttered villagescapes. Infill should only be allowed where there

is adequate space for a new building, without going significantly below the average housing density for the area. Given the need for food security and the likely future need for biofuels to reduce CO2 emissions, the Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land should be protected. For rural areas, there should be a focus on high building standards for new

builds and retrofitting improved insulation and the fitting of solar panels and heat pumps on older property.

Blue infrastructure, such as rivers, are not easily accessible. A policy should open up footpaths along all exiting waterways and provide access to the water for watersports users. Villages like Weston-on-Trent are surrounded by farmland, often identified for future development, so there is little public open space for people to access. The provision of public open space should be a condition of future development. Biodiversity Net Gain should be set at 20%, with an emphasis on tree planting, and should be an integral part of any new development. No off-site compensation allowed, as this could easily be reversed in future.

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

- We need clarity on how housing supply is managed and on what rules apply if housing supply is judged insufficient and local planning rules no longer apply. Eg What is the tilted balance and how does it apply? We wish to attend any hearings related to District Council or Planning Inspectorate reviews of the Local Plan.*

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, 100% on both counts! It's simply not reasonable to expect management companies to be able to achieve the same economies of scale, customer service and ecological accountability as a local council can for public open spaces.*
- The same goes for SUDS, but SUDS needs to be addressed alongside the overall water infrastructure – across surface water and sewerage at least, ideally clean water too. Today we have a mess of private and STW managed water mains and sewerage with no obvious single point of accountability. This seems to mean nobody is responsible.*
- We've heard many times that developers have been told over the decades that the sewerage system in Aston can't cope with any more houses, but developments still continue to go ahead. A case in point: Cameron's Ashwood Grange Development – now Elmlands and Heath Close has an expensive but functional pumped sewerage system that has not been adopted by Severn Trent Water and looks unlikely to ever be because it doesn't meet their standards. We're told that no one apart from Cameron knows how it is set up, not even the management company. The problem is that since that development went live, residents in the Manor Farm Road area and roads adjoining have experienced*

worsening issues with toilets that back up, showers that don't drain, and flooding from drains that carry raw sewage in both roads and properties. STW are on stand by to deal with the problems and regularly sent tankers to take the waste away, but when asked tell the residents that there's nothing they can do because our sewerage system was designed for a small village and we've not been one of those for a long time. Although the developer clearly established credible albeit expensive surface and dirty water solutions for their own developments, nobody appears responsible for the impact on the homes built many years ago when surface water and waste shared the same drains when the overall sewerage system met capacity. This is a clear case of developers implementing solutions for their immediate development while avoiding responsibility for the bigger downstream problem. In this case, STW's use of tankers is an expensive solution to a particular problem which is paid for by all residents through increased water rates.

- We would like to request a formal view of the surface water and sewerage situation in Aston and Weston, covering the Moor Lane area including impact of proposed developments (SHELAA 189, 48, 186 and 47), and more broadly recognising that Aston is not recognised as pumping station – the nearest is Shardlow which serves other areas in South Derbyshire too. Ideally this would include recommendations as to policy regarding adoption as above.

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

- Please help us understand how you will address the challenges of the rural Trent Villages which are in the process of being swallowed up by housing and NSIPs. Derby City is knocking at our door, two neighbouring counties are developing at our edges and there is no protection offered by the Mayors Plan as above at question 17.
- We understand that – at the time Local Plan Part 1 Review site selection was performed, the council did not need to allocate land within the Green Belt for housing. The Housing Supply was not being questioned and reports like the Growth Options Report (AECOM) set the scene for Planning purposes. Things have now changed however and we are exposed on a number of fronts:
 - o Planning rules are being changed so that Planning can become more rules based and we have no obvious safeguards – or ground rules - (like Green/Grey belt) in place
 - o Developers have successfully challenged the validity of South Derbyshire's Housing Supply and are busy with applications for Outline Planning Permission (that don't count towards the newly designated gap in the Housing Supply) claiming that Local and Neighbourhood Plans and Policies no longer count. (We understand that is not strictly true and something called the Tilted Balance applies with weightings balanced between the Local Plan and NPPF but we don't understand what that means in practical terms.) In the meantime, Planning are

actively seeking sites where development can be accelerated, where only a few short weeks ago they needed none. We have no idea whether we are safe or not.

- o On top of that we are all moving inexorably along the road to Local Government Reorganisation where we know for sure that South Derbyshire will sit alongside Derby City.*
- Although there is a strong case for Green belt to be considered, it may be too late for it to be deployed now to protect the rural Trent villages this time around. If it is too late, how will you ensure that the principles outlined in the AECOM report will continue to be deployed to support rules based planning, specifically:*
 - o A50 continues to be recognised as the southern boundary of Derby City (AECOM)*
 - o Planning will recognise the rural nature of the Trent Villages AND maintain their separation (AECOM)*
 - o And - for this iteration of the Local Plan part 2 - only permit windfall developments within the settlement boundaries.*