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*: Christine Scott
Organisation: [redacted]
Address*: [redacted]
Email: [redacted]

Agent details (where applicable)
Name*:
Organisation:
Address*:

Email:

*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)

This option would give full Local Plan coverage prior to Council reorganisation, and would help to protect against un-planned speculative development.

Question 2: Where should the housing needs be met?

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

Derby City's unmet housing needs should be met by using brown field development within Derby City. If this will not meet the total requirement then brown field sites in South Derbyshire should be used rather than continuing development on greenfield sites in 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.

There are six proposed SHELAA sites in Weston Parish (18, 118, 166, 258, 82 & 107 (107 partly in Aston)). Four of these already have developer interest and would add a total of 372 houses in Weston Parish. Our view is that all of these sites are unsustainable as local infrastructure could not cope. Infrastructure in Weston-on-Trent is inadequate. Road access is poor with dangerous pinch-points at either side of the village (Cuttle Bridge junction to the West and Aston Village Centre to the East), no usable bus service, no village shop, poor provision for walkers & cyclists, inadequate school capacity, poor access to healthcare, no permanent playing field, no permanent allotments. All of the proposed develoments would be built on best and most versatile (BMV) land which would result in the loss of valuable agricultural land.

SHELAA 118 had an Outline Application (ref.9/2014/0506) refused in August 2014 due to development being outside of the settlement boundary and archaeological impacts.

SHELAA 82 had an Outline Application (ref. 9/2005/1408) withdrawn in August 2006. An Outline Application (ref.9/2016/0577) was refused in November 2016 due to soil quality and being located outside of the settlement boundary.

SHELAA 107 had an Outline Application (ref.9/2017/0095) refused in June 2017 due to soil quality and being outside of the settlement boundary. An Outline Application (ref.9/2019/0646) was refused in December 2019 due to soil quality and being outside of the settlement boundary.

The latest version of the SHELAA documents show a new category of "Growth Options Study" All of the Weston SHELAAs except 107 are shown as "Red", so "Unsuitable area for strategic growth" SHELAA 107 is marked as 'Green', so "The majority of the site is located

within an area defined as suitable for Strategic Growth within the Growth Options Study" but it is not obvious why. We assume that AECOM's "Derby Housing Market Area (HMA) Growth Options Study" (August 2021) is the 'Growth Options Study referred in the latest SHELAA documents This report states that development South of the A50 is unsuitable due to the risk of increasing the perceived sprawl of Derby City. The report also mentions preventing coalescence between settlements such as Weston and Aston as a reason for not developing south of the A50. SHELAA 107 is south of the A50 so should be flagged as an unsuitable area for strategic growth. This development would directly impact the separation between Weston & Aston.

Our view is that all six of the SHELAA sites in Weston Parish are unsuitable and unsustainable. They should not be include as options in the Local Plan Part 2.

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)

The Weston Settlement Boundary should remain as it is, with no development outside of the boundary.

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)

A Settlement Boundary around the urban edge of Derby would provide the planning control needed to prevent the expansion of Derby City into the rural areas of South Derbyshire. This southwards expansion threatens the rural character of the villages, like Weston, in the Trent Valley.

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 for assessing settlement boundaries are reasonable and have resulted in sensible settlement boundaries. They should continue to be applied.

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

(Please provide a comment)

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 should be classified as a Rural Village.

The SDDC Core Strategy Topic Paper on Settlement Hierarchy defines the criteria for a Local Service Village as a "Bus service or convenience store and at least 5 other services". A bus service is defined as "hourly or better for the majority of the day in the working week". Weston has a limited bus service but this does not meet the criteria. Weston does not have either a bus service or a convenience store and only has 4 other services (Primary School, Village Hall, Outdoor Leisure & Public house). Weston Parish Council have raised this issue in on a number of occasions in previous Part 1 and Part 2 consultations, but no action has been taken. Weston clearly does not meet either criteria so should be re-classified as a Rural Village.

The SDDC Part Local Plan Review Issues and Options document is incorrect and needs to be updated.

Question 12: Do you agree with the retail hierarchy?

☐Yes ☒No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

Weston has no retail outlets so its inclusion in the retail hierarchy is unreasonable.
The SDDC Part Local Plan Review Issues and Options document is incorrect and needs to be updated.

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)

Weston does not have any retail outlets, so there is no retail area. Until these exist Weston should not be included in the retrial 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.

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 comunities 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 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)

Green Belt land should be protected.

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

☒Yes ☐No

(Please provide a reason for your answer)

SDDC needs to clarify its position over the uncertainty in 5 year housing supply and the effect on planning decisions. Clarity is needed on how housing supply is managed and on

the rules which apply if housing supply is judged insufficient and local planning rules no longer apply e.g. what is meant by the “tilted balance” and how does it apply?

We are concerned at the recent appeal decision to grant planning permission for 135 houses between Melbourne and King’s Newton. Planning was granted on appeal because SDDC could not show a robust 5 year housing supply. The 135 houses at Melbourne should have filled that gap, but this is only outline planning permission, which does not count as part of the planned housing supply. We are concerned that SDDC are still short of 5 year housing supply and will now need to go out to developers to find housing supply to fill the gap. Developers could now apply for outline permission for any of the six SHELAA sites in Weston Parish, aiming to win on appeal if the application is rejected. We are also concerned that SDDC may decide that appeals are inevitable and just grant outline planning permission for speculative applications. We note that the Melbourne developer is Richborough who have also tried to develop one of the sites in Weston Parish and that four out of the six sites in Weston have previous developer interest.

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**)**

See answer to Question 21 on Housing Supply.

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)

Section 106 funding is inadequate to provide the required infrastructure for new development. Developers should make realistic financial contributions to provide the infrastructure to support new developments. No development should take place until infrastructure is in place.

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)

Management of the common infrastructure for any new development should be under Local Authority control. This is needed to achieve the required economies of scale, level of customer service and environmental accountability.

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

(Please provide details)

We understand that there will be a further Part 1 (Regulation 19) Consultation this year followed by submission to the Secretary of State in the Spring (Regulation 22). We understand that there will be hearings over the summer and Weston-on-Trent Parish Council would like to appear at these hearings. There will be another consultation and a hearing on the Local Plan Part 2. We would also like to appear at that hearing.

Weston-on-Trent Village Hall should be used for future consultation events as there is much more space than Aston Heritage Centre.