View Response

Response #1306258

From	[redacted]
Date	Started: 28 Jan 2026 08:57. Last modified: 28 Jan 2026 11:19
Status	Complete
Title	[redacted]
First Name	Matthew
Last Name	Pruce
Organisation	Hallam Land Management
Address Line 1	[redacted]
Address Town	[redacted]
Address Post Code	[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

We consider that the Review of the Local Plan should be undertaken as a comprehensive, full review. This is on the basis that a full plan review will allow a more comprehensive approach to strategic issues such as addressing the unmet needs of the Derby housing market area (HMA). This is also an opportunity ensure that all policies contained would age at the same pace, avoiding a potential policy vacuum where policies in part of the plan become out of date more quickly than others.

2.

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

Hallam consider that a balanced approach to the distribution of housing should be taken. Development in South Derbyshire should be both focused around the Derby fringe to take account of the housing to meet the City's unmet housing need, whilst also focusing meaningful housing development in Key Service villages to meet the need of the remainder of the District.

It is highlighted that in the existing Local Plan only 5% of the total housing allocations (745 dwellings) where distributed across the Key Service Villages. 15% of housing was allocated at Drakelow Park (2,060 dwellings) which will predominantly meet housing need from the Burton area. It is therefore considered that in the emerging Plan more housing circa 20% should be distributed across Key Service Villages that will meet housing need specific to the District, as well as on the Derby Fringe.

Our site at Wragley Way, Sinfin is already allocated under H15 in the existing Local Plan and is subject to an outline planning application under reference 19/00877/OUT for 1,850 dwellings. This site specifically helps to meet the unmet housing need from Derby City. The delivery of this site is delayed pending the release of funding to help deliver a new junction on the A50, in the meantime a planning application is being prepared and will be submitted this Spring to deliver another phase of circa 300 dwellings and supporting

infrastructure. This scheme will help to continue supporting the unmet housing need of Derby in SDDC, if approved in 2026 a Reserved Matters application would follow in 2027 with commencement of development to follow in 2028. Assuming a build out rate of 50 dwellings per annum this phase could be fully delivered by 2033.

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

As part of the emerging Local Plan settlement boundaries should be reviewed to take into account recent development.

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 should ensure that sites are deliverable and viable. Sites where no meaningful delivery has taken place or funding is not available to support its delivery should not be reallocated.

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)

To compliment the delivery of specific accommodation, development should be evenly distributed and sufficient allocations should be made in Key Service Centres to help lower the ageing populations in these areas. Accommodation needs should be identified through the evidence base.

6.

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

«No response»

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

Whilst Amber Valley are still pursuing Mackworth as an allocation there are key concerns surrounding its delivery given the landowners have withdrawn their support. The site is not considered deliverable, and as the AVBC emerging Local Plan examination has not finished SDDC should not be reliant on Mackworth coming forward, other options with greater prospects of delivery in SDDC should be considered.

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

Policy wording to facilitate flexible affordable housing provision should be included, particularly facilitating appropriate cascade mechanisms. This is pertinent as funding for delivery of affordable housing through Section 106 has significantly stalled sites throughout England.

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

Yes, to provide clarity and inform future decision making.

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

The main principles are agreed with however; the inclusion of Principle 4 (d) is not. The identification of important gaps should be informed by evidence, not a subjective call and should be identified through policy measures. It is not for a settlement boundary review to determine what is an 'important gap' it should be an arbitrary exercise which is reflective of the current built form of a settlement.

11.

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

-

12.

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

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

Please enter any additional comments

«No response»

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

«No response»

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 response»

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

«No response»

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

«No response»

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

«No response»

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

No. The Council should not mandate the adoption of on-site infrastructure and consider everything on a site-by-site basis with policy flexibility. Otherwise, this may introduce additional costs to delivery that affect viability.

25.

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

A nutrient neutrality phasing note will be submitted separately, as discussed earlier.