

View Response

Response #1306674

From

[REDACTED]

Date

Started: 29 Jan 2026 08:42. Last modified: 29 Jan 2026 09:24

Status

Complete

Title

[REDACTED]

First Name

Alan

Last Name

elder

Address Line 1

[REDACTED]

Address Line 2

[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

There seem to be many opportunistic planning applications coming forward that aren't in the Local Plan Parts 1 and 2. There needs to be a joined-up plan for development where housing is supplied in accordance with the Derby Housing Market Area.

2.

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

I would prefer to see large-scale housing developments that are planned with appropriate infrastructure, leaving small rural villages like Aston-on-Trent to fulfil their local needs with small windfall developments. The sewerage system in Aston cannot cope with recent medium-sized developments (Elmlands/Heath Close), never mind the additional proposals both within the Local Development Plan and recent speculative proposals not in the LDP. The road system in Aston is very busy already with limited parking, large numbers of delivery vehicles and drivers passing through using the village as a short cut. The old narrow roads and heritage properties are increasingly damaged by this traffic, they were never designed to cope with these loads. There are 4 SHELAA's in the one small area of Moor Lane, in Aston, not far from the recent Elmlands development. It feels like developers are proposing a large development of Aston's boundary by adding a large number of medium-sized developments that won't have adequate infrastructure, ie sewerage, road system or schooling. These developments have to be considered against a proper Local Plan that ensures infrastructure is properly provided. As an example, the recent Elmlands development has its own pumped sewerage system that isn't integrated into the existing village system. There was no planning and control of this integration and it affects everyone in the area negatively.

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

The settlement boundaries for Aston and Weston should stay as they are now.

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 response»

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 response»

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

«No response»

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

«No response»

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

Planning should oversee clear boundaries for all populated areas, whether this is the city of Derby or nearby rural villages.

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

«No response»

11.

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

«No response»

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

There should be clear accountability for mains water supply and sewerage. At the moment there seems to be no single point of responsibility. A clear example of this is the recent Elmlands/Heath Close where the developer Cameron Homes put in a pumped sewerage system that isn't connected to Severn Trent system because the latter won't accept it meets their standards. Now there is an impasse where local residents have drains and toilets backing up. Severn Trent have to regularly visit to clear blockages. There seems to have been no oversight of the sewerage integration with the old legacy system. If there was no integration and planning of the sewerage system of one medium-sized development, what are the chances of another 5 neighbouring developments (SHELAA 189, 48, 186, 47 plus a new speculative proposal DMPA/2025/1645) getting integrated into the village

sewerage system properly? A high level plan of this infrastructure is essential.

25.

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

The 5 potential developments mentioned above (SHELAAAs 189, 48, 186, 47 plus a new speculative proposal DMPA/2025/1645) would adversely affect the rural character of this part of the village. Adding up to 278 houses in the SHELAAAs and 25 for DMPA/2025/1645 would be a massive addition to a small rural village like Aston. Adding a wildflower strip in a field further away for a year or two (as proposed by DMPA/2025/1645) won't offset this permanent loss of habitat right next to the village. The rural nature of the village would be permanently degraded.

Access to existing side roads off Moor Lane, a narrow single-track road, would be made considerably more dangerous due to the massive increase in traffic. Delivery vans, refuse lorries and emergency vehicles cannot turn around on these side roads itself so they frequently reverse blind down the narrow steep road junctions onto Moor Lane. But this proposal would bring a massive increase in vehicles passing the junctions from up to 300 new houses so the risks of an accident would be much higher. The junction at Hanger Bank/Moor Lane is not capable of safely coping with this increase, there is dense vegetation and fencing right up to the junction. Similarly, a number of residents along Moor Lane frequently have to reverse out of tight blind driveways onto what would become a much busier thoroughfare.

The proposed footpath in DMPA/2025/1645 along Moor Lane would cross the narrow junction between Hanger Bank and Moor Lane where the dense hedging obscures traffic right up to the junction. There would be very little warning of vehicles coming down the short steep hill, hidden from view by bushes until the last possible moment. This is not safe, a path would only work safely if it is on the other (east) side of the road to keep pedestrians away from the junction altogether.

An expanded Moor Lane is too narrow to accommodate 2-way traffic plus a

footpath. There are no passing places in the c230m distance between the southern pinch point on Moor Lane (where the current footpath ends) and a wider new road north of the northern pinch point between Hanger Cottage and a telegraph pole. Traffic would be backing up along Moor Lane all the time - this happens already with the limited number of vans, HGV's, farm vehicles and motorhomes currently using this road. There have been a number of accidents already at 15 Moor Lane where the road narrows suddenly at the southern pinch point. Moor Lane would have to be widened considerably to allow safe two-way traffic all along. If this cannot be done for whatever reason (eg due to protected hedgerows, old stable buildings and HV power lines needing relocation) then the new development should look for access elsewhere.

The northern pinch point is at an old cottage with a gable end right by the propose high traffic roadway. The cottage foundations have already been damaged by basic roadworks. Frequent braking of vehicles right by this pinch point would damage the building foundations further.

The old graveyard still has funeral corteges visiting on occasion and there is nowhere to park off Moor Lane at the cemetery gates. A funeral cortege would cause significant delays for traffic trying to access the new housing development.