

View Response

Response #1306731

From [Wheeldon 1867](#)



Agent [Caroline Large](#)

Date Started: 29 Jan 2026 09:59. Last modified: 30 Jan 2026 13:22

Status Complete

First Name The

Last Name Till

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

The Council's own Issues & Options paper highlights the risk that a pause could delay plan coverage and leave the district more exposed to speculative proposals. Proceeding now allows prompt identification of deliverable non-strategic allocations (including sustainable Key Service Village extensions

such as Etwall) to maintain housing delivery and five-year supply resilience.

2.

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

Land adjoining Egginton Road, Etwall, forms part of site 025 with SHELAA 20205. Southern edge of Etwall (Key Service Village); a logical, sustainable village extension rather than isolated sprawl, with strong boundaries including the A50. Up to 90 dwellings proposed and assuming allocation by late 2026, an outline application could follow quickly; build-out could be completed over 3-4 years once started, with first completions by no later than 2030 and completion around 2031 (typical 20-25 dpa). Affordable housing in a sustainable settlement to support local needs and rural vitality.

Flood risk across the wider landholding is acknowledged, but the promoted parcel is structured to focus built development in Flood Zone 1 with green infrastructure/SuDS and buffers to avoid functional floodplain impacts.

BNG land available south of the A50 and west of Etwall Brook for habitat enhancement/open space.

A separate application has been submitted on the adjoining land (DMPA/2025/1475). Allocation should enable coordinated principles across both parcels to avoid piecemeal outcomes, while each site remains independently deliverable (including separate access options

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

Extending/adjusting settlement boundaries for sustainable Key Service Villages (e.g., Etwall) to include allocated village-edge sites and provide clear, defensible limits.

A policy approach that supports a diverse supply of small/medium sites which can build out quickly and de-risk reliance on strategic sites.

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

A buffer of deliverable allocations to maintain supply if larger sites slip particularly given issues highlighted in recent appeals.

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)

Affordable housing provision aligned to local needs in sustainable settlements (Etwall is well placed).

Older persons / accessible housing (e.g., bungalows, accessible dwellings) as part of site-led delivery where appropriate, to respond to demographic change identified in the Issues & Options paper.

A balanced mix of market homes to support village services and vitality.

6.

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

Avoid over-reliance on a small number of large sites by ensuring a meaningful pipeline of deliverable small/medium allocations that can contribute earlier in the plan period, particularly where there is an established developer on board.

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

The priority should remain maintaining a resilient supply, including village-edge sites that can deliver early

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

Allocate additional deliverable sites in sustainable settlements (e.g., Etwall) to provide flexibility and reduce risk.

The Council could also accelerate delivery by strengthening expectations for early (“front-loaded”) surveys and mitigation on allocated and permitted sites, to avoid delays later in the process (particularly between allocation/outline and reserved matters). In practice, promoters should be expected to demonstrate at an early stage that key constraints are understood and capable of being mitigated, supported by proportionate evidence.

For example, on sustainable village-edge allocations such as the promoted land at Egginton Road, Etwall, early resolution of matters such as flood risk and drainage/SuDS (including a clear approach to keeping built development in appropriate areas and using green infrastructure buffers where needed) can de-risk delivery and reduce the likelihood of late redesign. Similarly, setting out early how biodiversity net gain will be achieved—potentially through identified on-site/linked land opportunities and a clear habitat delivery and management strategy—helps avoid slippage caused by last-minute BNG solutions.

To support this, the Council could introduce/require:

a constraints-and-mitigation checklist for allocations (including flood risk, drainage/SuDS, highways access, ecology/BNG/protected species, arboriculture, ground conditions, noise/air quality, utilities capacity and construction logistics);

a requirement for a mitigation and phasing strategy (what mitigation, where, and when it will be delivered) to accompany masterplans/applications;

use of PPAs / project plans for larger or more complex sites to agree milestones for surveys, consultation and technical sign-off.

This would help ensure that allocated sites progress efficiently to reserved matters and implementation, with fewer delays arising from fundamental constraints not being addressed early.

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

Defining boundaries around new allocations and urban edges improves clarity, supports plan-led delivery, and helps resist unplanned development

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 principles are sensible, particularly drawing boundaries tightly to defensible physical features. For Etwell, the A50 and established corridors provide strong, logical edges

11.

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

Where multiple adjoining sites are progressing, ensure boundaries/policies secure connectivity and coherent place-making.

12.

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please enter any additional comments

No further 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 further 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

Defining centres/boundaries can reduce uncertainty and support village vitality

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

Will give greater clarity moving forward.

17.

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

A locally specific policy (or clearly signposted local guidance) would reduce uncertainty and inconsistent decision-making by providing a transparent interpretation of “disproportionate” and “limited infilling” that reflects South Derbyshire’s settlement patterns. This would help suitable small-scale development come forward in a plan-led way—particularly within villages—while still protecting the overarching purposes of Green Belt designation in line with national policy.

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

Yes. The Issues & Options paper explains that the Council cannot currently determine whether Grey Belt exists because a Green Belt review has not been undertaken since Grey Belt was introduced in national policy. A structured Green Belt review would provide an evidence-led basis to identify any land that does not strongly contribute to key Green Belt purposes and could therefore support sustainable development without undermining Green Belt objectives. This would also increase transparency, reduce speculative proposals, and help ensure that any Green Belt-related development decisions are plan-led and consistent with national policy safeguards (including exclusions such as areas where habitats/heritage/flood risk constraints provide strong reasons to restrict development).

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

A policy framework supporting deliverable small/medium allocations alongside strategic sites to maintain supply resilience.

Stronger policy hooks for BNG delivery using linked land where available (as with your land south of A50 / west of brook).

Clear expectations for coordination where adjacent parcels come forward separately

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

Policies should be updated to reflect current national policy direction toward accelerating delivery and ensuring a diverse supply of sites, including the role of deliverable village-edge allocations where sustainable.

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

Keep clear infrastructure requirements and triggers for allocations, secured through S106 / conditions and (as the system changes) any new supplementary plan mechanisms.

For Etwall, standard mechanisms can address access, SuDS, BNG and necessary mitigation

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

Yes, in principle, because public adoption can provide long-term certainty for residents and avoid excessive private estate charges. However, the policy should remain flexible and allow private management where adoption is demonstrably not feasible or not available.

25.

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

We will be providing further information via email on the merits of our site at Etwall. Land at Egginton Road, Etwall (S/025) is suitable for up to 90 homes as a sustainable Key Service Village extension capable of early delivery (first completions by no later than 2030; completion ~2031), supported by clear mitigation for flood risk (built form focused to Flood Zone 1), and with linked land to deliver BNG and green infrastructure. Allocation should also set coordination principles with the adjoining site (DMPA/2025/1475) to avoid piecemeal outcomes and secure a coherent extension of Etwall.

26

You can upload up to 10 files.

«No files»