View Response

Response #1306788

From	[redacted]
Date	Started: 29 Jan 2026 11:47. Last modified: 29 Jan 2026 11:50
Status	Complete
Title	[redacted]
First Name	Beccy
Last Name	Carney
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 remain at risk from speculative planning applications until Local Plan Parts 1 and 2 are completed and adopted. Ideally we would enter Local Government Reorganisation with at least the possibility of a plan-led approach to development and a robust long term housing supply that is

consistent with our HMA Councils

2.

Where should the housing needs be met? (Please provide site details including projected delivery timescales and the specific need being 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. We are however very comfortable with the council's strategy of large-scale strategic housing development, planned in parallel with the supporting infrastructure, leaving rural villages like Aston and Weston to fulfil their local needs on a windfall basis.
• 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 – with little pr no brown field land at our disposal, the sustainability of our claim to being rural villages is at severe risk with developers holding options on swathes of the remaining BMV agricultural land. 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. 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). 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 proposed developments is on BMV agricultural land, outside settlement boundaries – 9 already have developer interest. They total 810-852 additional dwellings on 45.01ha of land which would be irredeemably lost to agriculture over 5-10 years if they went ahead. 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).

• Four of the more problematic SHELAAs (48, 189, 186 and 47) are in the Moor Lane area, two adjacent to the Ashwood Grange development (now Elmlands/Heath Close) where Providence Land and Cameron Homes were involved. These total 253-278 dwellings on 13.14ha of BMV agricultural land extending/infilling Aston towards the A50. It is a matter of public record that Cameron Homes have interests in SHELAAs 186 and 47, as well as in other land in the immediate vicinity and Providence Land have interest in SHELAA 48. Providence Land submitted Planning Application DMPA/2025/1645 for SHELAA 48 on 23 December, in parallel with SDDC's Issues and Options consultation. Residents, resident's groups and councillors are currently responding to that application against policies laid out in the adopted Local Plan. Although one of the smaller SHELAAs, 48 is important because it opens up access for other SHELAAs which don't currently have it, and to land that Cameron already have an interest in. Worryingly, Providence Land included a legal paper in their application that questions South Derbyshire's Five Year Land Supply Statement; references Richborough's planning appeal in early December; and states that in accordance with the NPPF, where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply, 'the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies and relevant housing policies are deemed out of date' (p1 Summary c). Given the weight of developer interest

in the area, and shift to favour large scale strategic development over smaller scale development in rural South Derbyshire, we expect Providence Land to be laser focused on achieving outline planning permission granted for SHELAA 48 through the same speculative route as Richborough, opening the door to planning applications for the remaining SHELAAs in the area before the Local Plan Part 2 can be formally adopted. Once outline planning permission has been granted, development can go ahead regardless of the housing polices in the Local Plan that are eventually adopted. Sometimes it feels like we're under siege!

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

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

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

- [x] 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)

Affordable housing for 1st time buyers

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

• 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

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)

• 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. If it can remain as a Key Service Village without taking on additional housing and industrial commitments fine, but its size and services indicate it would be more accurately classified as a Local Service Village.

12.

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

- ( ) Yes
- (•) No

Please enter any additional comments

Aston’s position in the existing retail hierarchy is fair. Weston has no general-purpose retail outlets and should not therefore be included

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

Retail has an important part to play in the heart of Aston which is however a conservation area – location of such services therefore needs to bed treated with sensitivity. 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.

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?

Without clarity, accidents will happen. See Question 25 for broader questions

around green belt.

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

• 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.
• I wish to attend any hearings related to District Council or Planning Inspectorate reviews of the Local Plan.

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

Yes, 100%. 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 and how practices impact canals and waterways – ideally across 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. Our clean water is also of only middling quality
• 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 standby to deal with the problems and regularly send tankers to take the waste away but tell 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 and the overall sewerage system meets 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 review of the surface water and sewerage situation in Aston and Weston, covering the Moor Lane area including impact of proposed developments (SHELAAs 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

25.

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

• 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 obvious protection offered by the Mayor's Plan.

• Green belt does not currently apply to Aston or Weston. According to Meta AI: Green belt policy protects the countryside by strictly controlling development to prevent urban sprawl, maintaining "permanence" and "openness" around cities. It stops neighbouring towns from merging, preserves the character of historic sites, and promotes urban regeneration by directing development toward brownfield land. Strict planning controls restrict new building projects in designated areas, preserving open, rural landscapes. By maintaining a buffer zone, it prevents towns and cities from merging into single, massive urban areas. It protects natural habitats, biodiversity, and agricultural land, and acts as a buffer against flood risks. By limiting outward expansion, it forces development to focus on rejuvenating derelict or, urban sites. And it provides access to open space for recreation, improving public health. THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT WE ARE MISSING!
• 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 (1) 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 (2) 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 (3) 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.
• So, should green belt now be considered to protect rural Trent villages? And if it's too late to do it, how will you ensure that the principles outlined in the AECOM report will continue to be deployed including:
o (1) A50 continues to be recognised as the southern boundary of Derby City

for both housing and industrial purposes
o (2) Planning will recognise the rural nature of the Trent Villages AND maintain their separation, including restriction of northward extensions/infill of Aston toward the A50 boundary
o (3) And - for this iteration of the Local Plan part 2 - only permit windfall developments within settlement boundaries.