

The Repton Parish Council would object to the proposed Development (DMPA/2025/0563) on Land Southwest of Mount Pleasant Road on the following grounds -

1. HOUSING

The Repton and Milton Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Policy H1 states -

6.1.2 POLICY H1: THE LIMITS OF DEVELOPMENT: The limits of development, which define the settlement boundary for the villages of Repton and Milton, will be maintained as identified on the proposals maps for each village, as shown below. Housing development outside of the settlement boundary will only be permitted if it is **solely or primarily** for affordable housing, of a scale and design appropriate to its context and generally in conformity with South Derbyshire Local Plan Policy BNE5.

The site is both outside the village settlement boundary and furthermore is not solely or primarily for affordable housing.

The proposed development does not meet, in any way, NDP Policy H1 and is, on its own, a reason for the application to be rejected.

We also object to the assertion in the Applicant's Planning Statement paragraphs 6.40 and 6.43 that there were only minor conflicts between this application and the Repton and Milton Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Application completely conflicts with the NDP and its policies.

We note that the applicant nowhere actually quotes the NDP H1 Policy nor indicates why the conflict is considered, by them, to be of only minor importance.

The South Derbyshire District Council Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1 has a revised policy H1. The wording of most relevance in Policy H1 is:

for the above two tiers [includes Repton], development of all sizes within the settlement boundaries will be considered appropriate and sites adjoining settlement boundaries as rural exception sites in accordance with Policy H21 as long as not greater than 25 dwellings.

Policy H21 states -

Rural exception sites, where development is kept in perpetuity as affordable housing, will be permitted adjoining settlements with boundaries defined in the Local Plan, other than Swadlincote, Derby and Burton. The number of dwellings to be provided should be in accordance with Policy H1. Due to the need for affordable housing, all homes delivered within rural exception sites are required to meet the definition of Affordable Housing as set out in the NPPF.

Rural exception sites will only be permitted where:

1. the homes meet a clearly identified local need arising from the adjoining settlement;
2. the need cannot reasonably be met within the settlement boundary;
3. A range of services and facilities are conveniently accessible from the site by means other than private car and
4. The development is proportionate in scale to the existing settlement and is compliant with all other relevant policies in the Local Plan.

The proposed development does not meet any of the requirements of the SDDC Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1 Policy H21 and forms additional grounds for objection.

2. COMMUNITY

The community does not agree with the application. The Applicant's Statement of Community Engagement Report itself shows that 94% of the 102 responses (96) to their proposal questionnaire were against the proposal (but this major result of the questionnaire seems to be of no importance and is not referred to in the document's introduction nor its conclusion or elsewhere in the submission).

The engagement was a one-way exercise since the application was not altered in any respect following the consultation and the only efforts made by the applicant were to minimise any community concerns.

There is no local community support for the application providing further grounds for objection. Furthermore we would expect the 96 objections to be noted in the SDDC assessment.

Also, the result of their community engagement is not referred to in the documents introduction nor its conclusion or elsewhere in the submission.

3. TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

The traffic assessment by DCC Highways will be based, we understand, using their rules, on Pinfold Lane having two unrestricted lanes and therefore they are bound to say there will not be a traffic problem.

In real life Pinfold Lane itself near the junction with Main /High Street is effectively a single lane highway since the terrace houses on Pinfold Lane do not have any off-street parking available to them and the first corner on Pinfold Lane has double yellow lines worsening the situation. The Lane is also used by a school Bus service with a drop off point on the road.

The results from any computer model relies entirely on the assumptions input to the model and if these inputs are not correct then the result can be very inaccurate and biased.

The use of the Census data in paragraph 3.5 of the Transport Assessment document to define the modes of travel to work is not correct. There are no major employment opportunities in the Parish. Travel by cycle is restricted by the lack of cycle routes, the narrow roads and the increasing level of traffic on the routes out of the village. This will further increase the use of cars for commuting. The only public bus route serving the village does not link with major employers such as Hospitals, Toyota or Rolls-Royce.

The Repton Parish Council does not agree with the choice of criteria used to define the selection of comparable sites to define the People Trip Rate in section 5.2 of the Traffic Assessment. The comparable sites to be used must be limited to those in rural areas with severely limited public transport connectivity. It is expected this change would have a significant effect and would not support the results quoted in the traffic assessment.

Due to the lack of easy transport links, the number of delivery vans that would be used by residents is ignored in the assessment.

So not only is the applicant incorrect in the number of cars and journeys but also quotes average number of journeys in the rush hours. The peak number of movements in this period will be a factor of as least three times the average.

It should be noted that the traffic survey manages to miss the Primary School evening rush

Furthermore, the Square in Repton is a known problem junction and the egress from Pinfold Lane has limited visibility particularly down Main Street. Outside

the village, the amount of traffic through Repton (and Willington) currently causes significant hold ups and delays particularly at rush hour, affecting access to the A38 and A50 Trunk Roads. Any problems caused, by for example, roadworks or flooding are exacerbated by the fact that the nearest alternative River Trent crossings being in Burton and Swarkstone Bridge (which is an ancient monument and provides only limited traffic capacity).

Given the above we do not accept the traffic assessment provided due to the incorrect assumptions used leading to an assessment that would not represent the actual situation in real life. We therefore object to this document.

4. SUSTAINABILITY (LOCAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES)

Table 2.2 in the Travel Plan document is incorrect in that it references Repton Health Centre (at 800m) as a facility for the parish, implying that it provides those facilities provided of a GP surgery. The Repton Health Centre serves as an administrative centre for NHS teams and is not there to provide the comprehensive health care the community requires. The local surgery and pharmacy are both in Willington (over two kilometres from the site) requiring either a bus or more likely a car journey. (The footpath along the Willington Road from Repton to Willington has access limitations and the carriageway's heavy traffic means that this walking route would not be suitable for people requiring the facilities provided by a surgery.)

(It should be further noted that this erroneous statement was included in the applicant's website proposal and was pointed out to them when the Repton and Milton Parish Council met the applicant's representatives but is repeated in these documents.)

Furthermore, the retail facilities in the village would not support a family's weekly shop and would therefore require access to outlets outside the village and journeys would be required to do this.

The Bakery referred to by the applicant is the office and kitchen for a service company that has no permanent outlet and shop in the village and should not be included.

All distances quoted in the Travel Plan are, at best, to the nearest edge of the site and not to the middle of the proposed housing, so all walking distances are understated to at least this extent. It is disturbing that the distances quoted in the table to the Maple Tree Café and the Village Hall are different given the Café is in the Village Hall.

Paragraphs 2.3.7 and 2.3.8 misrepresent the Manual for Streets from stating what a walkable neighbourhood might look like to seeing this as guidance as to what walking distances are advisable. Instead, the report chooses to ignore the advice from the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) partially quoted in paragraph 2.3.4 and, indeed, fails to observe other parts of the CIHT report that says that acceptable walking distances are proportional to the amount of time that a person expects to spend shopping – table 3.3 from the CIHT report suggests that for less than 30 minutes shopping, the acceptable walking distance is just 100m. The Spar shop is 832m from the proposed houses and a typical shop there takes less than 5 minutes.

Table 2.2 is thus not only incorrect also not compliant against the acceptable distances shown in Table 2.1 of the Travel Plan document. This means the comment in paragraph

2.3.8 of the document that the walking distances are acceptable is also incorrect. This erroneous table is repeated in the Traffic Assessment report.

We object to the applicant's conclusion that the site is a sustainable site with acceptable distances to the residents' required facilities.

Again, the applicant has chosen to ignore the reality of the actual situation in the village.

5. PULVERISED FUEL ASH

The Pulverised Fuel Ash (PFA) on the site (understood to contain toxic substances such as arsenic, barium, cadmium nickel and lead) was used to fill a quarry on the site and was covered by a layer of top soil that can have a depth of 0.1¹ to 0.5m with no known clay cap on the PFA. The presence of the PFA at the site raises a number of serious health concerns as follows -

- The sampling carried out by the applicant cannot be relied on to be representative of the whole site as the coal used by a power station came from a number of different coal pits, each with differing chemical makeup, in order that the power station boiler tubes lifetime was maximised. Indeed, the concentrations of arsenic in the soil leachate analysis were found by GRM to exceed acceptable levels².
- The disturbance of the PFA, currently covered by topsoil (that can have a depth of only 0.1m to 0.5m) in the construction of the development services and building foundations will lead to the inevitable mixing of the PFA with the top soil and will give rise to a health hazard to residents and their use of the now contaminated soil particularly when used for vegetable growing as they concentrate such chemicals. Restrictions in the use of gardens by residents to mitigate this risk are considered unacceptable.
- The GRM report estimates that 75% of the foundations will have to be piled and to a depth greater than the depth of the PFA and that there will be significant earth works³. Testing for arsenic and other toxins at depths of 40-50cms is therefore inadequate.
- It is assumed that the relevant building restrictions would apply to any house extensions or such changes and would need the relevant covenants to be put in place. This is considered to be unacceptable.
- A site in Branston also using PFA as an infill found that it was simpler to remove the PFA rather than continue with the restrictions that the PFA required on the safe use of it by residents
- The EHO's comments has faith in Hallam's integrity to stop work and pay for further investigations when problems are encountered – we don't have such faith and would wish to see robust and independent investigations carried out before permission is granted.

¹ 10cms for WS03, WS05 & WS10, 15cms for WS107, WS108 and WS109 (and others) listed in Appendix H to the GRM report titled "PI & PII Site Appraisal Report" dated September 2024

² Section 8.2 of the GRM report.

³ Section 11.6 (page 41) says "The untreated made ground is considered unsuitable as a bearing stratum and all new foundations should be carried down through it to found on the natural strata. This will result in foundation depths of up to at least 5m begl in places." The Summary of Recommendations on page 2 says "Significant earthworks (cut-and-fill) likely to be required."

The disturbance of the Pulverised Fuel Ash on site would form a serious hazard to the workers and to potential residents that would need to be thoroughly and independently investigated before permission is granted.

6. CHARACTER OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Repton Brook, Green Wedge, Mill Hill and Woodend -

Repton Brook at south end of the site has steep banks that pose a known safety hazard to children. This situation would be worsened with the number of children that would reside on the development, and this risk would need to be recognised.

We would object to the loss of an important open 'Green Wedge' in the village providing a major addition to the green spaces defined in the village and provides a nature conservation pathway through the village.

The existing footpath would be retained by the developer but instead of being a rural path would become urbanised and would lose its character as a residential amenity. Further more given the comments by the Force Designing Out Crime Officer consultee it would completely lose its amenity value.

There is increasing wildlife around Repton Brook (Kingfishers - in particular the part away from Wytan's Court). The development would seriously affect this type of wildlife.

Mill Hill is currently a small hamlet separate from Repton with its own character. The proposed development would effectively subsume Mill Hill into the village destroying its character. It would cause a loss of this heritage aspect of Repton.

The development would erode the separation of the main part of Repton village from the Woodend part of the village again giving rise to a loss of heritage in an historic village.

We object to the change in the character of the site and its effect on the surrounding environment. We also consider the open nature of the site is itself important as stated by the Planning Inspector when the last appeal on this site was heard. (section 9.1 below)

7. ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION

The DCC Archaeologist concludes "I therefore recommend that a base level of archaeological information for the site is therefore needed against NPPF para 207, and in the absence of this information I object to the application as currently presented." Turley/Hallam have then paid Orion to write a response letter which claims that no archaeological investigation is needed because the site is land made from PFA etc after quarrying. However, page 2 of Orion's letter shows that a substantial area was not so made. At least this area should be subjected to archaeological investigation. Based on this plan, it is clearly untrue for Orion to aver that "most of the site has been subject to quarrying".

We concur with the DCC Archaeologist that, in the absence of a base level of archaeological information for the non-made parts of the site, we object to the application.

8. AREAS OF CONCERN

The Parish Council finds the Application does not satisfactorily address the following concern –**Flooding and Sewerage** –

Flooding is a major concern and, following recent increased flooding, the village has set up a Community Flood Warden Scheme and a installed a stage monitor and alarm in the Repton Brook to handle road closures and parishioners' safety. The proposal refers to SuDS (Sustainable urban Drainage Systems) to manage the runoff from the site, including permeable pavements and green spaces to absorb rainfall, and retention/detention basins to hold back runoff from other hard surfaces to ensure there is no additional runoff to the Repton Brook during high rainfall.

The village has a continuing problem with the current sewerage arrangement which, given the age and condition of the sewers and increasing number of users in the village, has been of concern to the parishioners and also the sewerage utility, due to the number of repairs required and their capacity. Severn Trent will have to comment on these capacity concerns based on their understanding of the sewer network.

9. COMMENTS AGAINST SPECIFIC SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (not covered above)

These are comments against inaccuracies, omissions and misleading points in the applications supporting documents not covered above. We are concerned by the level of selective statements made in the application and the slant in the application that needs to be corrected.

8.1 Planning Statement

As might be expected we have some fundamental concerns with this document as indicated above but we also include the following points -

The first concern however is that they incorrectly title the Neighbourhood Development Plan, it is The Repton and Milton Neighbourhood Development Plan as adopted by SDDC.

We find it extraordinary that the applicant is unaware of the planning history of the site (paragraph 2.16), it having been refused five times but they only reference one and indicate that there are no details available. The Planning Inspectorate report for this latest appeal reference is – T/APP/F1040/A/89/137030/P5.

- The first application for this site was refused in 1978 following a public inquiry.
- A second application was submitted in March 1980 but the appeal against refusal was subsequently withdrawn.
- An application was refused in 1983 and the appeal also dismissed.
- The last application went appeal in 1990 and was again refused and as noted by the inspector that the development would seriously harm the character and setting of Repton and removal of the open nature of the site is a significant local feature.
- The site was also specifically proposed to the inspector examining the current SDDC Local Plan and was again refused.

The comments on Public Engagement (paragraphs 4.7 to 4.10) are covered in our section 2 just noting that 94% of the replies to their consultation were opposed to the application but this fact happens not to be mentioned.

The statement on paragraph in 6.11 is incorrect in that the NDP Policy H1 requires the development to be solely or primarily for affordable housing and it therefore this application does not meet this requirement.

Our major comment relates to paragraph 6.40 and 6.43 of the Applicant's Planning Statement. The applicant states that there are only minor conflicts with the Repton and Milton Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Application is actually completely in conflict with the NDP as outlined in section 1 above.

8.2 Statement of Community Engagement

This is covered under the Community Objection above. Whilst the Applicant's representatives met with the Parish Council, we have no indication that our concerns have been addressed other than to try to negate them.

Turley updated their "Statement of Community Engagement" report following a meeting between the Parish Council and four professionals from Turley and Hallam on 2nd July. Paragraph 3.7 of their updated report avers that we were particularly focused on rights of way and dog bins. **This is completely untrue.** As was obvious from paragraph 3.5 to their report, we had multiple significant grounds for objecting to their development which we had already shared with them. In addition, we discussed how they had gamed the planning system to take advantage of a delay in our updating the NDP (in order to link to the revision of the Local Plan Part 2) and, by asserting that SDDC does not have a 5-year housing supply, to ignore the consideration and effort that went into the Local Plan and the NDP.

The document apologises for misrepresenting the services in Repton (paragraph 3.5 near the end) and claims that the website has been corrected. **This is untrue.** The website still today claims banks, many bus stops and a medical centre that do not exist.

10. COMMUNITY RESPONSE

The Parish Council held an open meeting for parishioners in Repton Village Hall to hear their views on September 4th 2025. The meeting was attended by over 100 people. The initial part of the meeting included a presentation on the Proposal, the way to make objections on the SDDC portal and the planning process before the meeting was opened for the attendees to make their points. Many issues were raised by the attendees objecting to the development and these recorded and retained. It is to be noted that District and County Councillors were in attendance to provide information where it was relevant.

11. INACCURACIES IN THE APPLICANT'S INITIAL PROPOSAL STATEMENTS

The Repton Parish Council objects to the misleading or incorrect statements contained in the developer's online proposal posted in March 2025 prior to formally making a planning application. These inaccuracies show the developer has little understanding of the village or its environment or history and/or appears to seek to mislead the public to influence their opinions. The strength of response from our residents to their proposal shows the level of local opposition to the proposal.