

PLANNING REF : 261722
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 25 Blackthorn Way
: Measham, Swadlincote, Derbyshire
: DE12 7ND
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Kimberley Sayers
DATE SUBMITTED : 05/08/2026

COMMENTS:

Having reviewed the above application I wish to make the following points.

- 1) The AWE objected to plans for housing on this location in 2024, application 241057, as the site lies within the DEPZ zone of the AWE.
- 2) The joint emergency planning unit also advised against the 2024 application.
- 3) The office of nuclear regulation also objected to development on this site.
- 4) This new application notes (in the flood risk assessment) that the site does flood and there has been water ingress under the boundary fence of the neighbouring property. This flooding has only happened since the site was altered in July 2023.
- 5) The application states that no alterations have been made to the site prior to application(s). In July 2023 the site was dramatically altered.
Prior to this date there were historical natural ponds on the site that filled every year. These ponds have now been filled in and is, in part, the reason why there is flooding impacting the local area. The site previously contained multiple large trees and wildlife all of which was destroyed in July 2023 impacting greatly on vegetation and wildlife in the area.
At this time the ponds were filled in, the land completely cleared and the land flattened. These alterations were mentioned in an objection by the local council in 2024.
- 6) The application states that a pedestrian access point will be created. This road does have a 40mph speed limit but this limit is not always adhered to and hence a safety issue.
- 7) The access point for vehicles for this site is on/extremely close to a bend in the road and a further additional safety issue.

The 2024 application was for residential properties of a fixed number taking up the whole site. This new application, however, is for 2 properties and does not take up the whole site. This leads to concerns about the remaining area being used for transient residents. This, in turn, would increase the number of vehicles and persons on site, as well as buildings even if they are temporary or of a transient nature.

Given the above observations I would strongly advise against approving this application.