

Core Strategy Review Representation Form – Targeted Consultation

The consultation runs between Monday 15 January and 26 February 2024

For representations to be valid, a full name and address must be provided.

If you need to continue with more space for any of your answers, please attach further pages to this form.

All fields marked with an Asterix (*) must be completed.

Title(*):	Dr
First Name(*):	Martin Westmoreland
Job Title: (where relevant)	
Organisation: (where relevant)	
Address(*)	
Postcode(*)	
Telephone number(*)	
Email Address(*)	
Agent's details: (if applicable) Include name, address, contact number and email	

To which part of the Core Strategy Review does this representation relate? (Delete as appropriate)(*)	Policies / Policies Map / Other (please specify) Policies Map and Policies plus transport and infrastructure
Please use the space below to tell us specifically where the representation relates to (a policy, the policies map or other text). Do not use this space to make your comments as this is required further down the form.(*)	
Strategic policy 1.2 South Stanton; Strategic policy 1.5 South West of Kirk Hallam Strategic Policy 2.1 Stanton North Strategic Policy 4 transport Evidence base	
Do you consider the Core Strategy Review is Legally Compliant? (*) (Delete as appropriate)	Yes
Do you consider the Core Strategy Review is sound?(*): (Delete as appropriate)	No
Do you consider the Core Strategy Review complies with the duty to cooperate? (*) (Delete as appropriate):	Yes
Please give details of why you consider the Erewash Core Strategy Review is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy Review or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this space to set out your comments.	
<p>The identified strategies (1.2, 1.5 and 2.1) all have significant impact on local roads and transport infrastructure which have not clearly been addressed in the Council's responses (2.28.10, 2.31.18, 2.34.13, 2.38.7 respectively) nor do they apparently co-operate with for example with neighbouring councils such as Broxtowe nor indeed Nottinghamshire highways or National Highways. The response is not sound as none of the concerns have clearly been addressed by the council as the data from Systra is not presented thus the credibility of the plan is not validated. For example no modelling of traffic flow has been evidenced as having been completed and considered, not only to model the effects on the districts in Erewash (Sandiacre, Ilkeston and Long Eaton) but also to establish the effects of added traffic volume in neighbouring councils such as Broxtowe. The proposed Stanton Junction upgrade seemingly does nothing to balance the flow and ease bottlenecks to traffic either from or to from the proposed strategic policy locations for development. The A609 (Nottingham road) in Ilkeston is already so congested it is virtually a car park every morning and evening at peak times and slow at other times of the day. Corporation Road from Stanton North/Hallam Fields and Quarry hill industrial estates carries heavy good vehicles (HGV's) to the A609 from 4am from these sites through residential areas and increased industrial activity will only increase pressure to allow 24hour HGV access. There is no point creating employment opportunities in North Stanton if no businesses can move their goods in and out of the site efficiently when they need too otherwise their growth will be throttled.</p>	
<p>Environmentally Trowell is already adversely affected by the existing industrial emissions and plumes which are a blight on anyone living there due to the predominate wind direction from the South West e.g. from Quarry hill Industrial estate and Hallam Fields Industrial estate. Current emissions include, gas, vapour, particulates, noise nuisance and odour nuisance. The proposed Stanton North site will potentially add to this emissions burden unless adequate controls on allowed activity on the new Industrial area are put in place. Wards for example wish to increase scrap metal processing and seek to extend the rail link to enable them to do this, but this is most likely to allow processed scrap out, and will not necessarily limit raw scrap input to the plant by road which is likely to only add to industrial traffic up the A609 and increase the amount of iron oxide particulates landing on Trowell which stains everything it settles on.</p>	
Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy Review legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to cooperate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Core Strategy Review legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.	
The modifications proposed are to create a Junction 25a on the M1 at Stanton Gate and improve road links such as Sowbrook lane in Kirkhallam and Quarry hill road both leading to lows lane Stanton Gate, and improve links to the A6007 via Moorbridge lane Stapleford, and the B6002 through Sandiacre. This would unlock constriction of	

traffic flow to Stanton South, Stanton North and South West Kirk Hallam. It would also enhance the benefit of any Kirk Hallam relief road as the traffic toward the proposed Stanton junction improvement will have somewhere to go other than via the A609 in turn via Quarry hill road or Corporation road if headed to Nottingham, or M1/A52 via A6007/B6002.

Environmental controls are necessary on emissions from Stanton North, this could be achieved via restrictions on activity and emissions via the land lease agreements and/or any deed of sale.

Please note in your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?(*) (Delete as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I wish to participate in hearing sessions

Jan 30th matter 6 policy 1.1/1.2
Feb 6th matters 8 & 9

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination

Please use this space to continue any of your answers.

This email is security checked by Erewash Borough Council and subject to the disclaimer on webpage:
<https://www.erewash.gov.uk/privacy.html>