Further points regarding appeal ref: APP/N1025/W/23/3319160. As a now retired member of E.B.C.

Outdoor activity particularly when it involves getting close to nature we are often told, is very beneficial to our health and well-being including of course both ones physical and mental health. Some people like to cycle, some like to run or walk, while others prefer to take their outdoor recreation at a slower more sedentary pace.

Close to the proposed site there is an angling facility known locally as Roughs Pond which is used for fishing regularly by people living in and around Ilkeston and the nearby village of Kirk Hallam. It is my opinion that this will be seriously compromised if the building of 196 houses goes ahead. We also have a canal nearby, and part of the proposed site is prone to flooding. Could this be considered please?

There is concern in the area that nearby Schools are at saturation point, so how would this be ameliorated, and where would any new Schools be built to educate children living in the proposed dwellings? Could this be considered please?

We do now have the Stanton Park development coming on stream within the next few years. It will be sited on the now derelict former Stanton Ironworks site. It will provide opportunities for companies to setup and operate from there, and bring with them employment opportunities for people in and around the local Ilkeston area, and of course for people from further afield. Warehousing and distribution I am led to believe will be its central theme.

I am aware that a railhead is proposed in a bid to try and keep road traffic to a minimum. However I take the view that road transport will still have to be used, indeed I feel it naive to think otherwise. I do therefore think that understandably road use particularly heavy goods vehicles will increase substantially, adding to the road safety risks that are already there and of which I have referred to earlier.

.

And finally I would now like to flag up that in terms of the proposed site we have been here before, albeit a long time ago.

Around 1988 a company called Moor-Green properties submitted an almost identical proposal. The issue subsequently went to a planning inquiry, and it was finally determined that the proposal did not go ahead because of its unsuitability, which of course it didn’t and the appeal was duly dismissed.

I am of course aware that opinions and indeed legislation may have changed over time, but may I respectfully request that this point is also given some consideration please? Thank you very much for allowing me to speak.