
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 May 2025 12:34
To: Planning <planning@erewash.gov.uk>
Subject: Objections to the Core Strategy Amendments

Hi

I want to object to all the sites listed in the Core Strategy Amendment Review, and since the website only seems to permit lodging an objection to a single site I am doing this by email instead.

My main comment relates to all the Green Belt areas within the review, and I ask that I be recorded as objecting to each and every section of the document. I also make comment on some of the separate sites for reasons other than my concerns over the Green Belt.

My main reason for objecting to these developments is that I do not believe that the criteria set out in the NPPF has been met justifying any encroachment into the Green Belt at this time.

The Core Strategy and this Amendment are developed in order to meet the housing targets allocated to the council by central government. I do not believe that the number of houses required by government constitutes, in itself, the “exceptional circumstances” which are required under the Framework. This is particularly so in view of there being no published objective basis for the numbers allocated to each authority.

The term “exceptional circumstances” does include “instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for homes”. The waiting list for social housing in the general area might suggest that this is the case, but I do not accept that these plans will go far to address this issue – the vast majority of the planned housing allocations are not even for affordable housing, let alone social housing. Additionally, I do not remember seeing evidence that Erewash has specifically quantified local (i.e. Erewash) housing needs.

I also do not believe that much, if any, of the Green Belt selected for development would fit the definition of “Grey Belt”. As a concept, I can support the idea of Grey Belt as originally reported, i.e. pieces of land within the Green Belt which have previously been developed – indeed, I can think of a few locally, though they are all fairly small. I find the arguments that I have heard over distances between the edge of Derby and the edge of other towns, and how these distances will still be maintained, extremely spurious. The Green Belt in its entirety exists to prevent Nottingham and Derby from merging – while building on any of these sites does not immediately make the two cities any closer to each other, it does reduce the green space between the two cities, which is precisely what the Green Belt was established to prevent.

The Green Belt is a regional initiative, covering two counties and several local authorities. With Erewash having such a high proportion of its land earmarked as Green Belt it is incumbent on the region as a whole to find a solution to the housing shortage, rather than to expect our authority to have to sacrifice its green spaces.

I will now go on to make a few comments on specific sites, but, as stated, the above applies to all the sites.

Acorn Way, Derby: this is probably the worst of all the sites (along with Spondon Wood, for which planning permission has already been given), since this site does have the direct effect of enlarging the Derby conurbation which will encroach further into the countryside.

I have significant concerns about road safety too, with everybody living in the new development needing to cross the busy Acorn Way in order to reach any facilities.

If this site were to be developed, I believe that a 10% allocation to affordable housing is woefully inadequate.

South West of Kirk Hallam: the decimation of the landscape by this huge development is unacceptable. This is pure Green Belt (not a drop of Grey in sight) – as such, there will be a resulting impact on biodiversity in this area, not to mention the loss of amenity to the existing residents of Kirk Hallam.

The creation of the new link road will only go to increase traffic congestion at the junction with Ladywood Road and also at Twelve Houses (and also at Spondon and in West Hallam, as it will be used as an alternative route, particularly when there are problems on the trunk roads). The amount of traffic that is likely to use this road will affect air quality in the area.

The location of the proposed “local centre” is rather problematic, being on the “wrong” side of the new relief road, adding to road safety concerns.

If this site were to be developed, I believe that a 10% allocation to affordable housing is woefully inadequate.

South West of Draycott: I am concerned about the flood risk at this site.

East of Breaston: I am concerned about the flood risk at this site.

North of Breadsall Hill Top: this site, like that at Acorn Way, has the immediate effect of enlarging Derby, situated as it is next to the recent development within the Derby City boundaries (which doesn't appear to be shown on the map included within the consultation document – this needs to be rectified before anything is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate).

Breadsall village suffers regularly from flooding, and this development will only exacerbate that, as there will be additional run-off from the new estate.

North of West Hallam: from a road safety perspective, this is a ludicrous suggestion. Crossing the road near to the High Lane West / Station Road junction is already a dangerous activity. We may not have had any fatalities, but accidents do happen here (my own daughter still has the pins in her legs from 20 years ago to show what this road is like). Any residents in the new development will have to cross the main road in order to get to any facilities in the village (playgrounds, school, shops, doctor's, etc.) There is no pedestrian crossing, and I notice that there is no requirement for a pedestrian crossing in the notes accompanying this amendment. Indeed, the nearest pedestrian crossings over the A609 are in Ilkeston and at Smalley Crossroads! Having often crossed the junction on a bicycle too, I know that this is even worse. If people are not going to walk into the village, then they will drive, which makes a mockery of any suggestion that this is a sustainable location for development.

There is also a problem with flooding at this location, which any local residents can attest to.

I am totally opposed to this addition to the plans.

South of West Hallam: I have considerable concerns over road safety with this proposal. Beech Lane is already the most congested street in the village. In the afternoon, in the lead-up to school finishing, it is not unusual to see traffic having to drive along the pavement in order to get past obstructions at the same time as there is a large number of young pedestrians in the vicinity. Adding more housing, and a further junction, will only add to what is already an intolerable situation. I see nothing in the notes for this site that suggests that there will be any mitigating measures introduced.

Beech Lane runs across the top of a ridge overlooking the valley – the development of a new estate here will alter the landscape of the village in general, and for existing residents of Beach Lane in particular.

I am not making any additional comments regarding the Sandiacre and Borrowash sites, but I repeat that I am objecting to those as well with regard to the unacceptable loss of Green Belt.

Please acknowledge receipt of these objections.

Regards

Councillor Robert Mee
(West Hallam and Dale Abbey ward)

