

## Erewash Locally Distinct Issues: Links to Option for Consultation

		OPTIONS FOR CONSULTATION																						
		Key Diagram	(S. 2.10) Local Distinctiveness	1. Climate Change	2. Spatial Strategy	3. SUE's	4. Employment	5. Nottingham City	6. Town and Local Centres	7. Regeneration	8. Housing	9. Gypsies	10. Design	11. Local Services	12. Culture/Sport	13. Travel	14. Transport Infrastructure	15. Green Infrastructure	16. Biodiversity	17. Landscape Character	18. Green Infrastructure	19. Developer Contributions	X. Not included	
<b>ISSUES &amp; OPTIONS CONSULTATION – PART B (EREWASH)</b>	<b>EBC1a.</b> Spatial Portrait																							
	<b>EBC2a.</b> Spatial Vision																							
	<b>EBC3b.</b> Growth outside of the PUA				2.1 d/e																			
	<b>EBC4.</b> SUE's	Stanton				2.1 d	3			7.g														
		L.N of Pewit																						X
	<b>EBC5a.</b> Greenbelt-PUA				2.1a																			
	<b>EBC6a.</b> Greenbelt-Washed over S'ments				2.5																			
	<b>EBC7b.</b> Greenbelt-Inset Settlements				2.5																			
	<b>EBC8.</b> Employ-ment	a. Emp. SSA																						X
		b. Small Alloc						4.e																
		c. Stanton				2.2	3.2	4.c																
	<b>EBC9b.</b> Town Centres								6. 3.6	7. 3.7			10. 3.10											
<b>EBC10b.</b> Regenerating Deprived Areas				2. 1d/3				6.5	7.k															
<b>EBC11c.</b> Green Infrastructure				2.2.6													15					19		
<b>EBC12.</b> Any other Issues	Comments made in response to EBC12 were where appropriate redistributed to appropriately linked issues.																							

The above matrix shows how the preferred options which were supported through the public consultation for the Issues and Options document have subsequently been addressed in the production of the Core Strategy's next stage, the Options for Consultation. The following consultation summaries demonstrate in more detail how Erewash issues have been included and should be read in conjunction alongside the matrix.

**Please note:**

- The Orange boxes ( ■ ) represent the Consultation Summary of the Issues and Options Consultation.
- The Blue boxes ( ■ ) represent how preferred Options (which have come through the Issues and Options Consultation) have been taken forward into the 'Options for Consultation' document.

**Issue EBC1 – Developing an agreed spatial portrait of Erewash which provides a fair reflection of the Borough's characteristics**

There was an overwhelming majority of respondents who believed the spatial portrait, which was set out in the Issues and Options consultation document, represented a fair and accurate reflection of Erewash's characteristics. Indeed, nearly all of the respondents stated that they were in 'general agreement' with the portrait whilst several people expressed enthusiasm that the portrait recognised characteristics such as the Erewash Canal, historic assets and issues effecting rural settlements.

However, there was an issue regarding the fact that the portrait stated how Erewash benefits from an 'excellent transport infrastructure'. Although respondents accepted the Borough had an enhanced strategic infrastructure, they believe the portrait should reflect the heavily congested local roads, inadequate access to large Brownfield sites and that some parts of the Borough remain relatively remote.

Furthermore, minor amendments were suggested such the number of locks on the Erewash Canal should be revised to 14 and that the portrait should include the 7 scheduled monuments and one registered historic park and garden. Finally, there was a couple of comments made regarding 'The map of Erewash' (Map 4.1), which was provided before the portrait and how it should be amended to show Sustainable Urban Extension sites, whilst the key should refer to the 'Stanton Ironworks Site' as the 'Stanton Regeneration Area'.

→ **An overwhelming majority of respondents agreed with the Spatial Portrait of Erewash**

**EBC1 → Section 2.10**

The Spatial Portrait of Erewash which was set out in the Issues and Options Consultation has been carried through into the 'Options for Consultation' document i.e. the next stage of public consultation for the Core Strategy. The suggested minor amendments above have been made to the portrait including the recognition of locally congested roads. The revised portrait has been inserted

into section 2.10 of the 'Options for Consultation' document 'Local Distinctiveness in Erewash'.

**Issue EBC 2 – Developing an agreed spatial vision for Erewash which will guide future development in the Borough to 2026**

As with the spatial portrait, the vast majority of respondents supported the emerging spatial vision for Erewash in 2026 which was established in the Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation document. Of particular note, the Government Office commented how the draft vision is locally distinctive, reflects the key issues for Erewash and demonstrated good links to the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). Indeed, virtually all of the respondents expressed their over riding support of their vision. In particular, positive feedback was received owing to the vision's recognition that growth in rural areas as well as the urban and will be necessary to achieve positive and beneficial change. Similar praise was acquired from the aim that the Erewash Valley will be recognised as a regional tourist destination for recreation and leisure use.

Concerns were expressed though that some of the aims in the vision were ambitious and perhaps unrealistic with one respondent believing that the expectations being placed upon the Stanton Regeneration Area are too high. The following recommendations were also received suggesting that the Borough by 2026 should have:

- \* Responded to the challenge of climate change
- \* Capitalised on the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site in terms of tourism
- \* Protected and enhanced green infrastructure.

Minor word changes to the vision were also suggested such as utilising the term of 'publicly accessible green space' and areas at 'high probability' risk of flooding. Nevertheless, the guiding principles behind the vision were universally supported and signed up to by the stakeholders. One consultee stated how these will need to be carried forward and translated into 'spatial objectives' which will need to be included in the future Core Strategy document.

→ **An overwhelming majority of respondents agreed with the emerging Spatial Vision for Erewash**

**EBC2** → **Section 2.10**

The Spatial Vision for Erewash which was set out in the Issues and Options Consultation has been carried through into the 'Options of Consultation' document. However, the vision has been slightly amended to incorporate subtle word changes and to allow for adequate recognition of climate change, the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site and green infrastructure. The revised portrait has been inserted into section 2.10 'Local Distinctiveness in Erewash'.

### **Issue EBC3 – How should growth be located outside of the Principle Urban Area (Long Eaton, Sawley and Sandiacre) in Erewash?**

Largely owing to the importance of this issue, many associated representations were received but from these comments; it is nevertheless possible to draw out representative conclusions.

Consultees believed that Ilkeston, as the sub-regional centre serving an important employment and shopping role, should be a focus of growth outside the Principal Urban Area (PUA). Many comments expressed their desire for this additional development could provide the catalyst to regenerate the town and help fulfil its complementary role to the PUA. However, seeking to concentrate all development in Ilkeston as envisaged by Option EBC3a, generated concern that this would lead to further decline of rural settlements whilst the option itself was vulnerable to site development constraints. Furthermore people believed that too much development in Ilkeston would stretch existing facilities and services which have already reached their capacity. Indeed one comment from Derbyshire County Council explained of the limited availability of school places within Ilkeston and that from an educational perspective Option EBC3a would be the worst case scenario.

The consultation did find consensus in regard for the necessity of rural settlements to accommodate some additional growth with people repeatedly highlighting the need to provide affordable housing opportunities and support local facilities and services. The recent Taylor Review of the Rural Economy and Affordable Housing (2008) was cited to demonstrate how too restrictive planning practices can have such a detrimental affect the sustainability of on rural communities. This led to an overwhelming majority of positive comments being received in support of Option EBC3b which seeks to focus development in Ilkeston but allow growth to be provided in rural settlements. Ultimately, this option was supported as it provides a balanced approach whilst comments were also received stating that Option EBC3b is the only policy approach which is consistent with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Option EBC3c, which sought to focus development in the rural settlements, received a negative response with comments stating that such a policy would be against guidance particularly the regeneration strategy of the Regional Plan.

Furthermore, deep concern was expressed that the roles of rural settlements and countryside could be irrevocably changed.

Option EBC3d asked people which settlements were in need of and are appropriate for new development. Although Stanley, Stanley Common and Risley were highlighted, West Hallam was the settlement which received particularly attention as suitable location that could benefit from additional growth

- **The majority of respondents supported Option EBC3b**
- **West Hallam was promoted as a settlement in need of and suitable to accommodate some additional growth.**

### **EBC3b → Policy 2 (1.d & 1.e)**

Option EBC3b seeks to focus development outside of the Principal Urban Area (PUS) in Ilkeston Sub Regional Centre but also allow for adequate growth to be provided in rural settlement. This approach has been comprehensively embedded into Spatial Strategy (i.e. Policy 2) of the Options for Consultation Document.

As part of this Policy 2(1.d) sets out how approximately 4,420 homes new homes will be provided in or adjoining Ilkeston, including a Sustainable Urban Extension at Stanton. Furthermore Policy 2 (1.e) shows new housing will be provided in or adjoining other settlements including Breaston, Borrowash, Draycott and West Hallam. Indeed, as part of the justification of the Policy 2 (para 3.2.6) it is demonstrated how development will be concentrated in the larger and more accessible settlements. Other towns and villages will only be allocated small scale development in the form of exception sites, small scale infill, and rounding off settlement boundaries.

### **EBC3d → Policy 2 (1.d & 1.e)**

Insertion of West Hallam is included in the rural settlements laid out in the aforementioned Policy 2 (1.e)

### **Issue EBC4 – Which, if any, of the two Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) sites identified at Stanton and Pewit (West of Ilkeston) are appropriate to meet future growth needs?**

This issue received a large consultation response with many answers being provided to the range of supporting discussion questions which were provided

within the Issues and Options Consultation Document.

Of the two sites discussed, the Stanton Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) site was ultimately preferred as opposed to land to the North of Pewit Golf Course. Generally, Stanton was favoured as its development would not lead into an encroachment into the Green Belt and the open countryside. Indeed as a currently underused, degraded and derelict Brownfield site, its regeneration was seen as a priority from respondents. It was highlighted that not only would the regeneration make a significant contribution to the housing need and regional economy of the Borough, the development of Stanton would provide additional benefit to the potential of opening up areas around the Toton Sidings for redevelopment as well. Furthermore, regeneration at Stanton would also be consistent with RSS which names Stanton as an area which should be supported for brownfield regeneration.

However, a large number of proviso's and conditions were emphasised throughout the feedback such as the need to:

- \* Focus on employment provision rather than current projected residential levels with a view that jobs generate prosperity whilst residential generates commuting and service demands.
- \* Provide adequate access to the site which does not place too much burden on the existing road network whilst simultaneously preventing loss of the Green Belt.
- \* Prevent the loss of potential opportunities for Green Infrastructure at a strategic location and rather develop them.
- \* Embark on a thorough a safe process of adequate decontamination.
- \* Protect the northern part of the Stanton SUE site from development to prevent an undesirable coalescence issues with Kirk Hallam
- \* Acknowledge that it is unlikely that the Stanton SUE will be deliverable in the plan period and viable if there are too many unrealistic expectations placed on the regeneration scheme

As for land to the north of Pewit Golf course, numerous people did express desire for the site to be developed alongside Stanton. People accepted that if the development was needed to meet Borough needs, it was a logical step to utilise the site for its 'white land' credentials and avoid intrusions into the Green Belt elsewhere. However, there were many respondents who highlighted their opposition. The main reason for this opposition was the fact that the site is Greenfield in nature and is currently used by Erewash residents for recreational purposes namely walking. Indeed, people thought that land was a crucially component of the Boroughs Green Infrastructure which acts as an important link between the countryside and Ilkeston

→ **The majority of respondents supported development at the Stanton Sustainable Urban Extension site (subject to certain concerns being**

addressed).  
→ **There was a clear spilt of opinion in relation to the potential development of land to the North of Pewit Golf Course**

**Stanton Ironworks SUE → Policy 2 (1.d), Policy 3, Policy 7(g)**

The Stanton Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) which was favoured through the Issues and Options Consultation has been carried forward into the 'Options for Consultation' document. Indeed, references are made notably Policy 2 (1.d), and Policy 7(g) as well as Policy 3 which is entirely related to SUE's. It is important to remember that SUE policy 3 is supplemented with more detailed policies applying to employment, green infrastructure and transport etc which are contained throughout the Options of Consultation Document

The provisos on the development of Stanton which were laid out in the consultation summary above have been accounted for as follows

Incorporating employment provision:

Both Spatial Strategy Policy 2 (2) and Employment Policy 4 (c) dictates that 'significant' new economic development will take place at the Stanton SUE. Furthermore, SUE Policy 3 (2) also demonstrated how wide range of local employment and training opportunities will be provided for as part of the development.

Preventing undue burden on the existing transport infrastructure:

Regeneration Policy 7 (g) shows how the Stanton SUE will require improved accessibility 'without prejudicing the capacity and function of the existing transport and infrastructure network'. As part of this, SUE Policy 3 (7) encourages a modal shift away from the private car' through for example the increased access to the provision of high quality public transport.

Developing opportunities for Green Infrastructure:

This is clearly incorporated within SUE policy 3(8) which encourages the provision of new Green Infrastructure.

Effective remediation:

Effective remediation is a pre-requisite to development due to Health & Safety legislation.

Avoiding coalescence with Kirk Hallam:

The exact site boundaries of the individual SUES are still to be determined. Nevertheless, the emerging 'Stanton Regeneration Area' does not involve land to the north of Stanton Ironworks being developed.

Ensuring regeneration viability:

Policy 19 (Developer Contributions) explains how new development will be expected to meet the reasonable cost of new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal. Infrastructure Policy 18 also shows how funding from Government and other sources of funding will be sought to support infrastructure requirements.

Furthermore ongoing advice from Homes and Communities Agency/ATLAS will help to ensure that Erewash Borough Council's demands on the Stanton site owner / developer will be reasonable and realistic to ensure development commences within Core Strategy plan period.

**Land to the North of Pewit Golf Course SUE → X (not included)**

The promotion of Land to North of Pewit Golf Course as a SUE has not been included within the 'Options for Consultation' Document. Although there was recognition that site could help Borough meet growth needs if required, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) indicates that site would not be required providing progress with the Stanton Ironworks SUE goes ahead as expected.

**Issue EBC5 – What approach should be taken to the location of the Green Belt boundary around the Principal Urban Area (Long Eaton, Sawley and Sandiacre) within Erewash**

A number of general comments state that the present boundary of the Green Belt should be retained with one respondent citing the need to provide a green lung and a regional identity for the two cities of Nottingham and Derby. Overwhelmingly respondents were in favour of keeping the Green belt boundary as it is around Long Eaton, Sawley and Sandiacre with only one respondent (Nottingham County Council) against this option due to the amount of development Erewash has to accommodate. In a general comment the Environment Agency were also concerned that the present boundary reinforces the residential role of Long Eaton and Sawley placing additional pressures on areas of high flood risk.

However respondents when asked specifically to consider a re-alignment of the Green Belt boundary to encourage development adjacent to the PUA possibly as sustainable urban extensions were generally in favour of this option as it was felt that this would be more sustainable in the long run once brownfield sites had been exhausted and could help to provide development that meets a local need (one respondent mentioned a possible SUE to the south of Lock Lane, Sawley with another respondent wanting a re-alignment to reconsider the roles of Breaston and Draycott). Nottingham County Council stated that any Green Belt review should be done using a clear, and sound, evidence base and should be

underpinned by the principle of sustainability. Several representations were not in favour of this option.

→ **The overwhelming majority of respondents favoured of Option EBC5a**

### **EBC5a → Policy 2 (2.1a)**

The most favoured response to consultation on this locally distinct issue was the option that keeps the Green Belt boundary as it is around the Principal Urban Area (PUA) i.e. Long Eaton, Sawley and Sandiacre. There is no evidence for SUE's to be supported in or adjoining the PUA and as such there are no SUE's identified in Policy 2 (2.1a) of the Options for Consultation document.

### **Issue EBC6 – Erewash's rural settlements washed over by our Green Belt (e.g. Morley, Dale Abbey, and parts of Sawley, Risley, West Hallam, Stanley and Little Eaton) are subject to stringent restrictions from most forms of development. Should we reconsider this approach? If so should this be for all of the above settlements or just some or even none of them? If so, which one?**

When asked if there should be no change to the Green Belt, respondents were overwhelmingly in favour of keeping the present boundaries. Respondents wanted to protect the rural character and historical/archaeological interest of particular settlements (Dale Abbey, Morley, Risley and Stanley) while another respondent stated that Green Belt policy has been effective in containing urban areas and protecting the countryside.

When respondents were asked if the Green Belt should be drawn tightly around settlements allowing for a few development opportunities for local needs only on small sites currently washed over by the Green Belt they came out slightly in favour of this option. English Heritage stated that any relaxation should be informed by a comprehensive understanding of the historic environment of settlements and Derbyshire County Council note that many of the settlements have been designated as Conservation Areas so any relaxation of Green Belt policy should be carefully considered.

Finally respondents were asked their views on an option to form a Green Belt boundary around settlements allowing for a small scale of development to be determined. There was support for this option to provide a flexible approach based on local circumstance and the size and nature of the settlement (boundary changes were suggested at Risley, Stanley and West Hallam). A small number

of representations were against this proposal with one respondent stating that this option would lead to an irrevocable lose of village character.

→ **The majority of respondents supported Option EBC6a**

**EBC6a** → **Policy 2 (2.5) Section 2.10**

The most favoured response to consultation on this locally distinct issue was the option of no change to the Green Belt. Policy 2 (2.5) of the Options for Consultation retains the principle of the Green Belt and allows Erewash Borough Council to decide on a detailed Green Belt boundary review to allow for small scale development of towns and villages through a future Green Belt related Development Plan Document. Other towns and villages not listed in Policy 2 (the Policy lists the larger and more accessible settlements that assist in meeting sustainability objectives) will only be allocated small scale development in the form of exception sites, small scale infill, and rounding off settlement boundaries, as set out in site specific Development Plan Documents (See Justification text paragraph 3.2.6).

The Vision for Erewash in 2026 which is contained in Section 2.10 Options for Consultation also strongly supports and seeks to protect the overwhelming majority of the Green Belt.

**Issue EBC7 – Inset rural settlements within Erewash such as Breaston, Draycott, Ockbrook, Borrowash, Breadsall, Little Eaton, Stanley, Stanley Common, West Hallam, Stanton by Dale and Risley have the Green Belt boundary tightly drawn around them. Should we change this? If so should this be for all these settlements or just some of them? If so, which ones?**

Respondents were in favour of keeping Green Belt boundaries tight around settlements only allowing for limited infill development (Ockbrook, Stanley and Stanley Common were mentioned specifically). However a small number of representations were against this option with Nottinghamshire County Council highlighting the need for a comprehensive review of such settlements to assess their suitability in terms of any changes to their status.

When asked if the Green Belt boundary should be moved to allow a scale of development to be determined in some or all of the above settlements. The vast majority of respondents were in favour of this option as the Green Belt was seen as being a blunt instrument and some development to meet a local need in these locations could be appropriate in terms of sustainability (Breaston, Dale Abbey, Draycott, Risley, Stanley, Stanton-by-Dale, West Hallam and land around

Junction 25 of the M1 were mentioned specifically). English Heritage mentioned that any changes to the Green Belt would need to be informed by a comprehensive understanding of the historic environment of settlements.

→ **A slight majority of respondents supported Option EBC7b**

### **EBC7b** → **Policy 2 (2.5)**

The most favoured response to consultation on this locally distinct issue was the option to allow the Green Belt boundary to be realigned to encourage growth in some or all of the settlements listed to meet local needs. This approach has been carried through to Policy 2 (2.5) of the Options for Consultation which gives scope to allow for smaller scale development of towns and villages using Site Specific Development Plan Documents following a more detailed Green Belt boundary review. This could include for example the logical rounding off settlement boundaries.

### **Issue EBC8 – How does Erewash benefit from its strategic location by finding new high-quality sites in accessible locations that are attractive to the commercial market?**

The issue generated a large consultation response, with consultees asked whether they agreed with each of the 3 associate options. Many people highlighted the overwhelming importance of providing good quality employment land as a means to attract businesses and hence minimise the necessity to travel outside to access employment opportunities. People believed such new employment sites and linked job opportunities are needed to be identified to cope with the inevitable population increase of the borough.

Option EBC8a, which discussed the possibility of providing a Strategic Site Allocation for employment use in an accessible location to an M1 junction, ultimately received a mixed response. Many people saw the benefit of such a located site stating the overwhelming need to make better use of the development land surrounding the Borough's infrastructure network. In this sense, contributors felt that an opportunity to develop a major business park at a M1 junction should not be missed with accessibility being the key criteria for a successful commercial development. Indeed, a couple of comments pointed to the failure of Stanton to be brought forward over a number of years as evidence of this. As for potential appropriate locations, Junction 25 was highlighted on a number (6) of occasions with one consultee who strongly supported this option, suggesting Wilsthorpe Lodge Farm was an ideal location with several potential access points to Junction 25 and bridge access over the M1 already in existence.

However there were many comments stating disagreement with the option with the potential loss of green belt review being an issue highlighted. Comments suggested that such a business park could impact on the office market in Nottingham and also undermine the potential viability of employment land as part of the regeneration of Stanton Ironworks. Furthermore, concern was expressed about the potential pressure which could arise following significant development in the vicinity of the strategic road network. Similar transportation issues were raised due to an acknowledgement that such developments encourage long distance car commuting whereas employment sites should promote accessibility to labour supply and markets via public transport.

Consensus on Option EBC8b however was much easier to establish with a clear majority of consultees supporting the policy approach to promote smaller scale commercial development in accessible locations. That said, no-one was a particular advocate for the option with little justification provided for the support. Indeed, as this approach follows option EBC8a (i.e Business Park), we can assume though that it was favoured comparably due to the options promotion of 'smaller scale commercial development'. Criticism was however received as the option was considered too vague and unfocused to enable any meaningful delivery of genuine and sustained employment opportunities

Option EBC8c which seeks to prioritise employment generation development as part of the potential regeneration of Stanton Ironworks, was particularly supported. Consultees highlighted the fact that no other sites available anywhere else in the borough which are of such strategic nature. Indeed, regard was made to its size, Brownfield status and the ability to integrate with surrounding uses namely the M1 and nearby industrial estates, to provide a new high quality business park. Maximising the area allocated to employment at Stanton was deemed essential to attract new businesses and allow existing companies a chance to relocate from unsuitable sites and thereby catering for business evolution, growth and transformation over the next 20-30 years. There was an ultimate acknowledgement that if the Stanton regeneration does not produce an adequate range of new job opportunity Erewash runs the risk of becoming a commuter borough with people stating for example that 1 house job should equal 1 job.

However, despite this almost universal support concern was expressed with regards to effect of too much employment uses on the overall regeneration scheme's viability. Furthermore the need to create a new distinct place for people to live sustainably was emphasised, which means contains the right balance and range of uses (inc. retail, community facilities and other associated infrastructure) will need to be provided. A final notable concern suggests that too much commercial development could be to the detriment of offices and regeneration in City Centres. In summary therefore, a working balance of land uses needs to be attained which includes a good proportion and range of employment

opportunities.

- **There was a clear spilt of opinion in relation to EBC8a**
- **The majority of respondents supported Option EBC8b**
- **The overwhelming majority of respondents supported of Option EBC8c**

**EBC8a** → **X (not included)**

An strategic employment allocation located close to the M1 motorway has not been carried forward through into the next stage of consultation for the Core Strategy. However, as shown in the response to EBC8b, Options for Consultation Document Employment Policy 4 (e) encourages the supplying of such sites, albeit at a smaller scale that could be promoted through the site-specific Development Plan Document.

**EBC8b** → **Policy 4 (e)**

This Option is comprehensively into Policy 4 (e) of the 'Options for Consultation' document. This Policy gives Erewash Borough Council scope through joint site-specific DPD to provide a range of suitable sites for new employment or relocating businesses elsewhere to sites that are attractive to the market, especially in terms of accessibility, environmental quality and size, particularly where it will assist regeneration.

**EBC8c** → **Policy 2 (2), Policy 3 (2) Policy 4 (c)**

The priority of ensuring sufficient levels of employment generating development are present as part of the Stanton regeneration, is comprehensively embedded throughout the 'Options for Consultation' document in 3 notable polices. Spatial Strategy Policy 2 (2) dictates that significant new employment development should be provided as part of the Stanton Sustainable Urban Extension. The SUE Policy 3 (2) ensures that a wide range of local employment (and training) opportunities will needed to be provided for as part of the development. Furthermore, Employment Policy 4 (c) re-emphasises the above necessity of providing new and significant economic development on the Stanton site as it is named within the Option.

**Issue EBC9 – How should the Core Strategy approach the ongoing need to help regenerate our two main towns and ensure they maximise their potential?**

When asked if the Masterplans adopted for each Town Centre should continue to be the primary way to support regeneration schemes and initiatives a small number of respondents were equally split for and against this option with one respondent stating that Local Authorities have little control over Masterplans and should instead prioritise resources on employment opportunities for local people.

However, a more flexible approach towards possible future actions identified within the Masterplans was supported by a large number of representations with only one representation against this option. A number of people cited the need for greater flexibility to react to the present recession and to ensure that Masterplans are delivered.

A small number of representations came out slightly against an unplanned approach to overseeing the regeneration of Ilkeston and Long Eaton with respondents citing the need for policies that are formulated through consultation and informed by an evidence base (should take account of the latest flooding information).

→ **The overwhelming majority of respondents supported Option EBC9b**

### **EBC9b → Policy 6 (3.6), Policy 7 (3.7), Policy 10 (3.10.3)**

The most favoured response to consultation on this locally distinct issue was the option of allowing flexibility towards possible future actions identified within the Ilkeston and Long Eaton Masterplans given the current economic climate.

Flexibility is ensured throughout the Town Centre (Policy 6 – paragraph 3.6) and Regeneration Policies (Policy 7 – paragraph 3.7) of the Options for Consultation. If it is felt that Ilkeston and/or Long Eaton (and even Sandiacre given the Tesco application that is currently being determined) are underperforming, then Policy 6 (paragraph 3.6.7) gives Erewash Borough Council the scope to conduct more detailed Area Action Plans if it is felt necessary.

In addition to this, Policy 10 (3.10.3) reflects the importance of the Long Eaton Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI) as a mean to positively manage the historic environment and allow for town centre success.

### **Issue EBC10 – How do we transform pockets of deprivation in Erewash through the Core Strategy? Is this a specific issue for Cotmanhay and North Ilkeston?**

Respondents were generally in favour of focusing regeneration in Cotmanhay and North Ilkeston with one respondent stating that it would be unacceptable not to give Cotmanhay special attention as it is one of the most deprived wards in England although representations against this option mentioned that throwing more money at the problem would not alter the situation; if there was to be any future action this should focus on change not support.

However more representations were received that replied positively when asked if the Core Strategy should focus on regeneration aims for Ilkeston as a whole. With respondents citing the need to maximize the potential for economic development and social spin-offs for the Sub-Regional Centre of Ilkeston and that deprivation is spreading beyond North Ilkeston and should therefore be monitored and responded to accordingly.

People mentioned the following locations when asked to identify any other areas within Erewash which require additional regeneration interventions:

Central locations and areas where industry has ceased in **Long Eaton** including the Petersham Estate (mentioned several times), Acton Road Industrial Estate, Beresford Road Area, Stadium site off Grange Road, **Sandiacre**, **Sawley** (Old and New) and **Kirk Hallam**.

→ **The majority of respondents supported Option EBC10b** but identified a number of other locations in Erewash (particularly Long Eaton) that require regeneration interventions

### **EBC10b → Policy 7k, Policy 2 (1.d & 3), Policy 6 (5)**

The most favoured response to consultation on this locally distinct issue was the option to focus on the regeneration aims for Ilkeston as a whole rather than just Cotmanhay and North Ilkeston. The Issues and Options Consultation also identified a number of other locations particularly in Long Eaton).

Correspondingly, Policy 2 from the Options for Consultation document demonstrates that as a Sub Regional Centre, Ilkeston is expected to be a focus of significant growth. This includes a large provision of new housing (2.1.d) as well as Ilkeston being a focus for new retail, social, leisure and cultural development (2.3). This regeneration will be enhanced and supported from the Stanton SUE and town centre/regeneration policies contained within Policy 6 and 7 of the Options for Consultation. Office development will also be promoted within the town centre as outlined within Policy 6 (5). It should be noted that Long Eaton will also benefit through expected growth as well as the aforementioned town centre/regeneration policies.

This issue of targeting regeneration upon known areas of deprivation such as Cotmanhay, has been established within the 'Options for Consultation' document. Indeed, Policy 7 (k) demonstrates how local regeneration initiatives will be supported within such areas of recognised regeneration need.

### **Issue EBC11 – How should we protect and enhance our Green Infrastructure in Erewash?**

A small number of representations were generally in favour of a focus on protecting and enhancing existing strategic routes (Erewash River Valley, Erewash Canal and the Nutbrook Trail) through the Borough. British Waterways stated that this could help to achieve part of the vision for Erewash as a regional tourist destination for recreational and leisure use. Natural England also thought this was a sensible option with the strategic routes becoming a focus for expanding the green infrastructure network over a wider area.

All representations received on the option to protect major new Green Infrastructure routes (Derby to Sandiacre Canal, Ilkeston to Derby Disused Railway Line and the Nutbrook Canal) from adverse development were in favour of this option although one respondent while being in favour was also of the opinion that the money generated from new development such as canal-side employment and housing could enable the strategy to go beyond protection and plan for restoration.

A large number of representations were also in favour of not focusing on particular areas of Green Infrastructure and instead focus on trying to protect and enhance all forms of Green Infrastructure (with just one respondent not in favour of this approach). The reasons cited ranged from a balanced approach rather than focusing on a few sites, the greening of industrial estates, creation of new habitats and more specifically a respondent wanted Stanton Ironworks to be encompassed in any future Green Infrastructure Strategy. Nottingham County Council made a general comment that any future Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy should be developed within the context of the surrounding area and also stated that it is important to identify existing GI, areas that are deficient in GI and areas for future GI development which will feed into the creation of GI networks.

→ **The overwhelming majority of respondents supported Option EBC11c**

**EBC11c → Key Diagram, Policy 2 (2.6), Policy 15 (1 & 3.15) & Policy 19 (Justification Text 3.19.2)**

The most favoured response to consultation on this locally distinct issue was the

option that advocated a generic approach that does not focus on particular areas of Green Infrastructure but attempts to protect and enhance all forms of Green Infrastructure.

This has been carried forward into the Options for Consultation document throughout Policy 15. Criteria point 15 (1) asserts a strategic approach to the delivery, protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure. However, the policy importantly encourages Green Infrastructure to be focused on links between Greater Nottingham and Derby, together with corridors and assets of a more local level. Indeed, Site Specific Documents/Supplementary Planning Documents will identify such local and site specific Green Infrastructure corridors and assets.

Nevertheless, as part of the justification, (para 3.15.3), opportunities for Green Infrastructure in Erewash are highlighted including enhancements to the Derby to Sandiacre Canal, and the 'Great Northern Greenway' based on the former Ilkeston to Derby railway. The Erewash Valley is also presented within the Key Diagram of the Options for Consultation document demonstrating its importance as a strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor. Furthermore, encouraging Strategic Green Infrastructure as part of the Stanton Sustainable Urban Extension is covered in Policy 2 (2.6) which supplements SUE policy 3(8) which encourages the provision of new Green Infrastructure as part of the re-development

In addition to the above, the promotion of using developer contributions to enhance Green infrastructure projects is included in Policy 19 (paragraph 3.19.2).

**Issue EBC12 – Are there any other specific local issues or options relating to Erewash Borough that are not identified above and which you would like to raise?**

Given that EBC12 captures all other issues which in the respondents view, have not been addressed elsewhere in the Erewash distinct chapter of the Issues and Options Consultation Paper, there are a range of comments which are difficult to group and provide detailed assessment. Therefore, this section summarises the comments and should be considered when drafting Preferred Options.

1. Long Eaton is in need of Community Centres with specific attention to provide activities for the younger generation, and in very great need for youth leaders.
2. Reconsider transport policy to meet the redevelopment of the Stanton site is essential.
3. Derby to Ilkeston dismantled railway route for the new cycle route needs to be more sensitively handled in areas of ecological sensitivity (e.g. Stanley glow worms). There should also be tighter control on horse grazed pasture

- and associated buildings as it is completely changing the character of many areas.
4. A new access for the Stanton re-development needs to be created from the M1.
  5. Ilkeston should have a railway station and there should be more recreational opportunities for youths in Ilkeston.
  6. There is a severe lack of local employment in built-up urban areas e.g. Long Eaton, Sawley, Breaston, Draycott, Ilkeston. Also Ilkeston needs a new railway station.
  7. Need to fully research and consider the future before any major planning decisions are taken.
  8. Development should take into account wildlife habitats, future public transport access, schools, medical services, a good variety of shops including a chemist and post office. Also why build more industrial estates when the ones we have are half empty (such as Farm Fields Road). All residential development should be social housing.
  9. Any development proposed should minimize HGV traffic through Erewash's towns and villages, especially Sandiacre.
  10. Evaluate historic employment sites to ascertain the appropriateness of alternative uses. Protect agricultural land from 'horsiculture.' Protect and enhance built heritage. Promote the Borough and develop tourist facilities.
  11. Make the first 30 minutes free in Erewash BC car-parks. Make the Albion Centre in Ilkeston into a Youth Centre. Keep open public conveniences with random checks made by EBC wardens. Better policing of the pedestrianised area of Bath Street (Ilkeston), to ensure no cars or other vehicles are illegally using it as a thoroughfare.
  12. Traffic through Sandiacre is becoming a major problem to residents especially the number of HGV's. HGV's should be re-directed away from Sandiacre by one of the proposed new routes in years not decades.
  13. Provision of affordable housing and provide suitable housing for an ageing population but not close to industrial areas. There is also a need to consider all forms of leisure needed by the new population and also the need to ensure that there is easy access to transport.
  14. 20% is considered to be appropriate for employment land compared to housing. New development should not simply be a dormitory as this would be bad for the environment and the community.
  15. Need more off-road multi-user routes. In Risley there are four bridleways that are dead-ends could these be continued (?) and the Hopewell/Dale track has still not opened. Need a community farm for children to experience contact with animals and would like a community task force made up of unemployed people.
  16. Need to engage communities in helping to plan and look at options. We need better forums to discuss the options and look how we work with partners such as traders and the Wildlife Trust to name but two.
  17. New exit to M1 (Junction 25A) at the junction of the Sandiacre-Ilkeston road with four lanes to the Stanton Industrial Estate. Ban vehicles with

- more than two axels from the Red Lion Public House in Sandiacre to the M1.
- 18.** Want to see a railway station in the vicinity of Stanton/Ilkeston.
  - 19.** Accommodate some of Erewash BC housing growth in Broxtowe and considerable new housing and employment to the 'Western Arc.'

The following comments relate to the above numbered issues and show how they have been addressed in the Options for Consultation document:

- 1.** This is covered in Policy 19 (3.19.2).
- 2.** Refer to wording listed in response to Issue EBC4 (above).
- 3.** See response to Issue EBC11 (above) in relation to Ilkeston to Derby Disused Railway line, but the rest of the comment is overly detailed and not thought to be sufficiently strategic.
- 4.** Refer to separate wording listed in response to Issue EBC4 (above).
- 5.** This comment is included within the list of Transport Infrastructure priorities outlined in Policy 14 (paragraph 3.14).
- 6.** The station is included within the list of Transport Infrastructure priorities outlined in Policy 14 (paragraph 3.14). All aforementioned settlements have been highlighted for growth within Policy 2 (paragraph 3.2) and the creation of employment opportunities is considered to be a major component of growth.
- 7.** Core Strategy policy formulation is influenced by trends pinpointed in background evidence/studies.
- 8.** Issues covered in a variety of different Options for Consultation. In relation to housing mix and viability, there will be a focus on providing sufficient social housing to meet Erewash's needs.
- 9.** This is considered as part of the planning application process, and in particular the Design & Access Statement. With anticipated new employment development most likely to come from office development this could potentially reduce the long-term impact of HGV's throughout the Borough.
- 10.** 'Horsiculture' is generally permitted development. Built Heritage and Tourism will be supported by the following Options for Consultation respectively in Policy 10 (paragraph 3.10) and Policy 12 (paragraph 3.12).
- 11.** Erewash Borough Council will investigate of all of these issues (car parks, youth centres, toilets and wardens) and forward the issue to the correct departments for consideration. However, viability issues will need to be taken into consideration.
- 12.** Refer to separate wording listed above under bullet point number 9.
- 13.** All of these issues to varying degrees are covered in the Options for Consultation.
- 14.** Employment is a priority with the Erewash Vision (contained in section 2.10 of the Options for Consultation document) demonstrating that the

- Borough should not simply fulfill a dormitory role and ensure that sufficient jobs are provided within Erewash “so reducing the necessity to travel outside the Borough to access employment”.
- 15.** Erewash Borough Council is committed to improving the Green Infrastructure network across Erewash and general community assets of an acceptable scale to be provided alongside appropriate new development. Both of these factors are covered in Policy 19 (mentioned specifically in paragraph 3.19.2).
  - 16.** Erewash Borough Council has demonstrated its continued commitment to engagement with a variety of stakeholders and the community (at numerous consultation events) to discuss key issues and options. The Borough Council also decided to extend consultation to eight weeks in order to engage with as wide a range of people/groups as possible.
  - 17.** Refer to separate wording listed in response to Issue EBC4 (above).
  - 18.** The station is included within the list of Transport Infrastructure priorities outlined within Policy 14 of the Options for Consultation.
  - 19.** Regional Plan requirements/policy shows no ability to redistribute housing numbers within the Core HMA. The concept of a Western Arc has been considered as part of accommodating growth at a wider conurbation level.