

EAST MIDLANDS INTERMODAL PARK

Replies must be sent to the first stage of the consultation by **Friday 18th July** by post to FREEPOST EMIP CONSULTATION (no further address details or stamp required) or email to info@emipark.co.uk

Ideas for points that could be included are as follows.

An electronic copy is available on the Etwall website www.etwall.org.uk under the planning section should you wish to cut and paste any points.

- 1 **Flawed consultation** – The consultation leaflet and drop-in session provided insufficient information to make an informed choice on Options A, B and C. When questioned those present gave conflicting answers to queries. According to the developers there will be no speculative building on the site and there are currently no firm commitments from companies wishing to occupy the site. Therefore we are being consulted on what is predicted with little or no definite information.
- 2 **Increased traffic** – The traffic predictions for the site will impose an impossible burden on the local highways, coupled with the possible additional traffic impacts from the East Midlands Gateway Railfreight Interchange at Castle Donington (if approved). The Burnaston Interchange by Toyota has already been the subject of an inquiry and the Inspector found that road configuration to be inadequate. In the Appeal Decision letter of 19th August 2010 the Highways Agency maintains an objection on policy grounds ... the SRN (Strategic Road Network) ... should not be utilised by unsustainable or otherwise inappropriate development”.

Should approval be given to this development, construction of a new access must be complete before work started on site to ensure that all construction traffic came off the A50/A38 rather than using local roads.

Plans allow for all HGV traffic to come off a new junction at the Toyota roundabout but there is likely to be increased traffic through the local villages from employees accessing the site.

- 3 **Flood Risk** – There is no flood risk assessment or description of the Flood Models used by their contractors. The description of balancing lakes and their control structures is vague and sketchy.
- 4 **Greenfield Site** - The proposal is for an industrialisation of the open countryside on a largely Greenfield site in a rural area, historically used for very many years as a village common by residents for the pursuit of leisure activities including bird watching, horse riding, walking, cycling and beekeeping. These are established Rights of Way.
- 5 **Visual Impact** – Mitigating the visual impact on the surrounding properties, the local area and from further afield such as from the Tutbury Ridge and Newton Road in Burton-on-Trent will be very difficult in such a flat landscape. Tall warehousing would be alien to the village schemes of Etwall (with its Conservation Area) and the ancient churches of Etwall and Egginton.

- 6 **Employment** – The claim has been made that 7,000 jobs will be created. There has been no basis for this assumption other than the Cranfield Business School Model that X number of feet of warehousing = X number of jobs. As employment in South Derbyshire is currently just below 2% there is no evidence to show how many of these additional jobs would go to local people or to those from outside the immediate area.
- 7 **Housing** – If the development were to go ahead it is likely that the Local Plan would be reviewed and with this the need to provide more housing in the area together with a consequential increase in demand for local services such as schools, doctors, hospitals etc.
- 8 **Railway** – There was a prediction of an initial increase of two trains per day growing to an additional 12 trains per day once the construction was completed. The trains were expected to be 800m in length (almost half a mile). These would have to be fitted around the existing train service meaning more night train movements. This would increase pressure (and waiting times) on the existing level crossings on Egginton Road and Carriers Road. The additional 12 trains per day does not take account of additional trains associated with the East Midlands Gateway Railfreight Interchange (should that be approved). Any rail shunting should be sited away from local properties.
- 9 **CO2 Emissions** – Although the idea of a railfreight interchange is that it would reduce vehicle movements and therefore CO2 emissions, for those living in the area of the railfreight interchange there would be an increase as more vehicles would be arriving to deliver goods to site and disperse goods which had arrived by rail. How would air quality be monitored and mitigated.
- 10 **Light Pollution** – As this is a going to be a 24 hour operation, surrounding properties and the local area need to be protected from the perpetual daylight lighting.
- 11 **Noise** – As well as the noise from the increase in traffic, there is likely to be an increase in noise due to shunting on site. Earth bunds acoustic fencing or some other form of sound attenuation would be required to protect properties on the other side of the A50 from the site.
- 12 **Sewage** – It would appear that no consideration has been given to the discharge of foul water sewage from the site and recent problems with the sewage outfall at the pumping stations at the A38 and in Egginton village indicate the infrastructure between Egginton Common and Clay Mills lacks any capability of managing the sewage discharge from 7,000 employees.