

The plan showed the vast majority of the traffic heading east. This raised the question of the suitability of the site if most of the traffic is heading in one direction.

The A38 currently has 25,000 travel movements per day. The cumulative effect of the two railheads (Etwall and Castle Donington) would increase this dramatically. The sites would operate on shifts so there would be more vehicle movements at night therefore acoustic screening would be needed to avoid night noise.

If there was also an increase in the number and length of trains how often would local roads with level crossings be open? It was expected that the site would begin with two additional trains per day increasing to 12 plus those from the Castle Donington site.

It was suggested that bunding be put in the Severn-Trent owned field between Jacksons Lane and the A50 to prevent noise from bouncing back to local houses.

The Castle Donington development was spending £40m on improving roads to the site and no local roads were being used for access. All access to this site should be from the A38 and A50 with no access from local roads.

3 Flood Risk

At the moment there is no Flood Risk Assessment available. The Local Plan stated that there should be no increase in water run off rate or increase in flood risk elsewhere.

At the moment there would seem to be no worries for Etwall as it is upstream of the development but if additional housing in Mickleover and Etwall is approved there is likely to be more pressure on Etwall if the water cannot drain away.

4 Choice of Site

It is a greenfield site used for agriculture and recreational purposes. The Local Plan stated that the proposal should not cause unacceptable harm to the character of the local landscape. It is the site of Hilton Terrace where ancient artefacts had been found. It was felt that this development would totally change the nature of the environment.

Goodmans had told local residents that they did not consider that this was a rural area.

It was confirmed that Community Connect had held a meeting with the residents surrounding the site but had not given them any additional information to that obtained from the exhibition but had made a note of their concerns.

5 Visual Impact

There were no indications of the height of the buildings or how they would mitigate the visual impact. The Local Plan stated that the proposal should preserve the character or settings of any listed buildings or Conservation Areas.

A report before the SDDC Planning Committee recommended that no buildings be put south of the railway due to the flat landscape and the difficulty of shielding the visual impact from areas such as the Bretby Ridge. A decision on this was to be made later in the week. It was stated that if any

buildings were built in this position they would be the last to be constructed as a bridge or tunnel would be required to cross the railway line and this would be expensive. All of the major buildings would be north of the railway line.

It was expected that buildings could be as tall as 35m (100-120 ft) and there would also be stacked containers as well as buildings.

It was suggested that using the railhead could be a device for obtaining planning approval when in fact only a small proportion of the vehicle movements would be by rail as not many of the warehouses were linked by rail. It was felt that the Government had pledged that more freight should be moved by rail so they were keen to make this work. Only 10% of the freight at Daventry was moved by rail but this was growing. Network Rail was expected to increase the gauge of the line.

6 Employment

The claim that 7,000 jobs would be created was based on a formula. Unemployment in South Derbyshire was currently below 2% therefore it could be assumed that labour would come from outside the area. We would have to assume that people would be coming from outside the immediate area and would be travelling by car as there is insufficient local public transport. Some people are going to want to live closer to where they work which will increase pressure for more housing, schools, hospital facilities, doctors etc. It was predicted that 2.1% of the 7,000 employees would live in Etwall (350 people).

7 Housing

Provision is not made in the Local Plan for the impact on housing that this development would bring but it is likely that the Local Plan would be reviewed should approval be given. The current Local Plan provides for an additional 500 houses in Hilton, 100 in Etwall and more in Mickleover. This would meet the number that the Government currently states are required for this area but this does not factor in this development. The Castle Donington site is only 12 miles away – where is all of the additional housing required going to be sited?

8 Railway

Increased waiting times at existing crossings could be expected together with more night trains. There would also be additional trains expected from the Castle Donington site. If the development were to go ahead it should be ensured that all rail shunting took place well away from existing properties. Trains of 750m in length were expected. If most of the trains would be coming from the south and need to go back south – how would they turn around (via Derby?). It would be a 24 hour operation with passenger trains being given priority, therefore, there would be more train movements at night. The cumulative impact of this site and the Castle Donington site would mean a huge impact for those living close to the railway line, especially at night.

It was reported that the Signalmen between South Derbyshire and Stoke had been put on notice, therefore, it was expected that crossings would be automated.

9 Pollution

The Local Plan states that there shall be no unacceptable amenity or safety impacts including noise, vibration, odours, light pollution and traffic generation.

It was expected that there would be air quality issues from the increase in trains, buses and cars.

Light pollution was a worry for residents on Jacksons Lane. Already light at night from Toyota was beginning to be unacceptable. It was expected that the site would require perpetual daylight but that this could be mitigated by using lighting under the eaves of buildings, for example, which would be less obtrusive.

The developers were expected to provide an Environmental Statement.

The site was known to be a resting and feeding site for bats.

If noise was over 3.6 decibels in local properties, this would trigger a duty to provide noise insulation for properties affected.

10 Other Matters

- (a) Water Pressure - There is currently a problem with a lack of water pressure, particularly in Lodge Close. Any increased development was likely to worsen the situation.
- (b) Crime – Egginton Parish Council had visited the Daventry Railhead Development and there had been an increase in crime due to gangs taking advantage of the high value items being moved in HGVs and parked overnight in lay-bys in the area. Free on-site parking was essential.
- (c) White Noise – The site needed to be made a White Noise Area so that there was no beeping from reversing HGV's.
- (d) Construction – Bunding was required before construction began to protect local residents from construction noise. It was expected that the site would take 18 years to develop.
- (e) Emergency Access – An access was planned off Carriers Road where the existing concrete triangles were sited. In view of the number of accidents on this road it was recommended that this be moved nearer the Y-Pass Garage.

11 Next Steps

Everyone was urged to respond to the consultation by 18th July. Letters of objection could also be sent to the addresses listed on the handout and this was also available on the website www.etwall.org.uk. Residents were also encouraged to register with the Planning Inspectorate so that they could be kept informed and also send them their comments on the proposals. A link to the Planning Inspectorate was also available on the Etwall website.