

Appendix 9.1

Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA  
+44 (1604) 330 630  
[tritaxsymmetry.com](http://tritaxsymmetry.com)

7 January 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

**Notice pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.**

The purpose of this letter is to consult you on the proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI), including warehousing, on the land to the north-west of Junction 2 of the M69 motorway and associated highway works.

The proposals have previously been through two stages of non-statutory consultation in 2018 and 2019, and we are now inviting you to take part in the current stage of statutory consultation. The current statutory consultation is being undertaken pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). Notification of the proposed application has been publicised under the requirements of Section 48 of the Act.

This letter is being sent to all parties required to be consulted under Section 42 of the Act. Accordingly, you are being consulted on the proposals because;

1. You are a statutory consultee, being a prescribed body set out in the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 or a local authority under section 43 of the Act;
2. You have an interest in land that is the subject of the current proposals; or
3. You are another person or body to whom we think this proposal might be of interest.

Item 2 above refers to *an interest in land* - interests in land include the following:

- You are an owner, lessee, tenant or occupier of land which is in our proposed application boundary;
- You have an interest in the land or have the power to sell or convey some of the land which is in our proposed application boundary; or
- Your property or land may, in due course, be affected by the carrying out of or the use of the development which may entitle you to bring a claim for compensation in the future.

In order to deliver on the proposals, Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd will apply for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Secretary of State. If accepted, the application will be examined by the

Planning Inspectorate and a recommendation will be made to the Secretary of State for Transport who then decides whether to approve the DCO.

## The Proposals

The main features of the proposal are:

- New rail infrastructure providing access to the series of parallel sidings
- Intermodal freight terminal ('railport') capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day of up to 775m in length
- Hard surface areas for container storage
- Up to 850,000m<sup>2</sup> GIA of warehousing and ancillary buildings with a total footprint of 650,000m<sup>2</sup> and up to 200,000m<sup>2</sup> of mezzanine floorspace
- Lorry park with HGV fuel filling station
- Energy services area incorporating an electricity sub-station connected to the local distribution network and a gas-fired heat and power plant (10MW generation capacity fed from solar PV including standby capacity (20MW) and battery (20MW))
- Terrain remodelling, hard and soft landscape works, amenity water features and planting
- Noise attenuation measures – acoustic barriers up to 6m in height
- Pedestrian, equestrian and cycle access routes and infrastructure
- A new link road from M69 junction 2 to the B4668 / A47 Leicester Road including:
  - New access road connecting to an internal road network serving the SRFI
  - New rail bridge within the SRFI site
  - New junction at B4668 / A74 Leicester Road
- Works to the M69 motorway at Junction 2 comprising:
  - Reconfiguration of existing roundabout and approach lanes
  - Additional southern slip roads

## Consultation

The purpose of the current stage of statutory consultation is to receive feedback on the proposals from the relevant people. Responses will be considered in the formation of the final proposals and the impact of consultation on the final proposal will be detailed in a Consultation Report which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

The project website ([www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk](http://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk)) contains the following documentation for viewing and download and upon which we are seeking your views as part of the consultation:

- Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
- Draft Development Consent Order;
- DCO Explanation Document;
- Location Plan;
- Draft Works Plans;
- Draft Parameters Plan;
- Draft Illustrative Masterplan;
- Community Explanation Document
- Draft Highway Plans;
- Draft Rail Plans;
- Draft Rail Report
- Draft Planning Statement
- Draft Design and Access Statement.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on our social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyRail; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

If you are unable to view or download any of the above documentation, please get in touch using one of the methods listed below and we will be happy to provide copies of the documents you would like to see either on a USB stick. If you would like a hard copy of the documents the following small charges will apply:

- PEIR: £35.00 plus VAT
- SoCC: £20.00 plus VAT
- Community Explanation Document: £5.00 plus VAT
- Full set of all consultation materials comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plan: £125.00 plus VAT

Subject to government guidelines regarding public gatherings in relation to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, and to any restrictions which may be in place at the particular venue, we are planning to hold public exhibitions at several locations as follows:

- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Wed 19<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- Stoney Stanton Village Hall: Fri 21<sup>st</sup> Jan, 12.30pm-6.30pm
- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Sat 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Burbage Millennium Hall: Mon 24<sup>th</sup> Jan, 3pm-8pm
- Sapcote Methodist Church: Wed 26<sup>h</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- The George Ward Centre: Fri 28<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- St Francis Community Centre: Sat 29<sup>th</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Ashby Road Sports Club: Mon 31<sup>st</sup> Jan. 2pm-8pm
- Narborough Parish Council Hall: Tues 1<sup>st</sup> Feb, 1pm-9pm

We are also hosting two webinars, which require booking via the website [REDACTED] or by calling the Community Information Line (0844 556 3002). The two webinars will be held at the following times:

- Tuesday 25<sup>h</sup> Jan, 2pm-4pm
- Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> Feb, 6pm-8pm

We are aware of the potential for changes in guidance relating to public spaces due to the Covid-19 pandemic and we take public health and safety arrangements very seriously. At the time of writing this letter, those potential changes cannot be known. We are therefore currently planning to proceed with the events as outlined above. We will, however, keep this under review and in the event that any changes are needed in relation to those arrangements, such as restrictions on numbers, booking slots to attend the events or possibly even the need to hold more virtual events in place of those face-to-face exhibitions, we will publicise updates to explain any necessary changes, through our project website, the social media platforms listed above and through local press where possible.

### **Consultation responses**

We invite you to comment on the proposals during the consultation period, which officially runs from 12<sup>th</sup> January until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation however

we have opted to allow more than the statutory minimum 28-day period. The deadline for receipt of responses is 9<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

Please respond using one of the following methods:

- The comments section on [REDACTED]
- Email: [REDACTED]
- Call the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)
- Write to: C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT
- Complete a feedback form online on the project website or post a feedback form to C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT

### Further Information

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the Section 48 press notification which was published in the Leicester Mercury and Hinckley Times on 15<sup>h</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 and in the London Gazette and the Daily Telegraph on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021.

We thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,



Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director

**Section 48 Planning Act 2008**

**Regulation 4 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended)**

**Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Order 202X**

**NOTICE PUBLICISING A PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR A DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER ('DCO')**

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (TSH) of Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton NN4 5EA ("the Applicant") is proposing to apply to the Secretary of State (through the Planning Inspectorate) for a development consent order to authorise the construction, operation, use and maintenance of a rail freight interchange, alterations to Junction 2 of the M69 Motorway to provide south-facing slip roads and a new highway linking Junction 2 of the M69 Motorway with the B4468 Leicester Road ('the Application').

The proposed development would be located on land to the north-east of Hinckley, south of Elmesthorpe, east of the Leicester to Hinckley railway and west of the M69 Motorway. The main features of the proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI) are:

- a) New rail infrastructure off the Leicester to Hinckley railway;
- b) An intermodal freight terminal aka railport, capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day;
- c) Up to 850,000 m<sup>2</sup> of buildings for logistics use (comprising 650,000 square metres at ground floor level and a further 200,000 square metres of mezzanine floorspace) – a use within Class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended (warehouse and storage);
- d) Lorry Park with welfare facilities and HGV fuelling facilities;
- e) Highway works including:
  - i. Provision of south facing slips onto Junction 2 of the M69;
  - ii. A new highway link between Junction 2 and B4668/A47 Leicester Road;
  - iii. Improvements to existing highway junctions in the vicinity of the site

The project is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development meaning the Applicant will submit an Environmental Statement with the Application.

A copy of details of the proposals, plans, maps, and other draft documents showing the nature and location of the proposed development may be inspected free of charge on the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website [\[REDACTED\]](#) under 'Consultation Materials' tab on a page called 'Formal Consultation' from 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

In the event of queries in respect of the project documents on the website the following telephone number can be used:

**Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002**

To request hardcopies of the following documents please contact TSH either through any of the 'Contact Us' details referenced on the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website, or by telephoning the Community Information Line number above. Please note hardcopies are subject to the following reasonable printing and postal costs:

- Statement of Community Consultation £20.00 + VAT
- Preliminary Environmental Information Report £35.00 +VAT

- Community Explanation Document £5.00 + VAT
- Full set of all consultation material comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plans £125.00 + VAT

**The statutory consultation stage on Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange will run from 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 to 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The deadline for responses to the consultation is the 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022.**

During this period responses to the consultation may be made using any of the following methods:

- Online at the project website by completing a questionnaire (A hard copy of the questionnaire may be requested free of charge via the Community Information Line).
- Through attendance at public exhibitions and virtual events.
- Via written response to C/O Lexington Communications, 3rd Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT, or via email [REDACTED]
- Through the Community Information Line 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)

The details of the public exhibitions and virtual events are to be published on the project website; public notices in the press; social media; displayed on Site Notices in the vicinity of the proposed development, and provided to Blaby District Council; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council; Leicestershire County Council; Harborough District Council; Rugby Borough Council and all Parish Councils within 10km of Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on the project's social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyRail; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

and details of the public exhibitions and virtual events will also be published on these platforms.

**Issued by: Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (The Applicant), Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton, NN4 5EA**

**15<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

**Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website <https://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk/>**

**Community Information Line 0844 556 3002**

## Appendix 9.2



Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA  
  
+44 (1604) 330 630  
tritaxsymmetry.com

7 January 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

**Notice pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.**

The purpose of this letter is to consult you on the proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI), including warehousing, on the land to the north-west of Junction 2 of the M69 motorway and associated highway works.

The proposals have previously been through two stages of non-statutory consultation in 2018 and 2019, and we are now inviting you to take part in the current stage of statutory consultation. The current statutory consultation is being undertaken pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). Notification of the proposed application has been publicised under the requirements of Section 48 of the Act.

You are being consulted on the proposals because we are obliged to consult any party who has, or may have, an interest in land which is the subject of the current proposals. However, for your information, we understand that your interest is confined to ownership of land, or interests in land, beneath the public highway which is known as a subsoil interest.

In order to deliver on the proposals, Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd will apply for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Secretary of State. If accepted, the application will be examined by the Planning Inspectorate and a recommendation will be made to the Secretary of State for Transport who then decides whether to approve the DCO.

## **The Proposals**

The main features of the proposal are:

- New rail infrastructure providing access to the series of parallel sidings
- Intermodal freight terminal ('railport') capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day of up to 775m in length
- Hard surface areas for container storage
- Up to 850,000m<sup>2</sup> GIA of warehousing and ancillary buildings with a total footprint of 650,000m<sup>2</sup> and up to 200,000m<sup>2</sup> of mezzanine floorspace
- Lorry park with HGV fuel filling station
- Energy services area incorporating an electricity sub-station connected to the local distribution network and a gas-fired heat and power plant (10MW generation capacity fed from solar PV including standby capacity (20MW) and battery (20MW)
- Terrain remodelling, hard and soft landscape works, amenity water features and planting
- Noise attenuation measures – acoustic barriers up to 6m in height

- Pedestrian, equestrian and cycle access routes and infrastructure
- A new link road from M69 junction 2 to the B4668 / A47 Leicester Road including:
  - New access road connecting to an internal road network serving
  - New rail bridge within the SRFI site
  - New junction at B4668 / A74 Leicester Road
- Works to the M69 motorway at Junction 2 comprising:
  - Reconfiguration of existing roundabout and approach lanes
  - Additional southern slip roads

## Consultation

The purpose of the current stage of statutory consultation is to receive feedback on the proposals from the relevant people. Responses will be considered in the formation of the final proposals and the impact of consultation on the final proposal will be detailed in a Consultation Report which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

The project website ([www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk](http://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk)) contains the following documentation for viewing and download and upon which we are seeking your views as part of the consultation:

- Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
- Draft Development Consent Order;
- DCO Explanation Document;
- Location Plan;
- Draft Works Plans;
- Draft Parameters Plan;
- Draft Illustrative Masterplan;
- Community Explanation Document
- Draft Highway Plans;
- Draft Rail Plans;
- Draft Rail Report
- Draft Planning Statement
- Draft Design and Access Statement.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on our social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyRail; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

If you are unable to view or download any of the above documentation, please get in touch using one of the methods listed below and we will be happy to provide copies of the documents you would like to see either on a USB stick. If you would like a hard copy of the documents the following small charges will apply:

- PEIR: £35.00 plus VAT
- SoCC: £20.00 plus VAT
- Community Explanation Document: £5.00 plus VAT
- Full set of all consultation materials comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plan: £125.00 plus VAT

Subject to government guidelines regarding public gatherings in relation to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, and to any restrictions which may be in place at the particular venue, we are planning to hold public exhibitions at several locations as follows:

- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Wed 19<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- Stoney Stanton Village Hall: Fri 21<sup>st</sup> Jan, 12.30pm-6.30pm

- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Sat 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Burbage Millennium Hall: Mon 24<sup>th</sup> Jan, 3pm-8pm
- Sapcote Methodist Church: Wed 26<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- The George Ward Centre: Fri 28<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- St Francis Community Centre: Sat 29<sup>th</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Ashby Road Sports Club: Mon 31<sup>st</sup> Jan. 2pm-8pm
- Narborough Parish Council Hall: Tues 1<sup>st</sup> Feb, 1pm-9pm

We are also hosting two webinars, which require booking via the website ([www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk](http://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk)) or by calling the Community Information Line (0844 556 3002). The two webinars will be held at the following times:



- Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-4pm
- Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> Feb, 6pm-8pm

We are aware of the potential for changes in guidance relating to public spaces due to the Covid-19 pandemic and we take public health and safety arrangements very seriously. At the time of writing this letter, those potential changes cannot be known. We are therefore currently planning to proceed with the events as outlined above. We will, however, keep this under review and in the event that any changes are needed in relation to those arrangements, such as restrictions on numbers, booking slots to attend the events or possibly even the need to hold more virtual events in place of those face-to-face exhibitions, we will publicise updates to explain any necessary changes, through our project website, the social media platforms listed above and through local press where possible.

### **Consultation responses**

We invite you to comment on the proposals during the consultation period, which officially runs from 12<sup>th</sup> January until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation however we have opted to allow more than the statutory minimum 28-day period. The deadline for receipt of responses is 9<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

Please respond using one of the following methods:

- The comments section on 
- Email: 
- Call the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)
- Write to: C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT
- Complete a feedback form online on the project website or post a feedback form to C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT

### **Further Information**

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the Section 48 press notification which was published in the Leicester Mercury and Hinckley Times on 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 and in the London Gazette and the Daily Telegraph on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021.

We thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,



Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director

**Section 48 Planning Act 2008**

**Regulation 4 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended)**

**Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Order 202X**

**NOTICE PUBLICISING A PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR A DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER ('DCO')**

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (TSH) of Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton NN4 5EA ("the Applicant") is proposing to apply to the Secretary of State (through the Planning Inspectorate) for a development consent order to authorise the construction, operation, use and maintenance of a rail freight interchange, alterations to Junction 2 of the M69 Motorway to provide south-facing slip roads and a new highway linking Junction 2 of the M69 Motorway with the B4468 Leicester Road ('the Application').

The proposed development would be located on land to the north-east of Hinckley, south of Elmesthorpe, east of the Leicester to Hinckley railway and west of the M69 Motorway. The main features of the proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI) are:

- a) New rail infrastructure off the Leicester to Hinckley railway;
- b) An intermodal freight terminal aka railport, capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day;
- c) Up to 850,000 m<sup>2</sup> of buildings for logistics use (comprising 650,000 square metres at ground floor level and a further 200,000 square metres of mezzanine floorspace) – a use within Class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended (warehouse and storage);
- d) Lorry Park with welfare facilities and HGV fuelling facilities;
- e) Highway works including:
  - i. Provision of south facing slips onto Junction 2 of the M69;
  - ii. A new highway link between Junction 2 and B4668/A47 Leicester Road;
  - iii. Improvements to existing highway junctions in the vicinity of the site

The project is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development meaning the Applicant will submit an Environmental Statement with the Application.

A copy of details of the proposals, plans, maps, and other draft documents showing the nature and location of the proposed development may be inspected free of charge on the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website [\[REDACTED\]](#) under 'Consultation Materials' tab on a page called 'Formal Consultation' from 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

In the event of queries in respect of the project documents on the website the following telephone number can be used:

**Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002**

To request hardcopies of the following documents please contact TSH either through any of the 'Contact Us' details referenced on the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website, or by telephoning the Community Information Line number above. Please note hardcopies are subject to the following reasonable printing and postal costs:

- Statement of Community Consultation £20.00 + VAT
- Preliminary Environmental Information Report £35.00 +VAT

- Community Explanation Document £5.00 + VAT
- Full set of all consultation material comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plans £125.00 + VAT

**The statutory consultation stage on Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange will run from 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 to 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The deadline for responses to the consultation is the 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022.**

During this period responses to the consultation may be made using any of the following methods:

- Online at the project website by completing a questionnaire (A hard copy of the questionnaire may be requested free of charge via the Community Information Line).
- Through attendance at public exhibitions and virtual events.
- Via written response to C/O Lexington Communications, 3rd Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT, or via email [REDACTED]
- Through the Community Information Line 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)

The details of the public exhibitions and virtual events are to be published on the project website; public notices in the press; social media; displayed on Site Notices in the vicinity of the proposed development, and provided to Blaby District Council; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council; Leicestershire County Council; Harborough District Council; Rugby Borough Council and all Parish Councils within 10km of Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on the project's social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyRail; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

and details of the public exhibitions and virtual events will also be published on these platforms.

**Issued by: Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (The Applicant), Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton, NN4 5EA**

**15<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

**Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website [REDACTED]**

**Community Information Line 0844 556 3002**

## Appendix 9.3

Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA  
+44 (1604) 330 630  
tritaxsymmetry.com

4 February 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

As a party identified under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act), we wrote to you earlier in January 2022 to invite you to take part in this current stage of the statutory consultation relating to our proposed HNRFI development.

Tritax Symmetry has been informed that some parties did not receive a consultation letter and some letters were inadvertently omitted from the original notification list due to administrative errors.

The earlier letter invited parties to comment on the proposals during the period between 12<sup>th</sup> January and 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. Given that some parties have not received, or had this letter posted, we have decided to **extend the consultation until 8th April 2022 for all parties.**

The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation, however we opted to allow more than the statutory minimum 28-day period and we would like to ensure this new extended period is available to all parties. Therefore the new deadline for receipt of all responses is **8th April 2022.**

Furthermore, we'd like to inform you that the Twitter handle for the project was incorrectly published in the earlier letter. The correct handle is @HinckleyNRFI.

If you have any questions in respect of the consultation process please feel free to contact the consultation team on [REDACTED] or the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm).

Thank you if you have already provided your feedback to the consultation and if not, we thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director

Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA  
+44 (1604) 330 630  
tritaxsymmetry.com

4 February 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

**Notice pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.**

The purpose of this letter is to consult you on the proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI), including warehousing, on the land to the north-west of Junction 2 of the M69 motorway and associated highway works.

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd has been informed that you were inadvertently omitted from the original notification list due to administrative errors when our consultation letters were posted earlier in January 2022 seeking views on our proposals. We have therefore decided to extend the statutory consultation from the previous deadline of 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022 to **8<sup>th</sup> April 2022**.

The proposals have previously been through two stages of non-statutory consultation in 2018 and 2019, and we are now inviting you to take part in the current stage of statutory consultation. The current statutory consultation is being undertaken pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). Notification of the proposed application has been publicised under the requirements of Section 48 of the Act.

This letter is being sent to all parties required to be consulted under Section 42 of the Act. Accordingly, you are being consulted on the proposals because;

1. You are a statutory consultee, being a prescribed body set out in the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 or a local authority under section 43 of the Act;
2. You have an interest in land that is the subject of the current proposals; or
3. You are another person or body to whom we think this proposal might be of interest.

Item 2 above refers to *an interest in land* - interests in land include the following:

- You are an owner, lessee, tenant or occupier of land which is in our proposed application boundary;



- You have an interest in the land or have the power to sell or convey some of the land which is in our proposed application boundary; or
- Your property or land may, in due course, be affected by the carrying out of or the use of the development which may entitle you to bring a claim for compensation in the future.

In order to deliver on the proposals, Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd will apply for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Secretary of State. If accepted, the application will be examined by the Planning Inspectorate and a recommendation will be made to the Secretary of State for Transport who then decides whether to approve the DCO.

## The Proposals

The main features of the proposal are:

- New rail infrastructure providing access to the series of parallel sidings
- Intermodal freight terminal ('railport') capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day of up to 775m in length
- Hard surface areas for container storage
- Up to 850,000m<sup>2</sup> GIA of warehousing and ancillary buildings with a total footprint of 650,000m<sup>2</sup> and up to 200,000m<sup>2</sup> of mezzanine floorspace
- Lorry park with HGV fuel filling station and driver welfare facilities
- Energy services area incorporating an electricity sub-station connected to the local distribution network and a gas-fired heat and power plant (10MW) generation capacity fed from solar PV including standby capacity (20MW) and battery (20MW)
- Terrain remodelling, hard and soft landscape works, amenity water features and planting
- Noise attenuation measures – acoustic barriers up to 6m in height
- Pedestrian, equestrian and cycle access routes and infrastructure
- A new link road from M69 junction 2 to the B4668 / A47 Leicester Road including:
  - New access road connecting to an internal road network serving the SRFI
  - New rail bridge within the SRFI site
  - New junction at B4668 / A47 Leicester Road
- Works to the M69 motorway at Junction 2 comprising:
  - Reconfiguration of existing roundabout and approach lanes
  - Additional southern slip roads

## Consultation

The purpose of the current stage of statutory consultation is to receive feedback on the proposals from the relevant people. Responses will be considered in the formation of the final proposals and the impact of consultation on the final proposal will be detailed in a Consultation Report which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

The project website ([www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk](http://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk)) contains the following documentation for viewing and download and upon which we are seeking your views as part of the consultation:

- Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
- Draft Development Consent Order (DCO);
- DCO Explanation Document;
- Location Plan;
- Draft Works Plans;
- Draft Parameters Plan;
- Draft Illustrative Masterplan;
- Community Explanation Document
- Draft Highway Plans;

- Draft Rail Plans;
- Draft Rail Report
- Draft Planning Statement
- Draft Design and Access Statement.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on our social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyNRFI; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

If you are unable to view or download any of the above documentation, please get in touch using one of the methods listed below and we will be happy to provide copies of the documents you would like to see either on a USB stick. If you would like a hard copy of the documents the following small charges will apply:

- PEIR: £35.00 plus VAT
- SoCC: £20.00 plus VAT
- Community Explanation Document: £5.00 plus VAT
- Full set of all consultation materials comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plan: £125.00 plus VAT

We appreciate that you may have missed the opportunity to attend the public exhibitions and webinars by the time you receive this letter. The webinars will be published on the website for you to watch back, however, as you may have missed the opportunity to take part in one of the public exhibitions, we would like to offer to you a one-to-one meeting with the project team to ask any questions you may have. Please contact the consultation team on [REDACTED] or by calling the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm) to arrange.

### **Consultation responses**

We invite you to comment on the proposals during the consultation period, which officially runs until 8<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation however we have opted to allow more than the statutory minimum 28-day period. The deadline for receipt of responses is **8<sup>th</sup> April 2022**.

Please respond using one of the following methods:

- The comments section on [REDACTED]
- Email: [REDACTED]
- Call the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)
- Write to: C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT
- Complete a feedback form online on the project website or post a feedback form to C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT

### **Further Information**

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the Section 48 press notification which was published in the Leicester Mercury and Hinckley Times on 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 and in the London Gazette and the Daily Telegraph on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021. An updated Section 48 Notice will be published in the local press confirming the extended consultation period.

We thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,



Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director

Appendix 9.4

Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA  
+44 (1604) 330 630  
tritaxsymmetry.com

4 February 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

As a party identified under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act), we wrote to you earlier in January 2022 to invite you to take part in this current stage of the statutory consultation relating to our proposed HNRFI development.

Tritax Symmetry has been informed that some parties did not receive a consultation letter and some letters were inadvertently omitted from the original notification list due to administrative errors.

The earlier letter invited parties to comment on the proposals during the period between 12<sup>th</sup> January and 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. Given that some parties have not received, or had this letter posted, we have decided to **extend the consultation until 8th April 2022 for all parties.**

The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation, however we opted to allow more than the statutory minimum 28-day period and we would like to ensure this new extended period is available to all parties. Therefore the new deadline for receipt of all responses is **8th April 2022.**

Furthermore, we'd like to inform you that the Twitter handle for the project was incorrectly published in the earlier letter. The correct handle is @HinckleyNRFI.

If you have any questions in respect of the consultation process please feel free to contact the consultation team on [REDACTED] or the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm).

Thank you if you have already provided your feedback to the consultation and if not, we thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,



Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director

Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA  
  
+44 (1604) 330 630  
tritaxsymmetry.com

4 February 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

**Notice pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.**

The purpose of this letter is to consult you on the proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI), including warehousing, on the land to the north-west of Junction 2 of the M69 motorway and associated highway works.

Tritax Symmetry has been informed that you were inadvertently omitted from the original notification list due to administrative errors when our consultation letters were posted earlier in January 2022 seeking views on our proposals. We have therefore decided to extend the statutory consultation from the previous deadline of 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022 to **8<sup>th</sup> April 2022**.

The proposals have previously been through two stages of non-statutory consultation in 2018 and 2019, and we are now inviting you to take part in the current stage of statutory consultation. The current statutory consultation is being undertaken pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). Notification of the proposed application has been publicised under the requirements of Section 48 of the Act.

You are being consulted on the proposals because we are obliged to consult any party who has, or may have, an interest in land which is the subject of the current proposals. However, for your information, we understand that your interest is confined to ownership of land, or interests in land, beneath the public highway which is known as a subsoil interest.

In order to deliver on the proposals, Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd will apply for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Secretary of State. If accepted, the application will be examined by the Planning Inspectorate and a recommendation will be made to the Secretary of State for Transport who then decides whether to approve the DCO.

## **The Proposals**

The main features of the proposal are:

- New rail infrastructure providing access to the series of parallel sidings
- Intermodal freight terminal ('railport') capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day of up to 775m in length
- Hard surface areas for container storage

- Up to 850,000m<sup>2</sup> GIA of warehousing and ancillary buildings with a total footprint of 650,000m<sup>2</sup> and up to 200,000m<sup>2</sup> of mezzanine floorspace
- Lorry park with HGV fuel filling station and driver welfare facilities.
- Energy services area incorporating an electricity sub-station connected to the local distribution network and a gas-fired heat and power plant (10MW generation capacity fed from solar PV including standby capacity (20MW) and battery (20MW)
- Terrain remodelling, hard and soft landscape works, amenity water features and planting
- Noise attenuation measures – acoustic barriers up to 6m in height
- Pedestrian, equestrian and cycle access routes and infrastructure
- A new link road from M69 junction 2 to the B4668 / A47 Leicester Road including:
  - New access road connecting to an internal road network serving the SRFI
  - New rail bridge within the SRFI site
  - New junction at B4668 / A47 Leicester Road
- Works to the M69 motorway at Junction 2 comprising:
  - Reconfiguration of existing roundabout and approach lanes
  - Additional southern slip roads

## Consultation

The purpose of the current stage of statutory consultation is to receive feedback on the proposals from the relevant people. Responses will be considered in the formation of the final proposals and the impact of consultation on the final proposal will be detailed in a Consultation Report which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

The project website ([www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk](http://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk)) contains the following documentation for viewing and download and upon which we are seeking your views as part of the consultation:

- Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
- Draft Development Consent Order (DCO);
- DCO Explanation Document;
- Location Plan;
- Draft Works Plans;
- Draft Parameters Plan;
- Draft Illustrative Masterplan;
- Community Explanation Document
- Draft Highway Plans;
- Draft Rail Plans;
- Draft Rail Report
- Draft Planning Statement
- Draft Design and Access Statement.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on our social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyNRFI; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

If you are unable to view or download any of the above documentation, please get in touch using one of the methods listed below and we will be happy to provide copies of the documents you would like to see on a USB stick. If you would like a hard copy of the documents the following small charges will apply:

- PEIR: £35.00 plus VAT
- SoCC: £20.00 plus VAT
- Community Explanation Document: £5.00 plus VAT

- Full set of all consultation materials comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plan: £125.00 plus VAT

We appreciate that you may have missed the opportunity to attend the public exhibitions and webinars by the time you receive this letter. The webinars will be published on the website for you to watch back, however, as you may have missed the opportunity to take part in one of the public exhibitions, we would like to offer to you a one-to-one meeting with the project team to ask any questions you may have. Please contact the consultation team on [REDACTED] or by calling the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm) to arrange.

### Consultation responses

We invite you to comment on the proposals during the consultation period, which officially runs until 8<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation however we have opted to allow more than the statutory 28-day period. The deadline for receipt of responses is **8<sup>th</sup> April 2022**.

Please respond using one of the following methods:

- The comments section on [w \[REDACTED\]](#)
- Email: [REDACTED]
- Call the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)
- Write to: C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT
- Complete a feedback form online on the project website or post a feedback form to C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT

### Further Information

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the Section 48 press notification which was published in the Leicester Mercury and Hinckley Times on 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 and in the London Gazette and the Daily Telegraph on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021. An updated Section 48 Notice will be published in the local press confirming the extended consultation period.

We thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director



Appendix 9.5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA

+44 (1604) 330 630  
[tritaxsymmetry.com](http://tritaxsymmetry.com)

[Address]

15 February 2022

Dear Occupier

### **Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI)**

You may have recently received a letter and Land Interest Questionnaire (LIQ) from a company called Terraquest. Terraquest have been carrying out a process known as land referencing on behalf of Tritax Symmetry to support our application for Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI).

From feedback received at our consultation events we understand that concerns have been raised by those people who have received a LIQ from Terraquest because they own a subsoil interest in the highway.

A subsoil interest is a legal presumption that the ground beneath the surface of unregistered public highways is owned by the adjacent freeholders. It could be that your property does not include the land in the highway, but there is often no way of proving this so we conservatively have to include every freeholder directly adjacent to unregistered public highways in the land referencing exercise.

Land referencing allows us to fulfil our legal duty to identify those persons who may have an interest in the land potentially affected by HNRFI so as to allow those persons to be consulted directly regarding the proposed development and their comments taken into account and addressed as necessary prior to the submission of the application.

We would like to emphasise that receipt of **a letter and LIQ does not mean that your property or land is directly affected by the scheme**. The information from the LIQs is used to ensure those in the area are consulted directly, it does not necessarily mean that your property is required for the scheme.

The proposed highway upgrades at local junctions and on local roads which are still being discussed with LCC Highways are proposed to be carried out within the adopted highway, we do not intend to Compulsorily Purchase third party land outside of the adopted highway to carry out these upgrades.

Terraquest included a telephone and e-mail address in their correspondence to answer any queries regarding the LIQs and can still be contacted. However, should you wish to discuss this directly with Tritax Symmetry please do so by the following means:

- Email: [REDACTED]
- Calling the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm).

I hope this letter assists in addressing your concerns but please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information.

**Alex Reynolds**

Development Director

For and on behalf of Tritax Symmetry

**T:** +44 (1604) 330630

Appendix 9.6

**List of Prescribed Consultees under the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009**

Position	Prescribed Body	Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3	Address 4	Postcode
	Health and Safety Exec	Health and Safety Executive (The Midlands)*	NSIP Consultations	5.5.2 Redgrave Court	Merton Road	Bootle	L20 7HS
	Clinical Commissioning Groups	NHS East Leicestershire and Rutland CCG	NHS Coventry and Rugby COG	Parkside House,	Quinton Road		CV1 2NU
	Clinical Commissioning Groups	NHS East Leicestershire and Rutland CCG	Room G30	Pen Lloyd Building	County Hall	Leicester	LE3 8TB
	Clinical Commissioning Groups	NHS Warwickshire North CCG	Second Floor, Heron House	Newdegate Street	Nuneaton		CV11 4EL
Executive Director of Strategy and Planning	Clinical Commissioning Groups	NHS West Leicestershire CCG	55 Woodgate	Loughborough	Leicestershire		LE11 2TZ
	NHS Commissioning Board	NHS England Commissioning Board	PO Box 16728	Redditch			B97 9TP
Chief Officer for Planning and Performance	Natural England	Natural England	Hornbeam House	Electra Way	Crewe Business Park	Crewe	CW1 6GJ
	Natural England	Natural England – East Midlands	Apex Court	City Link	Nottingham		
Senior Local Government and National Infrastructure Adviser	Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission	Historic England	4th Floor	Cannon Bridge House	25 Dowgate Hill	London	EC4R 2YA
Inspector of Ancient Monuments	Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission	Historic England	4th Floor	Cannon Bridge House	25 Dowgate Hill	London	EC4R 2YA
	Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission	Historic England - Midlands Regional Office*	The Foundary	82 Granville Street	Birmingham		B1 2LH
Chief Fire Officer	Fire and Rescue Authority	Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service	12 Geoff Monk Way	Birstall	Leicester		LE4 3BU
	Fire and Rescue Authority	Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service*	Headquarters	Warwick Street	Leamington Spa		CV32 5LH
Police and Crime Commissioner	Police and Crime Commissioner	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire	Police Headquarters	St Johns	Enderby	Leicester	LE19 2BX
Police and Crime Commissioner	Police and Crime Commissioner	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Warwickshire	3 Northgate Street	Warwick			CV34 4SP
Chairman	Relevant Parish Councils	Aston Flamville Parish Council	1 Manor House Close	Aston Flamville	Hinckley	Leicester	LE10 3AU
	Relevant Parish Councils	Barwell Parish Council	10 High Street	Barwell	Leicester		LE9 8DQ
	Relevant Parish Councils	Broughton Astley Parish Council	Council Office	Station Road	Broughton Astley	Leicester	LE9 6PT
	Relevant Parish Councils	Cosby Parish Council	76 Springwell Lane	Whetstone	Leicester		LE8 6LT
	Relevant Parish Councils	Croft Parish Council	PO Box 10917		Leicester		LE9 3WP
	Relevant Parish Councils	Elmesthorpe Parish Council	Village Hall	Wilkinson Lane	Elmesthorpe	Leicester	LE9 7SP
	Relevant Parish Councils	Leicester Forest East Parish Council	The Parish Hall	Kings Drive	Leicester Forest East	Leicester	LE3 3JE
	Relevant Parish Councils	Leicester Forest West Parish Council	New Haven Far	Dans Lane	Leicester Forest West	Leicestershire	LE9 9RY
	Relevant Parish Councils	Lutterworth Town Council	Council Offices	Coventry Road	Lutterworth		LE17 4SH
	Relevant Parish Councils	Osbaston Parish Council	10 Little Mill Close	Barlstone	Nuneaton		CV13 0HW
	Relevant Parish Councils	Sapcote Parish Council	15 William Spencer Avenue	Sapcote	Leicestershire		LE9 4NF
	Relevant Parish Councils	Stoney Stanton Parish Council	83 Kirkby Rd	Barwell		Leicester	LE9 8FR
	Relevant Parish Councils	Willey Parish Council	Star Cottage	Main Street	Willey		CV23 0SH
	The Environmental Agency	Environmental Agency	PO Box 544	Rotherham	Yorkshire		S60 1BY
Equality and Human Rights Commission	Equality and Human Rights Commission*	Correspondence Unit	Fleetbank House	2-6 Salisbury Square	London		EC4Y 8JX
The Homes And Communities Agency	Homes England*	2 Marsham Street	Westminster	London			SW1P 4DF
The Homes And Communities Agency	Homes England*	50 Victoria Street	Westminster	London			SW1H 0TL

Secretary of State for Transport	Secretary of State for Transport	Secretary of State for Transport	Great Minister	House 33	Horseferry Road	London	SW1P 4DR
	Integrated Transport Authority	Transport for the East Midlands*	East Midlands Councils, First Floor Offices, South Annexe, Pera Business Park	Nottingham Road	Melton Mowbray	Leicestershire	LE13 0PB
	Relevant Highway Authority	Leicestershire County Council - Highways Development Management*	County Hall	Glenfield	Leicester		LE3 8RA
Spatial Planning Manager	Relevant Strategic Highway Authority	Highways England	National Highways	Stirling House	Lakeside Court	Osier Drive, Annesley	NG15 0DS
	The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority	Lake View	200 Lichfield Lane	Mansfield		NG18 4RG
	Office of Rail and Road	Office of Rail and Road	25 Cabot Square	London			E14 4QZ
	Canal and River Trust	Canal and River Trust	Head Office, National Waterways	Museum Ellesmere Port	South Per Road	Cheshire	CH65 4FW
	Local Resilience Forum	Leicestershire Local Resilience Forum	No. 1 Romulus Court	Meridian East	Meridian Business Park	Leicester	LE19 1YG
	Local Resilience Forum	Warwickshire Prepared (Warwickshire Local Resilience Forum)*	Shire Hall	Market Place	Warwick		CV34 4RL
	Statutory Undertakers	Abbey Power Generation Ltd	1-3 Strand	London			WC2N 5EH
	Statutory Undertakers	BT Openreach	81 Newgate Street	London			EC1A 7AJ
	Statutory Undertakers	Cadent Gas Limited	Ashbrook Court,	Central Boulevard	Coventry		CV7 8PR
	Statutory Undertakers	Centrica PLC*	Devonshire House	1 Devonshire Street	London		W1W 5DR
	Statutory Undertakers	Citigen (London) Limited	Millstream	Maidenhead Road	Windsor,	Berkshire	SL4 5GD
	Statutory Undertakers	Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee	c/o Department for Transport	Great Minster House	33 Horseferry Road	London	SW1P 4DR
	Statutory Undertakers	Dong Energy RB (UK) Limited	5 Howick Place	London			SW1P 1WG
	Statutory Undertakers	East Midlands Railway	Prospect House	Millenium Way	Pride Park	Derby	DE24 8HG
	Statutory Undertakers	Eastern Power Networks PLC	Newington House	237 Southwark Bridge Road	London		SE1 6NP
	Statutory Undertakers	Eclipse Power Network Limited	24 Osier Way	Olney Office Park	Olney		MK46 5FP
	Statutory Undertakers	EDF Development Company	Limited	Westwood Way	Westwood Business Park	Coventry	CV4 8LG
	Statutory Undertakers	Electricity North West Limited*	Electricity North West	Borron Street	Stockport		SK1 2JD
	Statutory Undertakers	Energetics Electricity Limited	Fenick House	Lister Way	Hamilton International	Glasgow	G72 0FT
	Statutory Undertakers	Energetics Gas Limited*	Fenick House	Lister Way	Hamilton	Glasgow	G72 0ET
	Statutory Undertakers	Energy Assets Networks Limited	Ship Canal House	98 King Street	Manchester		M2 4WU
	Statutory Undertakers	Energy Assets Pipelines	Limited	Ship Canal House	98 King Street	Manchester	M2 4WU
	Statutory Undertakers	ENGIE Power Limited*	No. 1 Leeds	26 Whitehall Road	Leeds		LS12 1BE
	Statutory Undertakers	EOX UK PLC	Westwood Way	Westwood Business Park	Coventry		CV4 8LG
Operations Manager	Statutory Undertakers	ES Pipelines Limited	1st Floor	Bluebird House	Mole Business Park		KT22 7BA
	Statutory Undertakers	ESP Connections Limited*	2nd Floor Bluebird House	Mole Business Park	Leatherhead		KT22 7BA
	Statutory Undertakers	ESP Electricity Limited	Bluebird House	Mole Business Park	Leatherhead	Surrey	KT22 7BA
	Statutory Undertakers	ESP Networks Limited*	2nd Floor Bluebird House	Mole Business Park	Leatherhead		KT22 7BA
	Statutory Undertakers	Esso Petroleum Company Limited	Exxonmobil House	Ermyrn Way	Leatherhead	Surrey	KT22 8UX
	Statutory Undertakers	Forbury Assets Limited	No.1 Forbury Place	43 Forbury Road	Reading		RG1 3JH
	Statutory Undertakers	Fulcrum Electricity Assets Limited	2 Europa View	Sheffield Business Park	Sheffield		S9 1XH

	Statutory Undertakers	Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	5th Floor 6 St Andrew	Street	London		EC4A 3AE
	Statutory Undertakers	G2 Energy IDNO Limited	Bluebird House	Mole Business Park	Leatherhead	Surrey	KT22 7BA
	Statutory Undertakers	GTC Pipelines Limited	Energy House	Woolpit Business Park, Windmill Avenue	Woolpit	Bury St Edmunds	IP30 9UP
	Statutory Undertakers	Harlaxton Energy Networks	Olney Office Park	25 Osier Way	Olney	Buckinghamshire	MK46 5FP
	Statutory Undertakers	Harlaxton Gas Networks Limited*	Toll Bar Road	Marston	Grantham		NG32 2HT
	Statutory Undertakers	Health Education England	1 Westbridge Cl	Leicester			LE3 5DR
	Statutory Undertakers	Health Research Authority	The Old Chapel	Royal Standard Court	Nottingham		NG1 6FS
	Statutory Undertakers	Highways England Historical Railways Estate	37 Tanner Row	York			YO1 6WP
	Statutory Undertakers	Independent Pipelines Limited*	Synergy House	Woolpit Business Park	Bury St Edmunds	Suffolk	IP30 9UP
	Statutory Undertakers	Independent Power Networks Limited	Toll Bar Road	Marston	Grantham,	Lincs	NG32 2HT
	Statutory Undertakers	Indigo Pipelines Limited*	1 London Wall	London			EC2Y 5AB
	Statutory Undertakers	International Power Ltd	40 Grosvenor Place	Victoria	London		SW1X 7EN
	Statutory Undertakers	Last Mile Electricity Ltd	Fenick House	Lister Way	Hamilton Technology Park	Glasgow	G72 0FT
	Statutory Undertakers	Last Mile Gas Limited*	Fenick House	Lister Way	Hamilton Technology Park	Glasgow	G72 0FT
	Statutory Undertakers	Leep Electricity Networks Ltd	Energy House	Woolpit Business Park	Windmill Avenue	Bury St Edmunds	IP30 9UP
	Statutory Undertakers	Leep Gas Networks Limited	The Greenhouse	Mediacityuk	Salford		M50 2EQ
	Statutory Undertakers	Leicester and Leicestershire LEP	City Hall	115 Charles Street	Leicester		LE1 1FZ
	Statutory Undertakers	Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust	Bridge Park Plaza	Bridge Park Road	Thurmaston	Leicester	LE4 8PQ
	Statutory Undertakers	Murphy Gas Networks Limited	Murphy Leeds Office	Long Causeway	Cross Green	Leeds	LS9 0SG
	Statutory Undertakers	National Grid Electricity	Transmission Plc	Avon Bank	Feeder Road	Bristol	BS2 0TB
	Statutory Undertakers	National Grid Gas Plc	1-3 Strand	London			WC2N 5EH
	Statutory Undertakers	National Patient Safety Agency c/o NHS England*	PO Box 16738,	Redditch			B97 9PT
	Statutory Undertakers	NATS Ltd*	Safeguarding Office	4000 Parkway	Whiteley	Fareham	PO15 7FL
Development Manager	Statutory Undertakers	Network Rail	1 Eversholt Street	London			NW1 2DN
	Statutory Undertakers	Network Rail & Network Rail Infrastructure Limited*	1 Eversholt Street	London			NW1 2DN
	Statutory Undertakers	Network Rail & Network Rail Infrastructure Limited*	1 Eversholt Street	London			NW1 2DN
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS Blood and Transplant	500, North Bristol Park,	Filton,	Bristol		BS34 7QH
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS Business Services Authority	Stella House	Goldcrest Way	Newburn Riverside	Newcastle upon Tyne	NE15 8NY
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS Digital	Unit 7 Strawberry Fields	Berrywood Business Village	Tollbar Way	Southampton	SO30 2UN
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS East Midlands Ambulance Service University NHS Foundation Trust*	1 Horizon Place	Mellors Way	Nottingham Business Park	Nottingham	NG8 6PY
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS England Legal Team	4th Floor	Quarry House	Leeds		LS2 7UE
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS Resolution	8th Floor	10 South Colonnade	Canary Wharf	London	E14 4PU
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS Trust Development Authority	Wellington House	133-155 Waterloo Road	105 Victoria Street	London	SE1 8UG
	Statutory Undertakers	NHS West Midlands Ambulance Service University NHS Foundation Trust*	Ambulance Headquarters	Millennium Point	Waterfront Business Park	Brierley Hill	DY5 1LX

	Statutory Undertakers	Northern Gas Networks	1100 Century Way	Thorpe Park	Business Park	Colton, Leeds	LS15 8TU
	Statutory Undertakers	Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Limited*	98 Aketon Road		Castleford		WF10 5DS
	Statutory Undertakers	Npower Direct Limited*	Level 20, 25	Canada Square	London		E14 5LQ
	Statutory Undertakers	Optimus Wind Limited and RWE Generation UK Plc	Windmill Hill	Business Park	Whitehill Way	Swindon	SN5 6PB
	Statutory Undertakers	Quadrant Pipelines Limited	Synergy House	Woolpit Business Park	Bury St Edmunds	Suffolk	IP30 9UP
	Statutory Undertakers	Rail and Safety Standards Board	The Helicon	1 South Place	London		EC2M 2RB
	Statutory Undertakers	Royal Mail Group*	100 Victoria Embankment	London			EC4Y 0HQ
	Statutory Undertakers	Scotland Gas Networks Plc	Axis House	5 Lonehead Drive,	Newbridge	Edinburgh	EH28 8TG
	Statutory Undertakers	Scottish Power Renewable (UK) Limited	Scottish Power	320 St Vincent St	Glasgow		G2 5AD
	Statutory Undertakers	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent Centre	2 St John's Street	Coventry		CV1 2LZ
	Statutory Undertakers	South Eastern Power Networks Plc*	237 Southwark Bridge Road		London		SE1 6NP
	Statutory Undertakers	Southern Electric Power Distribution Plc*	Inveralmond House,	200 Dunkeld Road,	Perth		PH1 3AQ
	Statutory Undertakers	Southern Gas Networks Plc	St Lawrence House	Station Approach, Horley	Surrey		RH6 9HU
	Statutory Undertakers	SP Distribution Plc*	320 St. Vincent Street		Glasgow		G2 5AD
	Statutory Undertakers	Squire Energy Limited	55 High Street	Epsom	Surrey		KT19 8DH
	Statutory Undertakers	SSE PG (Operations) Limited*	55 Vastern Road	Reading			RG1 8BU
	Statutory Undertakers	The Electricity Network Company Limited*	Peel Dome	The Trafford Centre	Manchester		M17 9PL
	Statutory Undertakers	The Inland Waterways Association - Leicestershire Branch*	Island House	Moor Road	Chesham		HP5 1WA
	Statutory Undertakers	UK Power Distribution Limited	Energy House	Woolpit Business Park,	Woolpit	Bury St Edmunds	IP30 9UP
	Statutory Undertakers	UK Power Networks Limited*	Newington House	237 Southwark Bridge Road	London		SE1 6NP
	Statutory Undertakers	UK Power Reserve Limited	Radcliffe House	Blenheim Court,	Warwick Road	Solihull	B91 2AA
	Statutory Undertakers	Uniper UK Limited*	Westwood Way	Westwood Business Park	Coventry		CV4 8LG
	Statutory Undertakers	Utility Assets Ltd	6500 Daresbury Park	Warrington	Cheshire		WA4 4GE
	Statutory Undertakers	Vattenfall Networks Limited*	Beaumont Bridge House	181 Queen Victoria Street	London		EC4V 4EG
	Statutory Undertakers	Wales and West Utilities Ltd	Wales and West House	Spooner Close,	Celtic Springs	Newport	NP10 8FZ
	Statutory Undertakers	Western Power Distribution (East Midlands) PLC	53 High Street	Cheveley	Newmarket,	Suffolk	CDB 9DQ
	Statutory Undertakers	Western Power Distribution (South West) Plc*	Avonbank	Feeder Road	Bristol		BS2 0TB
	Statutory Undertakers	WINGAS Storage UK Limited	Building 3	Chiswick Business Park	566 Chiswick High Road	London	W4 5YA
	Statutory Undertakers	Leicestershire County Council - Lead Local Flood Authority*	County Hall	Glenfield	Leicester		LE3 8RA
	Statutory Undertakers	Warwickshire County Council - Lead Flood Authority*	Shire Hall	Market Place	Warwick		CV34 4RL
	Crown Estate	Crown Estate	The Crown Estate Commissioners	The Crown Estate	St James's Market	London	SW1Y 4AH
	The Forestry Commission	The Forestry Commission	East and East Midlands Area	Santon, Downham	Brandon	Suffolk	IP27 0TJ
	The Office of Nuclear Regulation	The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Herdus House	Westlakes Science and Technology Park	Moor Row	Cumbria	CA24 3HU
	National Health Board	National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence	2nd Floor, 2 Redman Place	London			E20 1JQ



	United Kingdom Health Security Agency	United Kingdom Health Security Agency	Wellington House	133-155 Waterloo Road	London		SE1 8UG
Secretary of State for Defence	Ministry of Defence	Ministry of Defence	6th Floor Main Building	Whitehall	Horse Guards Avenue	London	SW1A 2HB

\*These parties received a letter dated 4 February 2022, they did not receive the original letter dated 7 January 2022 due to an administrative error in creating a mail merge list.

Appendix 9.7

**List of Non-Prescribed Consultees under the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009**

Non Prescribed Body	Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3	Address 4	Postcode
Relevant Organisation	Aecom	Aldgate Tower	2 Leman Street	London		E1 8FA
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Ansty Parish Council	Main Road	Ansty	Dudley		CV7 9JA
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Ashby Magna Parish Council	26 Peveril Rd	Ashby Magna	Lutterworth		LE17 5NQ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Ashby Parva Parish Council	Gilberts	Main Street	Ashby Parva	Lutterworth	LE17 5HY
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Atherstone Town Council	P.O. Box 2000	Atherstone	Warwickshire		CV9 1YN
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Baddesley Ensor Parish Council	Village Hall	Keys Hill	Baddesley Ensor	Warwickshire	CV9 2DF
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Bagworth and Thornton Parish Council	Bagworth Community Centre	Station Road	Bagworth	Leicestershire	LE67 1BH
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Barlstone Parish Council	126 Newbold Road	Barlstone	Nuneaton	Warwickshire	CV13 0DT
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Bentley and Merevale Parish Council	4, School Lane	Lea Marston	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands	B76 0BW
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Bitteswell with Bittesby Parish Council	8 Hazel Drive	Lutterworth	Leicestershire		LE17 4TX
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Blaby Parish Council	Blaby Civic Centre, 22-24 Leicester Road				LE8 4GQ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Brandon and Bretford Parish Council*	16 Avondale Road	Brandon	Coventry		CV8 3HS
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Braunston Parish Council*	The Green/Welton Road	Braunston	Daventry	Northamptonshire	NN11 7HW
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Braunstone Town Council	Braunstone Civic Centre	Kingsway	Braunstone Town	Leicester	LE3 2PP.
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Brinklow Parish Council	66 Coventry Road	Brinklow			
Relevant Organisation	British Horse Society*	Abbey Park	Stareton	Kenilworth	Warwickshire	CV8 2XZ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Burbage Parish Council	Burbage Millennium Hall	Britannia Rd	Burbage	Hinckley	LE10 2HF
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Burton Hastings and Stretton Baskerville Parish Council					
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Cadeby Parish Council	The Old Rectory	Little End	Cadeby	Nuneaton	CV13 0AS
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Carlton Parish Council	Home Farm House	7 Main Street	Carlton	Nuneaton, Warwickshire	CV13 0BZ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Churchover Parish Council	School Street	Churchover	Warwickshire		CV23 0EG
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Claybrooke Magna Parish Council	11 St Marys Road	Lutterworth	Leicestershire		LE17 4PS
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Claybrooke Parva Parish Council*	c/o Claybrooke Parve School	Main Rd	Lutterworth		LE17 5AF
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Combe Fields Parish Council	c/o Mobbs Wood Cottage	Nettle Hill	Brinklow Road	Coventry	CV7 9JN
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Cotesbach Parish Council	11 St Mary's Road	Lutterworth	Leicester		LE17 4PS
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Countesthorpe Parish Council	61 Station Road	Countesthorpe	Leicester		LE8 5TB
Relevant Organisation	Coventry and Warwickshire LEP	The Old Clink	The Holloway	Warwick		CV34 4SJ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Desford Parish Council	c/o Desford Library	Main Street	Desford	Leicestershire	LE9 9JP
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Dordon Parish Council	Dordon Village Hall	Browns Ln	Dordon	Tamworth	B78 1TR

Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Dunston Bassett Parish Council	Dunton Bassett Village Hall	Bennett Hill	Dunton Bassett	Leics	LE17 5JJ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Earl Shilton Town Council	21 Wood Street	Earl Shilton	Leicestershire		LE9 7NE
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Easehall Parish Council	78 Fareham Avenue	Rugby			CV22 5HT
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Enderby Parish Council	Civic Centre	King Street	Enderby	Leicester	LE19 4NT
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Frolesworth Parish Council	Greystones	55 Main Street	Frolesworth	Lutterworth	LE17 5EE
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Glen Parva Parish Council	Parish Council Office	Dorothy Avenue	Glen Parva	Leicester	LE2 9JD
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Glenfield Parish Council	Park House	Stamford Street	Glenfield	Leicester	LE3 8DL
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Grendon Parish Council	26 Main Road	Grendon	Northants		NN7 1JW
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Groby Parish Council	Parish Council Office	Village Hall, Leicester Road	Groby	Leicester	LE6 0DQ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Harborough Magna Parish Council	Holly Barn	Main Street	Harborough Magna	Rugby	CV23 0HS
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Hartshill Parish Council	Hartshill Community Centre	Church Road	Hartshill	Nuneaton	CV10 0LY
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Higham on the Hill Parish Council	76 Hilary Bevins Close	Higham on the Hill	Nuneaton		CV13 6AQ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Hinckley Hub	Rugby Road	Hinckley		LE10 0FR
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Huncote Parish Council	c/o 3 Mountfield Road	Earl Shilton	Leicestershire		LE9 7LW
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Kilby Parish Council	Willow Farm	Peatling Road	Ashby Magna	Leics	LE17 5NW
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Kirby Muxloe Parish Council	Parish Council Office	Station Road	Kirby Muxloe	Leicester	LE9 2EN
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Leicestershire County Council*	County Hall	Glenfield	Leicester		LE3 8RA
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Leire Parish Council	The Old Stables	Fir Tree Lane	Swinford	Leics	LE17 6BH
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Lubbesthorpe Parish Council	11 Ringwood Close	Desford	Leicestershire		LE9 9HZ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Mancetter Parish Council	Mancetter Memorial Hall	Old Farm Road	Mancetter	Atherstone	CV9 1QN
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Market Bosworth Parish Council	Parish Council Office	Parish Hall	Park Street, Market Bosworth	Warwickshire	CV13 0LL
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Markfield Parish Council	Markfield Community & Sports Centre	Mayflower Close	Markfield, Leicestershire		LE67 9ST
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Monks Kirby Parish Council	12 Bell Lane	Monks Kirby	Rugby		CV23 0QY
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Murphy Power Distribution Limited	Hawks Green Lane	Cannock	Staffordshire		WS11 7LH
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Nailstone Parish Council	8 River Sence Way	Hugglescote	Leicestershire		LE67 2DB
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Narborough Parish Council	Parish Centre	Desford Road	Narborough	Leics	LE19 2EL
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Newbold Parish Council	The Sports Pavillion	Alans Way	Newbold Verdon		LE9 9LB
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Pailton Parish Council	Pailton Village Hall	Lutterworth Road	Pailton		CV23 0QE
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Peckleton Parish Council	Woodbine Cottage	11 Cottage Lane	Desford	Leicestershire	LE9 9GF
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Potters Marston Parish Council	Potters Marston Hall	Pingle Lane	Potters Marston	Leicester	LE9 3JR
Relevant Organisation	Ramblers Association	1 Clink Street	3rd Floor	London		SE1 9DG

Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Ratby Parish Council	13 Station road	Ratby	Leicester	LE6 0JQ	
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Shackerstone Parish Council	The Dairy, Village Farm	Main Street	Stanford on Soar	Loughborough, Leics	LE12 5QA
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Sharnford Parish Council	Brambles	Parsons Lane	Sharnford	Hinckley	LE10 3PY
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Shawell Parish Council	149 Main Road	Sheepy Magna			CV9 3QU
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Sheepy Parish Council*	149 Main Road	Sheepy Magna			CV9 3QU
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Shilton and Barnacle Parish Council*	19 Spring Road	Barnacle			CV7 9LG
Relevant Organisation	Sport England	1st Floor	Bloomsbury Street	London		WC1B 3HF
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	St Nicolas Ward Council Councillors*	Town Hall	Coton Rd	Nuneaton		CV11 5AA
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Stanton under Bardon Parish Council*	The Village Hall	2 St John Cole Crescent	Stanton under Bardon	Leicestershire	LE67 9AE
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Stoke Golding Parish Council*	Old Forge	Blacksmiths Yard	Stoke Golding	Nuneaton	CV13 6HD
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Stretton under Fosse Parish Council	Stretton under Fosse	Warwickshire			
Relevant Organisation	Sustrans	Suite 2b	The Hub	Friar Lane	Nottingham	NG1 6DQ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Sutton Cheney Parish Council	10 Little Mill Close	Barlstone	Nuneaton	Warks	CV13 0HW
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Tamworth Borough Council*	Marmion House	Lichfield Street	Tamworth		B79 7BZ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Thurlaston Parish Council	16 Cambridge Drive	Desford	Leics		LE9 9JB
Relevant Organisation	Transport Focus*	Albany House	86 Petty France	London		SW1H 9EA
Relevant Organisation	Triumph Motorcycles UK	Normandy Way		Hinckley		LE10 3BZ
Relevant Organisation	Triumph Motorcycles UK	Harrowbrook Road		Hinckley		LE10 0NJ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Twycross Parish Council	16 St Thomas Way	Frisby on the Wreake	Melton Mowbray		LE14 2PF
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Ullesthorpe Parish Council	The Old Stables	Fir Tree Lane	Swinford	Leics	LE17 6BH
Relevant Organisation	University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust	Patient Information and Liaison Service	The Firs, C/O Glenfield Hospital	Groby Road	Leicester	LE3 9QP
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Warwickshire County Council	Highways	Shire Hall	Market Place	Warwick	CV34 4RL
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Whetstone Parish Council	Council Offices	Cemetery Road	Whetstone	Leicester	LE8 6LL
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Wibtoft Parish Council	Highfields	Wibtoft	Lutterworth		LE17 5BB
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Wigston Parva Parish Council*	c/o Democratic Services	Blaby District Council	Desford Road	Narborough	LE19 2EP
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Witherley Parish Council	Cool Hill Farm	Sibson Road	Sheepy Parva	Atherstone	CV9 3RE
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Withybrook Parish Council	Bow House, Bow Lane	Withybrook	Warwickshire		CV7 9LQ
Local Authority within Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI)	Wolvey Parish Council	19 Spring Road	Barnacle			CV7 9LG

\*These parties received a letter dated 4 February 2022, they did not receive the original letter dated 7 January 2022 due to an administrative error in creating a mail merge list.

Appendix 9.8

**APPENDIX 9.8 SECTION 42 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND REGARD TO RESPONSE**

Consultee: Aston Flamville PC		Date of Consultee Response: 10/04/2022	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Consultation material was superficial.</p> <p>The PEIR information was difficult to understand and conflicting.</p> <p>No substantive evidence for claims made on traffic, pollution, flood risk, mitigation.</p> <p>Premature consultation and does not conform with the National Infrastructure Planning Regulations.</p>	<p>Each exhibition was attended by members of the Applicant’s professional team who sought to engage with visitors wherever possible. The exhibition, the community newsletter, site notices, and press notices, all sign posted the HNRFI website where detailed information was available in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).</p> <p>The Planning Act 2008: guidance on the pre-application process for major infrastructure projects states (paragraph 55):</p> <p>‘Applicants must set out clearly what is being consulted on. They must be careful to make it clear to local communities what is settled and why, and what remains to be decided, so that expectations of local communities are properly managed.’</p> <p>The Applicant made clear that the traffic impacts of HNRFI had not been settled with the Highway Authorities.</p>	N	Consultation Report (Document reference 5.1)

Request for further consultation	<p><b>Comments on the Proposals</b></p> <p>The Planning Act 2008: guidance on the pre-application process further states:</p> <p>Applicants are not expected to repeat consultation rounds set out in their Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) unless the project proposals have changed ‘very substantially’.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 consultation further targeted consultation has been undertaken in the form of mailing out a newsletter to those who had asked to be kept informed. Following a data refresh carried out by the applicant's land referencing company 52 additional parties were written to post the Stage 2 consultation advising that they had land interests within the Order Limits, mainly related to sub-soil interests. Communication has continued post Stage 2 consultation with 5.42 parties to set out matters agreed and matters where further discussion would be helpful.</p> <p>The Applicant’s review of all consultation responses has not revealed a need to make substantial changes to the application such that further consultation would be required. The Applicant will ensure that all affected statutory consultees and local communities are informed of the amendments to HNRFI in the light of the consultation responses received via the Consultation Report.</p>	N	Consultation Report (Document reference 5.1)
----------------------------------	--	---	--



<p>Justification of site location questioned</p>	<p><b>Justification of Site Location</b></p> <p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states ‘The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFIs’ (paragraph 2.56). The NPS also states that the number of locations for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope of developers to identify ‘viable alternative sites’.</p> <p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 17.3). An optimum position for 2041 would be that 60% of new warehouses are provided at rail served sites however 43% by this period is more realistic – this equates to 768,000 sq m (para 17.11). This suggests that there is a strong demand for a SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p> <p>Alternative sites considered during the Site Search (as detailed within Chapter 4 of the submitted ES document reference 6.1.4).</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment (Document 16.1) which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)</p> <p>Planning Statement (Document 7.1)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (Document 16.1)</p>
--	---	----------	--

	serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI.		
--	--	--	--

<p>Inadequate traffic mitigation information.</p> <p>The Ministry of Transport concluded in the 1960/70's that the opening of south facing exits to Jcn 2 of the M69 was not feasible without providing significant local road improvements / bypasses.</p> <p>Traffic impacts for Aston Flamville.</p>	<p><b>Traffic Implications</b></p> <p>Three options were consulted upon in 2019, a bypass around Stoney Stanton, one around Sapcote and the A47 link through the site. The public feedback was very negative to the Stoney Stanton and Sapcote options.</p> <p>Ahead of the consultation the applicant's transport consultants ran three separate scenarios for each of the options through the traffic model.</p> <p>The A47 link had the most significant benefit in terms of removing traffic from the B581 in Stoney Stanton and providing direct access to the M69 for settlements to the North and West of Hinckley.</p> <p>The Sapcote bypass removed some traffic, but a large number of vehicles were generated by the villages themselves. The Sapcote Bypass also drew more traffic to it (induced demand) which placed more pressure on the surrounding highway network. There are increases in general traffic through the village, however the numbers are at such a level that they do not justify the construction of a bypass. The proposed mitigation measures within Sapcote and Stoney Stanton are specifically designed to improve safety for residents and to discourage through-routing of vehicles from further afield.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)</p>
---	---	----------	--

	<p>Transport modelling has confirmed that no specific mitigation works need to be carried out as a result of the proposals within Aston Flamville, however the access infrastructure and other off-site highway improvements would provide overall improvement in the movement of traffic in the wider locality.</p> <p>The additional slip roads on the M69 and the link road through the site will offer alternative routing along arterial and strategic networks. It is unlikely that a significant amount of development traffic would regularly re-route through Aston Flamville and of those re-routed trips, they are unlikely to be HGVs as HGV routing will be managed and enforced through an HGV routing strategy agreed with the highways authority.</p> <p>As well as the installation of the southern slip roads at Junction 2 of the M69 and the A47 link road a number of other off-site mitigation proposals have been put forward.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>The proposal does not address rat running in Aston Flamville if there is an incident on the strategic road network.</p>	<p><b>Strategic Road Network</b></p> <p>It is not possible to mitigate for single events, such as SRN closures. However, the A47 link road does provide significant relief for highways around Burbage and Aston Flamville should a closure happen. This will enable National Highways and the emergency services to re-route traffic away from sensitive residential areas and on to the key A and B roads in the unfortunate event of a motorway closure.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>Impact of noise, air and light pollution on Aston Flamville residents. No appropriate mitigation appears to be proposed.</p> <p>The impact on Burbage Common, Aston Firs Woods, hedgerows, wildlife, water table &amp; public walkways all need more description and explanation.</p> <p>The consultation material provided by the developer is unclear &amp; unsubstantiated by appropriate authorities.</p>	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Noise assessment has confirmed that mitigation is not required for Aston Flamville. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>The assessment has been updated to take account of updated traffic flows for the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>No mitigation is required to mitigate noise impacts at Aston Flamville however noise mitigation measures are set out in ES chapter 10 including but not limited to acoustic barriers, use of noise reducing technologies in the railport and considerate construction practices.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p>



	<p>undertaken by low emission vehicles or by foot / bike and therefore reduce the number of trips associated with the development per day.</p> <p><b>Lighting</b></p> <p>A lighting strategy is submitted as part of the submission version of the application and a requirement included within the DCO requiring the submission of lighting details for each phase.</p> <p>To protect the amenity of residents luminaires on the site perimeter are proposed to be installed with factory fitted shielding this restricts the visibility of the light source from a distance and also reduces the emission of “back light”</p> <p>The site will be illuminated in accordance with the ILP Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light (Environmental Zone <b>E2 – Rural, low district brightness</b>). This Guidance Note recommends that the immediate environment is classified into an environmental zone based on ambient lighting levels in the surrounding area. This places restrictions on permissible level of obtrusive light.</p> <p><b>Description and explanation of impacts</b></p>		<p>Ecology (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 15 – Hydrogeology (Document 6.1.15)</p> <p>Consultation Report (Document 5.1)</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>The impact on Burbage Common, Aston Firs Woods, hedgerows, wildlife, water table and public walkways is detailed throughout ES Chapters 11 Landscape, ES Chapter 12 Ecology, ES Chapter 15 Hydrogeology. In terms of landscape, several representative viewpoints are included within the Common (including viewpoints 42, 43 and 44) to assess impacts from a visual perspective and a number of those are presented as photomontages.</p> <p><b>The consultation material</b></p> <p>The holding of the statutory consultation on a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project does not require an applicant to have reached prior agreement with consultees on technical and environmental issues. The Planning Act 2008: guidance on the pre-application process for major infrastructure projects states (paragraph 55):</p> <p>‘Applicants must set out clearly what is being consulted on. They must be careful to make it clear to local communities what is settled and why, and what remains to be decided, so that expectations of local communities are properly managed.’</p> <p>The Applicant made clear what impacts of HNRFI had and had not been settled in particular highway matters.</p>		
--	--	--	--



Consultee: British Horse Society		Date of Consultee Response: 07/04/2022	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>We welcome the provisions planned into the site for horse riders and other non-motorised users.</p> <p>Nevertheless, some long-term and construction period issues need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Noted. Due consideration has been given to all BHS comments below.</p>		N/A
<p>1) Measures to prevent either HGVs or employees' vehicles using the B road through Sapcote. These could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Planning condition stipulating HGV routes, including when there are blockages on M69 and A47.</li> <li>b. Downgrading the B road to 'unclassified' until it reaches the B4114.</li> <li>c. Directional priorities in Sapcote village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The HGV Routing Strategy for the site addresses this and is secured by a DCO requirement.</li> <li>b. Downgrading will not remove it from mapping and satnavs. It is unlikely to have a significant impact on traffic levels.</li> <li>c. Agreed. There are facilities at the western end of the village which we intend to replicate on the eastern approach. We have ensured that any 'peninsulas' have channels for cycles and horses between the peninsula and the existing kerb line.</li> </ul>	<p>Y</p> <p>N</p> <p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p>

<p>2) Behind-the-hedge tracks (in both directions) along both the Sapcote and Stoney Stanton roads</p> <p>a) Possible re-location eastwards of the BW V29 crossing so that it is away from junction manoeuvres. AND</p> <p>b) Provision of a Pegasus crossing for BW V29 as it crosses this road.</p>	<p>On road facilities for cyclists are proposed with improved footway and cycleways. Behind hedge tracks would demand significant Compulsory Purchase of private land.</p> <p>a. The signalisation of the J2 roundabout means that the stoplines for the eastern approach need to be close to the circulatory carriageway. Moving the crossing eastwards would mean providing two sets of signals near each other which will cause other safety issues. Stopping in the central island will be necessary, however the entry flows will be signal controlled rather than free flow as they currently operate.</p> <p>b. A higher control button has been accommodated.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>3) Essential heightening the existing parapets on the roundabout above the M69 to “bridleway” standard or better.</p> <p>Ideally the parapets should be solid.</p>	<p>Equestrians would be encouraged to cross the M69 on the bridleway bridge north of M69 Junction 2. Equestrians should not be crossing the motorway junction, the rails on the junction bridge are not equestrian suitable rather they are pedestrian and vehicle restraints. National Highways would be unlikely to accept a barrier change in this location.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>4) The non-motorised tracks (see above) be continued on the bridge surfaces</p> <p>a) Or alternatively, separate bridges north and south of the existing bridge, specifically for the non-motorised.</p>	<p>Riders should not be using the M69 Junction 2 bridge as a crossing. Increased signage and control measures will be provided to direct equestrian users via the existing bridleways and over the dedicated bridge north of the junction.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p>5) There is no information we have seen on the construction process and period.</p>	<p>Further detail is provided via the Illustrative Construction Phasing Plan, Chapter 3 of the ES and within the CEMP and CTMP.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Illustrative Phasing Plan (Document 2.13)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Project Description (Document 6.1.3)</p> <p>Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 17.1)</p>

			Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 17.6)
6) Re-location of the western arm of BW V29 to its permanent line before construction starts.	This will take part in the 'Enabling Works Phase' which will occur before construction of the any of the 'Development Phases'.	Y	Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)
7) Livery yards at Burbage Common Road rely on BW U52 and Burbage Common Road to reach (and return from) Burbage Common with its BW (U51) and additional riding routes. There is a significant risk that the livery yard businesses could fail if customers move elsewhere during an extended construction period.	All stopping up and diversion works in regard to PRoW will be implemented during the 'Enabling Works Phase' which will occur prior to any of the 'Development Phases'. The diverted route will ensure a safe passage around the site for the duration of the development phases. During the enabling works there will be short periods when temporary diversions and closures will need to take place for health and safety reasons, but these will be programmed to minimise disruption to users.	Y	Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)
		Y	

<p>8) Facilities are needed for users of BW U52 (riders, walkers, cyclists, possibly the disabled) to also reach Burbage Common Road and the Common.</p>	<p>Users of BW U52 will be able to access Burbage Common from this route via an underpass under the A47 link road. This will be delivered up front during the 'Enabling Works Phase' which will occur before construction of any of the 'Development Phases'.</p>		<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>
<p>9) Planned bridleway around north and east edges of the site between Burbage Common Road and the M69 Junction 2 roundabout needs to be in place before the PRow network is disrupted by construction.</p>	<p>This route and its landscaping will be delivered up front during the 'Enabling Works Phase' which will occur before construction of the any of the 'Development Phases'. Planting species are detailed within the Landscape Environmental Management Plan.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Landscape Environmental Management Plan (Document (17.3))</p>
<p>10) Measures in place to retain the link across the entrance to the new link road between the west arm of V29 and USRN 2801316 (abandoned part of old B4669, erroneously(?) shown on developers' documents as "Smithy Lane" and</p>	<p>This link is retained and delivered via a Pegasus crossing, with a higher control button placed an appropriate distance away from the road itself.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

access to Aston Firs Caravan Site), for the non-motorised. Possibly temporary button-controlled lights?			
11) A link from the west end of USRN 2801316 directly into Aston Firs to provide non-motorised access to Smithy Lane and Burbage Common. This link to be permanent as it will also serve the minor lane opposite, going south to Aston Flamville.	This link is retained as it is and will not be affected by the Proposed Development.	N	N/A
12) Assuming that the redundant W arm of Burbage Common Lane remains open to the non-motorised, the permanent facilities need to be available as early as possible (see above).	The western arm of Burbage Common Road will remain open to the non-motorised and will be delivered during the 'Enabling Works Phase' before any of the 'Development Phases' commence.	N	N/A
13) We note that at least 3 footpath level crossings will need to be extinguished and the footpaths diverted. What, specifically, will be the provision and how early in the construction period will it be installed?	These pedestrian level crossings will be closed as per Network Rail recommendation and rerouted over existing and nearby bridges. Where this is not possible (Outwoods crossing), a pedestrian footbridge will be provided prior to the first train utilising the rail terminal in the interests of public safety.	N	N/A
14) Where multi-user tracks are installed, our advice is that they should be given a minimum width of 5 metres if they are to be fenced on both sides.	The parameters allow for such widths however the detailed design of these routes will be dealt with through the detailed design stage and with	N	N/A

The surface should be split 50/50 down the middle – half grass and half with a firm or sealed surface. Grass is the preferred surface for horses and is kinder to human feet than asphalt.	consultation and agreement from LCC Highways and BHS. Comments are noted with regard to surface treatments.		
15) If a 'sealed' surface is preferred, we recommend bound rubber crumb type surfaces as these self-drain, so do not puddle or ice and contribute to essential SUDS.	Comments are noted with regard to surface treatments.	N	N/A

<b>Consultee: BT Openreach</b>			
<b>Response</b>	<b>Regard to response</b>	<b>Scheme change</b>	<b>Relevant Document Reference</b>
<p>Keep BT Openreach up to date on progress of the project.</p> <p>Openreach colleagues are aware of the proposal and potential impact to underground infrastructure.</p>	Applications have been submitted to BT Openreach to land enquiries, new development and removal of existing network in all cases explaining that we would like to progress and agree protective provisions and if appropriate agree a statement of common ground with their commercial / legal team.	Y	N/A

Consultee: Burbage Parish Council		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Concern about the preparedness, quality, and implementation of this consultation.</p> <p>No specific reference to Burbage, its residents or it's highways in any of the documentation.</p>	<p>Detailed information on the specific consultation that has taken place is set out within the submitted Consultation Report and the Statement of Community Consultation.</p> <p>The consultation exercise took place over a 12 week period, considerably longer than the statutory period of 28 days.</p> <p>Three consultation events took place, with two non-statutory events undertaken in 2018 and 2019. On each occasion a public exhibition was held in Burbage and was well attended. All premises within 3km of the site were notified by post of the events inclusive of Burbage. Information relating to Burbage was included in the PEIR including highways information .</p> <p>Residents that attended the exhibition and visited the website were able to discuss matters with members of the project team.</p>	N	Consultation Report (Document 5.1)
<p>Inappropriate exhibition room in light of Covid-19. One hour queue.</p>	<p>Attendance to consultation events was managed in line with the Covid-19 requirements at that time</p>	N	



<p>Presentation material high-level on local focus.</p> <p>Questions were either not able to be answered or answers focused on the national need and benefit, rather than the local impact.</p>	<p>which saw social distancing restrictions and face mask wearing no longer required. To support the comfort of attendees the applicants team wore face masks.</p> <p>Nine events were held in total during the statutory consultation; one in Burbage, with two in nearby Hinckley and one in nearby Sapcote. A member of the project team remained at the entrance to the venue to assist in controlling and managing attendance.</p> <p>Information regarding the proposal was also available on the project website for those that were unable, or chose not to, attend in-person consultation events / exhibitions. A dedicated Community Information Phone line was also available throughout the consultation.</p> <p>Pre-Application Guidance for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects explains that consultation can take place whilst matters had not settled. It has been made clear, throughout the process that the transport modelling material had not been agreed with the relevant highways authorities at the time. This has now been resolved.</p>		<p>Consultation Report (Document 5.1)</p>
<p>Poor Quality Maps particularly in the transport chapter.</p>	<p>Three specific highway and transport consultation boards were exhibited at consultation, showing the proposed junction mitigation with labelling of their location. Information at the exhibition was also</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<p>capable of explanation, with the consultant team also in attendance.</p> <p>Maps and drawings were capable of being downloaded as well as being enlarged on the project website and online consultation platform.</p>		
<p>The transport chapter lists three scenarios for which traffic will be assessed for both 2026 and 2036, six scenarios in total.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do Nothing – Without Development (WoD) inclusive of committed development.</li> <li>○ Do Minimum – Without Development With Access Infrastructure (WoDWS)</li> <li>○ Do Something – With Development (WD): including the Access Infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>The highway impact table (Table 8.5) only provides figures for two scenarios, 2036 figures with and without development. No presentation of a comparison of current traffic levels, no details of daily HGV trips.</p>	<p>Whilst all three scenarios have been ran for completeness both the PEIR and ES only report on the 2036 scenarios as this represents the worst case of full development build out</p> <p>Reference to the 2036 with and without development scenarios provides the most direct comparison of the change in traffic conditions brought about by the development and is the worst-case future scenario.</p> <p>The baseline report contains existing traffic flows and referenced in the ES Chapter. The ES chapter is supported by a Transport Assessment which provided further detail and appendices to this.</p> <p>The ‘without development with access infrastructure’ was a reference for officers and individuals to understand the impact the new slips and A47 has on background traffic, without the development being in place. This is theoretical as the slips and the link road would not be built without the development.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p>Incomplete agreement with partners in the Transport Working Group</p>	<p>The Applicant was transparent throughout the consultation periods in that the traffic modelling had not been agreed with the Transport Working Group.</p> <p>At that time, a model was used from Summer 2021.</p> <p>This has now been resolved, and traffic data has been agreed with the Transport Working Group, and this is detailed within Chapter 8 of the ES. For the avoidance of doubt, the new outputs do not significantly differ from the previous runs as they feature the same projected development traffic and infrastructure interventions.</p> <p>Regard has been had to the comments received, and further consultation on this matter is not considered necessary as the subsequent amendments to the proposal have not materially changed the application or its associated impacts. This is in line with the Pre-Application Guidance for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>Urge a further consultation to be carried out.</p>	<p>Applicants are not expected to repeat consultation rounds set out in their Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) unless the project proposals have changed 'very substantially'.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<p>Further consultation on this matter is not considered necessary as the subsequent amendments to the proposal have not substantially changed the application or its associated impacts. This is in line with the Pre-Application Guidance for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.</p>		
<p>Specific industries or locations which the terminal would be targeting not identified. Without this specific information it is difficult to see how the traffic trip models can be validated.</p> <p>Should take account of terminals already consented and other consented logistics development.</p>	<p>AECOM developed the HNRFI employee trips model in 2018 which shows the likely location of HNRFI workers. This forms the main area of impact where employment opportunities are anticipated during the operation of the HNRFI. Further information and details on the model are provided in Appendix 4 to the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 7.67). This suggests that there is a strong demand for SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI. A specific logistics demand and supply assessment report has been</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (document reference 6.1.4)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (document reference 6.1.5)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Traffic and Transport (document reference 6.1.8)</p>

	submitted with the application setting out the logistics needs for the market area.		Market Needs Assessment (Document Reference 16.1)  HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (Document Reference 16.2)
No Cost Benefit (Harm) Analysis of options. The option study does not address the clear direction on these matters given by the Inspectorates Scoping Opinion in December 2020.	<p>The NPS does not require an applicant for a SRFI to undertake a Cost Benefit Analysis of all potential sites.</p> <p>Alternative sites were considered during the Site Search (as detailed within Chapter 4 of the submitted ES).</p> <p>The physical requirements of an SRFI are restrictive in terms of suitable sites. Alternative options could not be pursued further for the reasons provided within the submission, and it has not been purely down to financial costs that resulted in the subject site being progressed further.</p> <p>HNRFI will form a critical part of the Midlands rail freight terminal network, with particularly significant</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)

	<p>importance for port traffic to and from manufacturers and retail and e-tail distribution networks. Its position on the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North (F2MN) line means it will be able to run very efficient rail services, maximising the shift from road to rail, off the national road networks.</p> <p>Being next to the M69 Junction 2 means the bulk of the onward distribution will be on the national network, unless serving a very local business. The physical requirements of an SRFI are very restrictive in terms of suitable sites, not least as much of the Victorian railways were built in flood plains. Other options were considered and could not be pursued further for the reasons identified in ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Evolution.</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.83 – 4.89 of the NPS provide specific policy guidance on the assessment principles for SRFI, including their function, locational requirements and scale and design. This policy advice was taken into account in the Applicant’s assessment of locations and design option. An appraisal of the seven potential SRFI locations is provided within ES chapter 4 Site Selection and Evolution, it includes a review of rail and road accessibility.</p>		

<p>The topics below to consider Burbage Common and any mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Green Space access</li> <li>• General Community health and Well Being</li> <li>• Trees</li> <li>• Ancient woodland</li> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Ecology</li> <li>• Light Pollution</li> <li>• Noise Pollution</li> <li>• Landscape impact</li> </ul>	<p>All of the matters raised in relation to Burbage Common are assessed in ES Chapters 9, 10, 11, 12 , and ES Appendix 3.2 and Appendix 7.1.</p> <p>Adjustments were made to the design as part of the assessment process to provide enhanced landscape and ecological features and to ensure sufficient screening and buffering to Burbage Common was included in the proposals including 22ha of open green space adjacent to the Country Park.</p> <p>The matters of health and wellbeing in relation to noise, air quality and lighting on human health are addressed in the health and equality briefing note attached at ES Appendix 7.1.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>ES Chapter 9 Air Quality (document reference 6.1.9)</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Acoustics (document reference 6.1.10)</p> <p>ES Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual (document reference 6.1.11)</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Ecology and Biodiversity (6.1.12)</p> <p>Appendix 3.2 Lighting Strategy (document reference 6.2.3.1)</p> <p>Appendix 7.1 Health and Equality Briefing</p>
---	---	----------	--

			Note (document reference 6.2.7.1)
<p>The open countryside surrounding the village, is needed to supplement the formal provision of green space within the village,.</p> <p>Reduces the public footpath networks to the west of the village.</p>	<p>Additional open space with public access is being created adjacent to Burbage Common and a series of new Public Rights of Way are being created.</p>	Y	<p>ES Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual (document reference 6.1.11)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Appraisal and Strategy</p>
<p>Insufficient green space is being offered in the design to mitigate for the loss of openness and clean air, presently available to all users.</p>	<p>Additional publicly accessible green space is proposed to the south of the A47 Link Road to mitigate for the loss of openness and to the north of the railway line to provide an additional wooded buffer. In all, approximately 28% of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road area is proposed as open green space.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Illustrative Landscape Strategy (Document 6.3.11.20)</p>
<p><b>Environment – Trees ancient woodland – air quality</b></p>	<p>A full detailed assessment of air quality impacts during both construction and operational phases was undertaken within the ES. A construction phase dust</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement</p>



<p>Insufficient mitigation for air pollution.</p> <p>Trees instead of unsightly acoustic barriers.</p> <p>The increased height needed to cross the Common for the link road, is too prominent and suggested screening only emphasises the mass and visible traffic creating noise and air pollution of great magnitude.</p> <p>It is not acceptable that there should be increased levels of air pollution even if a general saving nationally.</p>	<p>assessment was undertaken in accordance with national guidance and mitigation measures proportionate to the level of construction activities were identified. These measures are incorporated into the CEMP which is a Requirement of the DCO and therefore the recommended mitigation is secured within the proposals.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of peak construction phase road traffic movements was undertaken which identified that construction vehicles and staff trips would have a negligible impact on local air quality at the height of construction activities. No measures were therefore required to offset any impacts however an HGV Routing Plan has been produced to direct construction vehicle traffic away from densely populated areas and to support deliveries of materials and equipment outside of peak hours to minimise local congestion.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the impact of development-generated traffic was undertaken in accordance with relevant national guidance. The assessment identified that the impact of the HNRFI on human receptors was negligible and therefore mitigation measures were not required however, measures are incorporated into the HNRFI to further reduce emissions associated with the development. These include the installation of electric vehicle charging points, new and improved cycleways, footpaths and bridleways through the Main Site, a new Pegasus crossing and the installation of photovoltaics to generate power for the development.</p> <p>Trees will screen acoustic barriers, however trees alone would not provide acoustic mitigation.</p>		<p>Chapter 9 - Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Construction Environmental Management Plan (document reference 17.1)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (document reference 17.4)</p>
---	---	--	--

	<p>The link road will not cross the Common. Landscape planting and bunding will be located adjacent to the link road providing screening of the link road. Noise and air quality have been addressed above. A full assessment of visual impact matters is set out in ES Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual Impacts.</p>		
<p><b>Ecology – plant, and wildlife impact</b></p> <p>Burbage Common consists of ancient woodland and open fields which support a huge biodiversity of plants, animals, and birds. There can be no absolute assurance that noise, chemical - both airborne and waterborne, dust and light pollution and the most likely invasion of rats, scavenger foxes etc will not adversely affect, reduce, or even decimate the wildlife on the common.</p> <p>A planting of mature trees encircling the site would greatly both enhance and mitigate both light and air pollution and would be a minimum to mitigate these issues.</p>	<p>The impacts on Burbage Common have formed part of the assessment in each relevant chapter of the ES, and appropriate mitigation has been identified.</p> <p>Substantial planting and landscaping forms part of the development proposals. Landscaping and planting is considered within Chapter 11 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Further details on noise and air quality have been set out above.</p> <p>Chapters 11 and 12 of the submitted ES set out a summary of the assessment of landscape and ecology matters, including mitigatory measures that will be implemented.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 - Air Quality (document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Chapter 12 Ecology (document reference 6.1.12)</p>

<p>We believe the safety of the ecology of the site is a fundamental element of this proposed development.</p>	<p>The submitted Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan provides further detail on this.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Net Gain strategy has been submitted to ensure net gains for biodiversity can be delivered.</p>		
<p><b>Light Pollution</b></p> <p>Further information is required on how the plans will minimise the spillage of light, particular from the link road adjacent to Burbage Common.</p> <p>The site will be open 24/7 creating a constant intrusion of light. If not mitigated effectively the lighting would remove the current dark sky, affecting all breeding and feeding patterns of all wildlife.</p>	<p>The site will be illuminated in accordance with the ILP Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light (Environmental Zone E2 – Rural, low district brightness). This Guidance Note recommends that the immediate environment is classified into an environmental zone based on ambient lighting levels in the surrounding area. This places restrictions on permissible levels of obtrusive light.</p> <p>All lighting sited close to ecologically sensitive areas including Burbage Common has been designed to minimise light spill. The indicative external lighting design has been produced in collaboration with the appointed Ecologist. The design process was iterative and was reviewed by the Ecologist at each stage to ensure light was managed at specific areas of ecological value. In cases where light spill needed to be further controlled the introduction of back light shields, optics with sharp cut off or a reduction in mounting height have been introduced to reduce as</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>

	<p>far as practicable whilst still providing adequate illumination.</p> <p>A lighting strategy has been submitted with the application and a DCO requirement requires the submission of phase specific lighting strategies.</p>		
<p><b>Noise Pollution</b></p> <p>Noise attenuation measures, including acoustic barriers up to six metres in height, with significant impact upon wildlife. The installation plans for these barriers will need to demonstrate how such an impact will be mitigated.</p>	<p>The management of routes for wildlife will be considered at the detailed design stage with consideration given to passing gates for wildlife along the acoustic fencing.</p> <p>.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology(document reference 6.1.12)</p>
<p><b>Visual Landscape impact, particularly from the common area, sense of being in the countryside</b></p> <p>The proposed mass and height of this development would create an over-bearing effect to those wishing to enjoy clean air and 'the good-life' feeling when outside in the fields and trees.</p>	<p>A full visual impact assessment is provided within Chapter 11 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>The landscaping strategy has been designed to reduce visual effects of the proposed development. The landscaping strategy is set out in Chapter 11 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Building heights have been reduced between 2 – 5 metres in response to comments on building heights.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
<p><b>Biodiversity</b></p>			

<p>It is essential that the planned net gain of 10% is delivered in a way such that the local community benefits from enjoyment of this gain and any offsite 'off-set' is not located many miles from the community. Ecological corridors for wildlife should be included.</p> <p>An offset should be achieved at locations of not more than a 30 min walk from the settlements of Hinckley or Burbage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What impact will this have on the existing environment?</li> <li>• What will be the effect on families using it?</li> <li>• How will the proposal to build bunds to hide the site demonstrate how these will not cause more disruption to wildlife, as their corridor of access will be restricted? and possible flooding.</li> <li>• What additional measures can be implemented to reduce light / noise pollution to minimise the severe effect on wildlife?</li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 12 of the ES sets out how the mitigation for the habitats and species will be implemented and managed. An Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) will be submitted. These detail the methodologies for protection of habitats and species and then their future management respectively.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Net gain strategy has been devised that will ensure that net gains for biodiversity can be delivered, this has focused on providing the gains in close proximity to the site.</p> <p>Where possible the proposals have aimed to reduce biodiversity impacts through the site layout and have looked at the onsite provision to ensure that the biodiversity gains can be maximised onsite. We have also looked at providing off-site compensation in the closest area possible to the site in order to provide the gains required in the locality. The full Biodiversity impact Assessment (BIA) sets out all the measures that have been put in place in order to ensure that the BNG requirements are met. The BIA is provided in the ES at Appendix 12.2 and Chapter 12</p> <p>If further measures are required, we will consider other off-site mechanisms, in order to provide the overall BNG compensation package.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document (17.3)</p> <p>Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (Document 17.6)</p>
---	---	----------	--

<p><b>Loss of Community Connections</b></p> <p>We note the plans to reroute the bridleway on a corridor between the warehouses and the M69. This is an example of an excessive diversion, and we need to see what mitigation has been considered to ensure horses are not spooked by sudden noises in this congested area.</p>	<p>The PRow strategy identifies diversion routes which will be provided to secure connectivity. In recognition that Burbage Common Road is used by walkers, cyclists and equestrians, a dedicated 'off-road' route has been formed on the eastern boundary, which will be landscaped.</p> <p>The setting of the route will be different from the existing setting provided by Burbage Common Road. A permissive route will be available throughout the site, as shown on the illustrative masterplan. The spatial context of this route will be within an urban development project, rather than open countryside. The re-routed bridleways are set within a broad green corridors of varying habitats, including woodland, meadow, scrub and stream, which will be planted during the enabling works to provide early amenity provision to pedestrians and horse riders. This landscape treatment is illustrated on Figures 11.20 (Landscape Strategy) and 11.17 (Illustrative Landscape Sections AA to GG).</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Appendix 11.20 Landscape Strategy (document reference 6.2.11.20)</p> <p>Appendix 11.16 Landscape Sections (document reference 6.2.11.17)</p>
<p><b>Traffic Impacts</b></p> <p>Given there is no agreed traffic model with the local highway authorities it is not possible to</p>	<p>The traffic model has now been agreed with the Transport Working Group. Full details of traffic implications are provided within Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and</p>

<p>provide detailed comments upon the highway proposals in addition to the comment already made about the quality of the consultation materials. We offer the following matters of principle which we believe should be addressed.</p>			<p>traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Motorway Resilience</b></p> <p>Full plans should be included in the full application for resilience planning for the closure of the M69 due to accident or any other emergency. These plans should consider the likelihood of such closure, duration and the impact on the local highway network and its ability to cope with the closure. Such closures are not rare, with evidence of a typical 100 days being impacted each year.</p>	<p>It is not possible to mitigate for single events, such as SRN closures. However, the A47 link road does provide significant relief for highways around Burbage and Aston Flamville should a closure happen. This will enable National Highways and the emergency services to re-route traffic away from sensitive residential areas and on to the key A and B roads in the unfortunate event of a motorway closure.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 19 - Accidents and disasters (Document 6.1.19)</p>
<p><b>HGV Parking Provision</b></p> <p>The area already suffers from unwanted and inappropriate HGV overnight parking with associated anti-social practises which result from this parking, due to lack of facilities and toilets. Whilst the consultation states that HGV parking area, with driver welfare facilities will be included within the development plans, it provides no evidence of the number of such parking spaces,</p>	<p>104 Lorry parking spaces were shown on the Masterplan presented at Consultation, and remain</p> <p>The lorry parking area would be for use of HGVs using the HNRFI site, it would not be open to non HNRFI vehicles.</p> <p>The lorry park will have a secure access and only accessible to HNRFI users and clearly identified as such.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Parameters Plan (document reference 2.12)</p> <p>HGV routing strategy (document reference 17.4)</p>

<p>which are required to meet the needs of the HGV trips intended. Further the consultation gives no assurance that a robust analysis will be carried out prior to the submission of the application and that the full requirement of HGV parking spaces will be provided in the final application. These matters must be addressed prior to the final application.</p>	<p>A HGV routing strategy is submitted with the application and will be secured by DCO requirement.</p>		
<p>In similar concerns about capacity for Freight routes, Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council has said that they will not support the route from Southampton through Birmingham due to capacity constraints in Birmingham. [Scoping opinion adopted by Secretary of State 22 Dec 2020). A clear demonstration of how such concerns can, and should be, addressed.</p> <p>Many concerns have been raised regarding the impact of increased service on the operation of the level crossing in Narborough. It is essential that mitigation plans are implemented which fully address these concerns and presented in the final application.</p>	<p><i>The primary markets for HNRFI will be through Felixstowe, London Gateway and the Northern Ports / Regions. These are all served without needing to go through Birmingham, which is one of the fundamental benefits of HNRFI.</i></p> <p><i>Container flows through Southampton Port primarily serve the South Midlands, Birmingham and South-West England and Welsh markets.</i></p> <p><i>There is a service being operated now between London Gateway and Southampton to reposition containers between the two ports, which would resolve the need to move containers via Birmingham, if there is a capacity constraint.</i></p> <p><i>Network Rail cannot allocate paths at this juncture. If available, they are bid for at the time they are required by the Train Operating Companies.</i></p> <p><i>There is currently some capacity through Water Orton to the Birmingham routes. However HNRFI is not predicated on trains needing to go via Birmingham.</i></p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>



	<p><i>Future investments have the potential to create additional capacity / easing of constraints, including HS2 and the possibility of a 'dive under' at Nuneaton, connecting to WCML south, at Coventry. This would then avoid Birmingham completely.</i></p> <p><i>HNRFI helps develop the region's capacity for rail freight without needing to go through Birmingham, so should allay SMBCs concerns.</i></p> <p>Network Rail has undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Based on the pre-pandemic timetable, in the morning peak hours 7-10am, there is one possible time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4-7pm there are two.</p> <p>Each train would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5 minutes, which is far less than a stopping passenger train coming from Leicester, which is 4-5 minutes. In each hour, the total barrier down time would be approximately 20 minutes, which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier downtime at a level crossing.</p>		
<p><b>Employment</b></p> <p>The consultation considers land use and socioeconomic effect in chapter 7. In our opinion the chapter seeks to draw evidence together</p>	<p>Relevant information is provided at Chapter 7 of the submitted ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land</p>

<p>from several sources but fails to reach a conclusion as to the cause and effect of the various models.</p> <p>In locating the terminal, the location should take account, of a suitable workforce. The assessment given in chapter 7 mixes the local employment position with a “need” for increased employment, paragraph 7.55 <i>“Strategic housing development at New Lubbesthorpe, Earl Shilton and Barwell are reported to deliver nearly 9,000 new homes to the South-West Growth Area, creating a demand for employment.”</i></p> <p>Figure 7.3 clearly shows an expected workforce being drawn from Leicester, Coventry, and Nuneaton. This is not surprising as the local workforce has no capacity to fill the expected 8,400 jobs. This is not contributing to reduction of carbon due to the increased commuting it would bring. Given such high levels of staff are expected to come from these areas, the plans should provide more opportunity for commuting to take place via rail and thus reducing commuting traffic.</p>	<p>The proposed development does not create 8,400 new jobs in the sense that all employees are arriving from beyond the locality. The assessment anticipates that additionality of operational employment will be in the range of 4,400 – 5,400. The new employees would arrive from a range of locations as identified by the trip generation model provided by AECOM. The Chapter provides further commentary on how these levels have been determined.</p> <p>A Sustainable Transport Strategy and Travel Plan accompanies the application demonstrating the sustainable transport modes available to employees and the means to create modal shift.</p>		<p>use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Flood Risk</b></p> <p>We have read the consultation chapter which covers flood issues and believe the content does</p>	<p>Chapter 14 of the PEIR presented a preliminary assessment of the flood risk and drainage issues at the site, along with the proposed measures that would be included to prevent any deterioration of the baseline</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>not provide the clear explanation to interested respondents in non-technical language that these issues have been fully investigated, assessed and full mitigation measures have been included in the plans, which are prepared in an understandable form to all interested parties.</p> <p>It is essential that full remedial measures are known and put in place.</p>	<p>conditions. The Chapter was accompanied by a preliminary version of the Flood Risk Assessment, and it was summarised within the PEIR non-technical summary and the Community Explanation Document. Additionally, a series of webinar presentations were made, as part of the consultation phase, which gave a high-level summary of the flood risk and drainage aspects of the scheme. Representatives were also available at the public consultation events to answer any questions.</p> <p>Chapter 14 of the ES and the accompanying technical appendices including the Flood Risk Assessment, presents the latest information on flood risk including any necessary mitigation measures. The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority have been consulted throughout the assessment, and they have confirmed that they are comfortable with the flood management strategy.</p>		<p>Chapter 14 – Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)</p>
<p><b>On-site Power Generation</b></p> <p>A gas fired power station is planned, including a large, tall chimney. This will include an energy centre with an electricity substation; roof-mounted solar photovoltaic panels with a generation capacity of up to 38 megawatts (MW), providing direct electricity supply to the building</p>	<p>The proposed energy centre is intended as a short-term operative resource and will utilise gas from renewable sources. Renewable gas will only be utilised if the PV and Grid cannot meet the supply needed.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>

<p>or exporting power to battery storage in the energy centre.</p> <p>We seek assurance that this gas fired power station will be used for emergency situations only in the in event of national grid supply problems and otherwise would be on stand-by. We also seek assurance that the emissions whilst operational are identified and built into the air quality management plan.</p>	<p>The emissions have been built into the air quality modelling and are set out in the Environmental Statement.</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p>
---	---	--	---

<p><b>Consultee: Cadent</b></p>		<p><b>Date of Consultee Response: 09/06/22</b></p>	
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Regard to response</b></p>	<p><b>Scheme change</b></p>	<p><b>Relevant Document Reference</b></p>
<p>In respect of existing Cadent infrastructure, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus,</p>	<p>Comments are noted regarding the presence of existing Cadent assets within the proposed Redline Boundary and the requirement for these to be retained. We have previously obtained diversion and connection quotations on this scheme and have made do allowance within the proposals to accommodate Cadent requirements.</p> <p>Protective provisions are included within the final draft of the Development Consent Order (DCO). A draft version of protective provisions was included within the DCO publicised during the statutory consultation</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1)</p>

	<p>although it is noted Cadent did not comment upon these.</p> <p>A Statement of Common Ground will be produced between TSH and Cadent.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Consultee: Claybrooke Parva PC		Date of Consultee Response: 03/03/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>The parish Council object to the proposal on the grounds of:</p> <p>1. The already over-densification of warehouses and logistics operations in the area. Currently, from M69 almost continually along the A5 towards Magna Park, Lutterworth.</p> <p>2. That the building of more warehousing will inevitably lead to more heavy goods and other traffic along the already very busy A5 which is becoming a blackspot for accidents with 2 recent fatalities.</p>	<p>1. The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states 'The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFI's' (paragraph 2.56). The NPS acknowledges that the number of locations for strategic rail freight interchange like HNRFI will be limited and goes on to say this will restrict the scope of developers to identify 'viable alternative sites'. The HNRFI application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p> <p>HGV Route Management</p>

	<p>2. It is acknowledged that HNRFI will give rise to HGV movement on the strategic highway network including the A5. The impact of this traffic has been extensively modelled. Information received through Consultation with National Highways on the traffic impacts of HNRFI on the Strategic Highway Network is included within our assessments. A full assessment of impacts is provided in Chapter 8: <i>Transport and traffic</i> of this ES. HGV routing will be managed through a HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy which will be secured through a DCO requirement.</p>		<p>Plan and Strategy (document reference 17.4)</p>
--	---	--	--

Consultee: Countesthorpe PC		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p><b>Existing Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Where freight accesses the interchange via the motorway, there are concerns that current infrastructure is not sufficient to support access from the east.</p>	<p>The traffic impact of HNRFI, including HGV movement has been modelled extensively The Highway Authorities have reviewed the modelling outputs. Reasonable steps have been identified to mitigate these impacts to an acceptable level.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
<p><b>Transport / Highways</b></p> <p>Small villages are impacted by heavy traffic and supporting infrastructure does not take this into account.</p> <p>Public transport links are inadequate and the proposal will exacerbate this.</p> <p>Concerns relating to commuter traffic and impact on surrounding villages.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the quality of existing road infrastructure in villages.</p>	<p>The impact of traffic on the local highway network through nearby villages has been modelled. Where necessary mitigation measures have been proposed.</p> <p>Public transport improvements will be made and secured through S106.</p> <p>As part of the proposals, the Applicant has prepared measures through a travel plan to encourage movement by transport, other than the private car.</p> <p>A full assessment of impacts is provided in Chapter 8: <i>Transport and traffic</i> of this ES.</p>	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

<p>Concerns relating to the impact at Narborough level crossing and barrier down times.</p>	<p>Network Rail have undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Based on the pre-pandemic timetable, in the morning peak hours 7 – 10 am, there is only one possible time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4 – 7 pm only two. Each train would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5minutes. This is far less than a stopping passenger train coming from Leicester, which is 4-5 minutes. In each hour the total barrier down time would be approximately 20 minutes, with 40 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b></p> <p>Concerns regarding cumulative effects on environment, ecology, wildlife and flooding, and subsequent reliance on imported food staples.</p>	<p>The application for HNRFI is accompanied by an ES which includes an assessment of cumulative effects at chapter 20. The Government has identified a compelling need for an ‘expanded network of SRFIs’ (National Planning Statement (NPS) on National Networks paragraph 2.56) which are ‘approximately located relative to the markets they will serve’. Due to the requirements for good road and rail access, the Government acknowledges that ‘it may be that countryside locations are required for SRFIs’ (NPS paragraph 4.84).</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects</p>



			(Document Reference 6.1.20)
--	--	--	-----------------------------

Consultee: CPRE		Date of Consultee Response: 04/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>CPRE strongly opposed to the proposal.</p> <p><b>Need / Demand</b></p> <p>The need for the development is questioned including comments made regarding existing rail connected sites in the area and the cumulative impact these have.</p> <p>Contradiction in 'need' evidence between the Leicester and Leicestershire Logistics Study (2021) and the more recent North West Leicestershire Plan. Further analysis required to consider the growth of existing and approved rail freight interchanges before considering additional need.</p>	<p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states 'The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFI's' (paragraph 2.56). The NPS also states that the number of locations for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope of developers to identify 'viable alternative sites'.</p> <p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 7.67). This suggests that there is a strong demand for SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p> <p>HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference 16.2)</p>

	<p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI. A HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment report is also submitted setting out the demand for logistics floorspace in the market area.</p>		
<p>Unclear strategy for road/rail use and unclear justification for the proposed location.</p>	<p>For highway modelling purposes the total HGV movements on and off the public road network on a worst-case scenario is assumed to be c.9,000 total movements per day, of which 1,361 are to and from the rail terminal (this assumes 30% of rail movements stay within the scheme). The percentage of containers assumed by TSH to be moved to surrounding areas, off site, via the highway network is 70%; whilst other consented SRFI developments have utilised a lesser figure of 60%, demonstrating our modelling is robust in its assumptions comparatively. A technical note on the Railport Generation of HGV movements can be found at Chapter 8 of the PEIR report within appendix 8.1 (1.3) Appendix D: Baker Rose Technical Note 1; Railport Generation of HGV Movements to and from the Public Highway. This has been agreed with LCC Highways.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p><b>Transport / Highways</b></p> <p>Concerns relating to potential traffic increases and impacts on motorway junctions / slip roads in the context of existing problems, previous mitigation, approved and pipeline development.</p> <p>Concerns regarding use of local roads and villages and existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Building more roads and increasing capacity of existing roads just leads to facilitating more traffic and will not be sufficient to accommodate road-based development.</p> <p>CPRE noted that the traffic evidence had not been agreed with the County Council / Transport Working Group. Transport evidence relating to proposed HGV generation is questioned.</p> <p>Logistics sites require commuter access by private car which has associated traffic impacts.</p> <p>The removal of freight from road to rail depends on demand and routing. Concerns regarding the actual removal of HGV traffic and the type of fuel HGVs require.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the submitted ES sets out the baseline position and likely impacts of the proposal both during construction and operation.</p> <p>Traffic data has now been agreed with the Transport Working Group.</p> <p>Further analysis of Junction 21 has been carried out and included within the ES assessment.</p> <p>Strategic modelling has significantly improved since the construction of the M69, and as such prediction of traffic movement is more accurate using complex datasets.</p> <p>The model has considered all movement and the redistribution of background traffic because of construction of the south facing slips at Junction 2 M69.</p> <p>Receptor sensitivity has been reviewed considering the feedback received and mitigation has been proposed where impacts are significant. This is set out within Chapter 8 of the ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Active and Public Transport</b></p>			<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>Accessibility to and from the site by other modes is extremely poor. There is currently no frequent bus service and it is unlikely the site could be served by bus.</p> <p>There is no satisfactory provision for cyclists and access by foot is unlikely given the distances involved.</p> <p>A replacement PROW would be in the context of a depleting countryside which would not be attractive for use.</p>	<p>Public transport improvements will be secured through S106 and discussion have taken place with Arriva such that it is proposed that the X6 bus service will be extended to serve HNRFI. New Demand Responsive Transport measures are also proposed following discussions with Vectare, the current provider of the DRT pilot in South Leicestershire. These will link with under-served villages around the HNRFI site.</p> <p>The submission Sustainable Transport Strategy provides details on public transport, cycling and walking measures. The A47 link road will provide over 2km of new cycling and walking facilities which connect to existing facilities in Hinckley</p> <p>The replacement PROW strategy is included alongside additional new areas of open space which will be accessed by the proposed PROW network and will contribute to the enjoyment of the countryside.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>
<p><b>Transport Assessment</b></p> <p>Comments have been made on the limitations and constraints of the Transport Assessment and Traffic Modelling.</p> <p>Use of the 1993 IEMA Guidelines to inform the EA is not accepted.</p>	<p>This is the standard guidance on transport specific ES inputs</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p>Small changes in traffic demand may not change traffic flow during congestion, but can lead to displacement of traffic onto unsuitable roads.</p> <p>The IEMA sensitivity receptors does not reflect the impact on rural roads and villages.</p> <p>Routing of traffic needs to be considered in the context of motorway closures at any given time.</p> <p>A fixed level of growth is unlikely as changes to the road network will increase opportunities to travel, generate more traffic and increased journey lengths.</p> <p>The introduction of southbound slips could substantially change both the volume of the traffic and its origin and destination.</p> <p>There is a risk of some elements of road being downgraded / ignored as a result of the standard receptor sensitivities applied.</p> <p>Sensitivity ratings do not give a fair representation of the impacts to villages.</p> <p>A risk assessment approach should be taken to ensure roads are safe and suitable in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	<p>The PRTM model accounts for displaced traffic as it assesses all congestion across an extended area- in this case most of Leicestershire and significant parts of Warwickshire.</p> <p>Sensitive receptors have been revisited for the production of the ES chapter with greater emphasis of receptors within rural villages.</p> <p>Modelling accounts for normal conditions for the understanding of impacts on infrastructure. Long-term infrastructure design regrettably cannot be put in place for short term issues on the network.</p> <p>Growth has been based on the Uncertainty Log, which accounts for reasonably foreseeable projects and is based on DfT WebTAG guidance. This includes Local Plan allocations and Strategic growth and presents a more nuanced approach than applying fixed growth.</p> <p>No roads are proposed to be downgraded as a result of the receptor sensitivities.</p> <p>See above- these have been revisited.</p> <p>Safety audits are being carried out on all roads that are subject to mitigation.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>New road infrastructure and increased traffic will influence future development patterns, and the model outputs are questioned.</p> <p>Traffic problems will be exacerbated if development is approach in south and east Leicester.</p> <p>Operational traffic is compared to overall network and doesn't consider traffic travelling to the site, or traffic re-routed / generated. Comparisons made are not comparable.</p>	<p>See above, future development is addressed as far as reasonably foreseeable within the PRTM model.</p> <p>Development traffic is factored into the future baseline flows. This is to understand redistributive effects of both new infrastructure and potential congestion as a result of the development traffic.</p>		
<p><b>The Rail Network</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity of the rail network to accommodate the number of trains modelled is questioned.</li> <li>• There is no evaluation of the impact of SRFI on national rail network or port terminals.</li> <li>• Improvement to routes to ports does not support our economy and resilience, and only benefits imports.</li> <li>• The HNRFI Interim Rail Study does not consider capacity constraints on the entire route to Felixstowe. Concerns that there are no plans to upgrade any part of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Network Rail is satisfied that there is capacity in the current timetable on its Strategic Freight Network to accommodate HNRFI traffic. The network and port capacity is continuing to be invested in and these, with the growth in SRFIs are critical national infrastructure developments to achieve NetZero.</li> <li>• The UK is a trading nation and without efficient routes to market for UK manufacturers and assemblers, our balance of trade will worsen. For the Midlands this is particularly important because all products have to be transported to a port for export. The Midlands exported £48.6bn of products in the year to end</li> </ul>	N	<p>Rail Operations Report (document reference 6.2.3.1)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>

<p>Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail line or to enable electric trains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HNRFI Interim Rail Study area only looks at the section between Water Orton and Wigston. Concerns raised regarding capacity of junctions and the potential conflict of movement when crossing the southbound track.</li> <li>• Comments made regarding the potential for a Leicester-Coventry passenger service.</li> <li>• While some unused freight paths exist in the national timetable there is no guarantee that these could be used to serve the SRFI.</li> <li>• There appears to be no realistic prospect of being able to reach 16 train paths per day each way.</li> </ul>	<p>Q1 2022 and 30.9Bn of this was machinery and transport, at 65.9% of all UK exports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of these Midlands businesses are part of complex international supply chains, importing and exporting parts to make products for onward use by other manufacturers. Good access to ports is all part of ensuring durable supply chains to support British industry.</li> <li>• Supply Chain ‘resilience’ has arisen because of the pandemic and geopolitical challenges, which have left supply chains too vulnerable to disruption to be able to continue to rely on a de-stocked ‘Just in Time’ supply chain. The impact means critical stocks need to be built and held locally, which demands more warehousing. This is of national strategic importance. Resilience also relies on good transport links and an ability to move stock in and out of ports as quickly as possible. Rail does this best, but needs SRFI’s to deliver to, with adjoining warehousing, to achieve the most resilient supply chains for the future. HNRFI does all this.</li> <li>• Network Rail is satisfied that there is capacity in the current timetable to and through the key local nodes on its Strategic Freight Network to accommodate HNRFI traffic. The network and</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>port capacity is continuing to be invested in and these, with the growth in SRFIs are critical national infrastructure developments to achieve NetZero.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Network Rail is considering upgrades to the Felixstowe to Nuneaton line. HNRFI has been designed to accommodate electric trains using Overhead Line Equipment (OLE) if this becomes the solution to achieve NetZero. However, Hydrogen Hybrid trains are now being developed and trialled internationally, which means electrification of the line may not be required.</li> <li>• Network Rail has had regard to the potential Leicester to Coventry passenger service and HNRFI freight services do not prevent that service from happening.</li> <li>• There are indeed unused freight paths in the national timetable and these will be bid for by Train Operating Companies to satisfy customer demand for HNRFI, as they are for all SRFI's, as and when needed. This is a standard well understood and regulated process. Network Rail / Great British Railways Transition Team (GBRTT) are being required by Government to grow rail freight and HNRFI is fully supported by them, to help achieve that growth.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Network Rail have confirmed that within the current (pre pandemic) timetable, there are more than enough train paths to accommodate 16 trains per day each way (32 movements), between 06:00 and 23:00. This is without even considering available paths between 23:00 and 06:00.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Carbon Dioxide, Climate Change and Pollution</b></p> <p>Objections on the basis of a lack of evidence relating to a reduction in CO2 emissions and contributing towards net-zero.</p> <p>Flaws in the assessment as it doesn't consider all sources of emissions/energy use / embedded carbon.</p> <p>The proposal conflicts with aims of addressing climate change. No indication of a contribution towards mitigating climate change.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the Questionnaire provided by the Applicants.</p>	<p>Chapter 18 of the submitted ES considers the likely significant effects of energy and climate change, including CO2 emissions.</p> <p>The scope of that assessment includes the 'embodied carbon' from manufacture of construction materials, construction traffic, and the earthmoving works.</p> <p>It also includes the greenhouse gas emissions from operational energy use and the changes in operational transport, both rail and road.</p> <p>An energy statement and embodied carbon assessment are included with the ES at appendix 6.2.18.1 and 6.2.18.2.</p> <p>The questionnaire provided at consultation was designed to gage the views of the community in a structured manner but also to allow the respondents to provide comments outside of the specific question and</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p> <p>Consultation Report (document reference 6.2.5.1)</p>

	to provide any other comments not specifically covered by a question on the form.		
<p><b>Consultation</b></p> <p>Insufficient consultation period.</p> <p>Leading Questions.</p>	<p>The consultation period took place over a 12 week period (significantly longer than the statutory 28 day period).</p> <p>Full details of the consultation undertaken is set out within the submitted Consultation Report.</p> <p>The questionnaire provided at consultation was designed to gage the views of the community in a structured manner but also to allow the respondents to provide comments outside of the specific question and to provide any other comments not specifically covered by a question on the form.</p>	N	Consultation Report (document reference 5.1)
Loss of greenfield land	The loss of greenfield land is unavoidable however additional open space with public access is being created adjacent to Burbage Common and a series of new Public Rights of Way are being created.	N	Parameters Plan (Document Reference 2.12)
Additional job creation (excluding the relocation of existing jobs) questioned.	Employment was calculated by applying the standard job density ratios from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Employment Density Guide (2015) to the floorspace of the Proposed Development. The HCA advises applying 95 sq.m of Gross External Area (GEA) per worker for National Distribution Centres (NDCs), and 77 sq.m (GEA) per worker for Regional Distribution Centres (RDCs). This range has been	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Land-Use and Socio-Economic Effects 6.1.7)

	informed by research conducted by Prologis surveying their own logistics operations.		
<p>Air quality, noise and vibration matters haven't been considered in detail, but CPRE may wish to do so if the scheme progresses.</p> <p>The efficiency/success of construction noise mitigation is broadly questioned.</p> <p>The assessments have been limited in relation to construction traffic, in line with the traffic assessment.</p>	<p><b>Air Quality</b></p> <p>The Air Quality Assessment is presented within Chapter 9 of the submitted ES. This considers the baseline position, likely impacts during the construction and operational phases and identifies mitigatory measures as appropriate.</p> <p>Air quality impacts resulting from construction is not anticipated to be significant, as road traffic levels have been assessed as being lower than those associated with operation, which has been determined to have a negligible impact on air quality in the local area, which is not significant.</p> <p><b>Noise &amp; Vibration</b></p> <p>A full noise assessment has been submitted and chapter 10 of the submitted ES sets out baseline position and details the likely implications both during construction and operation as well as identifying appropriate mitigatory measures where necessary.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p>

	During construction, mitigation will be controlled through phased CEMPs. A CEMP has been submitted as part of the DCO application.		
<p><b>Landscape, Ecology and Heritage</b></p> <p><b>a. Visibility</b></p> <p>There are no comprehensive photomontages from the locations identified in the landscape report to enable the proposal to be visualised.</p> <p>Tree cover does not fully mitigate the buildings.</p> <p>Lighting impact is difficult to assess using the photographs provided. There is no separate lighting assessment or strategy.</p> <p>Concerns regarding receptors that would experience a high impact are downgraded as being a low significance. Burbage Common is an important asset for local residents.</p> <p><b>b. Loss of Biodiversity</b></p> <p>We are also concerned about the impact on the wider environment and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Two sets of photomontages are submitted with the application (one comprising the parameters and one based on the illustrative masterplan and proposed landscaping). The photomontages include a range of distances from the proposal. The assessment of the change and overall effect on views is included within Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>We have produced a lighting strategy to ensure that lighting impacts are limited in extent, and we have designed to ensure that the most appropriate lighting is used. Night –time Photomontages are also assessed as part of the visual impact assessment in Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The lighting strategy is provided as part of the DCO application and the impact assessment is provided within the full ES.</p> <p>Chapters 11 and 12 of the submitted ES set out a summary of the assessment of landscape and ecology matters, including mitigatory measures that will be implemented.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological</p>

<p>Further mitigation as part of a future strategy has not been identified and the adequacy of such measures cannot be assessed.</p> <p>The development will change the wider biodiversity landscape.</p>	<p>The submitted Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan provides further detail on this.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Net Gain strategy has been submitted to ensure net gains for biodiversity can be delivered.</p>		<p>Management Plan (Document (17.3))</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>
<p><b>Amenity</b></p> <p>Amenity impacts on an urbanised and industrialised countryside. Impacts on surrounding parks, green spaces, recreational space and open spaces of importance.</p> <p>The PEIR does not reference the Open Spaces and Recreational Study (2016).</p> <p>The assessment should take account of the combined impact on landscape, amenity and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Burbage Common and Country Park have been considered throughout the process with photoviewpoint locations within it and a landscape strategy designed to reflect the character. Views from the Country Park have been ascribed as high value, high susceptibility and high sensitivity within the EIA.</p> <p>An extension to the publicly accessible open space of the Common is provided as part of the proposals in accordance with Policy aspirations in the 2016 Study.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>

<p><b>Cumulative Impacts and Future Development</b></p> <p>No assessment has been made of cumulative impacts and it should include combination transport effects from junction changes.</p> <p>The impact of workers commuting to site from dispersed locations has not been assessed.</p>	<p>Chapter 20 of the ES reports on the assessment of cumulative and in-combination effects.</p> <p>AECOM developed the HNRFI employee trips model in 2018 which shows the likely location of HNRFI workers. This forms the main area of impact where employment opportunities are anticipated during the operation of the HNRFI. Further information and details on the model are provided in Appendix 4 to the Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
<p><b>Questionnaire</b></p> <p>CPRE does not agree that the transfer of freight to rail plays an important role in a low-carbon economy and addressing climate change.</p> <p>Carbon saved by moving freight from road to rail is likely to be low and outweighed by carbon produced by the construction of a new rail terminal. All assumptions are optimistic.</p> <p>The development does not show commitment to tackling climate change. There is no justification of reduced traffic, no inclusion of solar power or travel planning. No assessment is made reduced congestion or extent of walking/cycling.</p>	<p>The comments are noted however Government recognises the importance of rail freight in creating a low carbon economy. The NPS supports the creation of a network of SRFIs across the regions.</p> <p>The development would reduce HGV miles by moving freight from road to rail,</p> <p>Solar power would be the main form of power to the site as set out in ES Appendix 18.1 Energy Strategy.</p> <p>A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted as part of the application ES Appendix 8.2.</p> <p>A lorry park is proposed as part of the development to serve the site.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Planning Statement (document reference 7.1)</p>

<p>CPRE does not support the lorry park and does not consider there is a current need. If the proposal progresses, facilities would be required.</p> <p>CPRE may wish to make further comments regarding landscaping and mitigation if the scheme progresses.</p>			
---	--	--	--

Consultee: Cross Country		Date of Consultee Response: 07/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>CrossCountry is currently the sole operator of passenger train services on the route between Birmingham New Street and Leicester, and we are the sole provider of train services at Hinckley railway station. We therefore have a significant interest in the proposals you are formally consulting on.</p> <p>CrossCountry feel reassured at the fact Network Rail have been extensively involved in the development work so far. We appreciate the assurance that our pre-COVID timetable and train paths on the route between Birmingham and Leicester have been accounted for as part of this development work.</p> <p>It is a real positive to know that the Midlands Connect 'Midlands Rail Hub' aspirations for passenger train service delivery on the route have been accounted for as part of the development work carried out to date.</p> <p>Cross Country in principle are supportive of the scheme.</p>	No further response required	N/A	N/A



Consultee: Derbyshire County Council		Date of Consultee Response: 31/01/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
The proposals are considered to raise no significant strategic planning or infrastructure issues for Derbyshire County Council.	No further response required.	N/A	N/A

Consultee: Desford PC		Date of Consultee Response: 17/02/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Desford Parish Council supportive of the scheme as it will create significant employment within the nearby area.	The applicant welcomes the Council's support for HNRFI, as a consequence of the new employment opportunities which will be provided.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)

Consultee: Earl Shilton PC		Date of Consultee Response: 10/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Earl Shilton object to the proposal.</p> <p>Earl Shilton PC comment that the highways and rail freight models have not been proved to be accurate, sensitive or sustainable.</p> <p>The need for a SRFI is not evident and existing facilities could be expanded.</p>	<p>The traffic model has now been agreed with the Transport Working Group. Full details of traffic implications are provided within Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Rail modelling has been agreed with Network Rail,</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>

Consultee: East Midlands Railway		Date of Consultee Response: 10/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>EMR is supportive of the investment in the railway network and a scheme that has the potential to transfer freight from road to rail.</p> <p>EMR references the Rail Report conducted by WSP in Dec 21 and welcomes the consideration that Wigston North Junction is close to capacity today. The report highlights that a need of an infrastructure intervention to grade separate the Nuneaton Line from the Midland Mainline (MML) between Wigston North Junction and Glen Parva Junction, as identified in the Leicester Capacity development proposals would be required. EMR feels that this intervention would be required to unlock the Leicester area. EMR feels that the proposed freight terminal at Hinckley will not be the only source of increased freight paths in this area, considering the strategic east to west corridor between Peterborough and Leicester, and the backdrop of decarbonisation from road to rail which is a key part of the National Policy Statement. EMR would like to be included in development work as this proposal progresses.</p> <p>EMR would also like to raise additional potential enhancements to infrastructure in the Leicester</p>	<p>ES Appendix 3.1 Rail Operations Report . validates that the HNRFI can operate within the current rail network capacity. This confirmation is based on a detailed assessment of the current train timetable and consultation with Network Rail to ensure that freight associated with the HNRFI can be added without exceeding capacity constraints. Network Rail have confirmed that the freight associated with the HNRFI can be added to the network without affecting capacity.</p> <p>EMRs comments on additional potential enhancements are noted and would be welcomed however it should be clarified that these enhancements are not necessary to the operation of HNRFI.</p> <p>Network Rail have undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Based on the pre-pandemic timetable, in the morning peak hours 7 – 10 am, there is only one possible time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4 – 7 pm only two. Each train would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5 mins. This is far less than a stopping passenger train coming from Leicester, which is 4-5 minutes. In each hour the total barrier down time would be approximately 20 minutes, with 40</p>	N	Rail Operations Report (document reference 6.2.3.1)

<p>Area, whereby there is potential for 4 tracking between Wigston North and Leicester (Leicester Master Plan), as well as the electrification of the Midland Mainline north of Wigston to Sheffield and Nottingham (Integrated Rail Plan). EMR feels that 4-Tracking between Leicester and Wigston North Junction, and grade separation at Wigston North Junction, would provide the greatest benefits to unlocking growth on this corridor for future services along this route.</p> <p>EMR would like to acknowledge Midlands Connect's aspirations to provide future services connecting Leicester to Coventry via Nuneaton.</p> <p>EMR recognise complaints made by the community of Narborough due to extended level crossing down times. EMR suggest collaboration with Network Rail to assess and mitigate risks associated with increased crossing downtimes due to an uplift in services as part of this proposal.</p> <p>As mentioned above, EMR is supportive of any investment in rail infrastructure, and this scheme is a key strategic development to support the National Policy Statement by moving freight from road to rail. EMR would like to be involved in its development prior to any Network Change consultations.</p>	<p>minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Elmhurst PC		Date of Consultee Response: 10/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Adequacy of Consultation questioned as residents were unable to obtain basic information at the public consultation events.</p> <p>Acknowledge the Rochdale Envelope approach however it is considered that the degree of certainty in the information provided in this consultation exercise was inadequate.</p> <p>Any changes to the information that has been presented to the public, the Parish Council believes that a further consultation on highways/traffic matters should take place.</p> <p>Some of the information contained in the online documents appears to be factually incorrect. In one case, the error relates to the availability of public transport for the proposed workforce.</p>	<p>The material presented during the public exhibition was capable of being explained in the presence of the project team. All persons attending the events on behalf of the applicant were attending in a professional capacity and answered questions to the best of their ability noting that the scheme design was still evolving (including in response to the issues raised at the consultation events themselves) and, as such, certain elements could not yet be finalised and so definitive responses could not at that stage always be given. The Applicant made clear what elements including traffic matters had and had not been settled with the Highway Authorities.</p> <p>Extensive consultation information was made available to the project website including a PEIR, draft plans, draft DCO, a community explanation document, draft planning statement, draft design and access statement and draft Rail Report.</p> <p>Further traffic modelling has been completed since the consultation and traffic data has been agreed with the Transport Working Group, this is detailed within Chapter 8 of the ES. For the avoidance of doubt, the new outputs do not significantly differ from the previous runs as they feature the</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>S.106 Planning Obligation Heads of Terms (document reference 10.1)</p>

<p>Residents to the north west of the site in the Bridle Path Road /Billington Roads East &amp; West areas were advised that the cost of any work to the ordinary watercourses necessitated by increased flow of water from the application site would be borne by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>2.7.It is both inappropriate and unacceptable for the residents of Elmesthorpe to have been faced with "don't know" as a response from your consultants at the Statutory Consultation events, particularly bearing in mind that the Parish Council understands that the proposed application is to be made in a matter of months.</p> <p>2.8. materials on the database are not searchable across all documents so it has been difficult for them to locate items.</p> <p>2.9.</p>	<p>same projected development traffic and infrastructure interventions negating the need for further consultation.</p> <p>Public transport improvements are to be secured through Section 106 and a sustainable transport strategy which is a requirement of the DCO.</p> <p>There is no requirement for the Proposed Scheme to include watercourse or surface water drainage improvements outside of the DCO boundary</p> <p>The Applicant was transparent throughout the consultation periods in what matters were agreed and what matters were not yet agreed.</p> <p>As well as the consultation material being presented on the project website, there was a community information line and details for writing to the project team to provide any assistance to interested parties wanting to find out more about the project or to source information on specific matters.</p>		
<p>3. Location</p> <p>No justification for the development taking into account the proximity and capacity of the existing Rail Freight Interchanges in the area.</p>	<p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states 'The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFI's' (paragraph 2.56). The NPS also states that the number of locations for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope of developers to identify 'viable alternative sites'.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 Policy and need (document reference 6.1.5)</p>

<p>3.2. Residents believe this development will operate primarily as a road based warehousing facility with a disproportionately low amount of freight actually being transported by rail. This concern was not addressed at the public consultations, with varying responses being provided to residents about the amount of rail freight. The most common response given to residents was "up to 16 trains per day", but no hard facts as to the actual number.</p> <p>3.3. Sixteen trains per day is comparable to the operating level at East Midlands Gateway which the Parish Council understands operates six services daily serving the ports of Felixstowe, Southampton &amp; Liverpool, and London Gateway. By comparison, the Parish Council understands that HNRFI will not be serving this number of ports, and accordingly, the Parish Council would ask how the figure of "up to 16 trains per day" has been arrived at.</p> <p>3.4. The Parish Council questions the need and justification for the HNRFI in the first place. One of the main national policy criteria for a NRFI as described in Chapter</p>	<p>The terminal has been designed to accommodate 16 trains per day and the capacity of the rail network to accommodate 16 trains per day is supported by Network Rail.</p> <p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 7.67). This suggests that there is a strong demand for SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve and the details of the preferred terminal partner. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI.</p> <p>The automotive reference is to locally based end manufacturers, who import parts and export parts and finished products (not necessarily cars), as well as Tier suppliers within the catchment, supplying automotive production lines with parts etc. elsewhere.</p> <p>The existing terminals are fully let, and there are no development opportunities for expansion that would enable an occupier to locate adjacent an existing terminal that serves F2MN. A full assessment is provided within the submitted Market Needs Assessment and ES chapter 4 Site selection and evolution.</p>		<p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 Site Selection and Evolution (document reference 6.1.4)</p> <p>HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference 16.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Traffic and Transport (document reference 6.1.8)</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>5 of the PEIR "Need and Policy" documents 5.23 is that "It is important that SRFIs are located near the business markets they will serve and linked to the key supply chain routes (NPS paragraph 2.56)".</p> <p>We understand your consultants advised residents that HNRFI is intended to serve the local automotive industry, and the example of MIRA Technology Park was given as an end user in the automotive industry. The Parish Council would point out that whilst MIRA boasts "35 major companies on site forming Europe's largest automotive research and design cluster", none of the 35 companies are undertaking large scale vehicle production at the Technology Park and therefore we assume have no requirement for large volume parts deliveries. As far as the Parish Council is aware, there is no large scale vehicle production on sites near Elmesthorpe.</p> <p>3.5. The residents believe that there is capacity at existing Rail Freight Interchanges in the area, and accordingly the proposed development at Elmesthorpe is unnecessary.</p>	<p>As referenced above the NPS supports a network of SRFIs and the Government is committed to growth in rail freight.</p> <p>As well as The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) a Savills report HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference 16.2) which sets out the up to date trends in the market and demand for warehousing.</p>		
--	---	--	--



To illustrate this, please find below a table of the other sites brought to the attention of the Parish Council, their proximity to HNRFI (by road based on AA data) and whether they are currently advertising availability of space:

Rail Freight interchange	Distance in miles	Space available
Proloqis RFI DIRFT	19.2	Yes
Birch Coppice Tamworth	19.7	Yes
Hams Hall	23.9	Yes
East Midlands Gateway RFI	29	Yes

3.6. In January 2019, GB Freightline service launched a new service from Birch Coppice described as transporting "a mixture of intermodal boxes from Birch Coppice to Felixstowe, passing through Hams Hall, Leicester, Peterborough and Ipswich on the way." As there is now an existing service based less than 20 miles away which serves Felixstowe, the Parish Council would ask why it is considered that another rail freight interchange is needed at Elmesthorpe.

3.7. Further warehousing is not necessary because there is warehousing available at

<p>Hinckley Park, Hinckley, where Amazon have recently taken up 532,500sq.ft alongside the existing DPD site, and Magna Park at Lutterworth.</p>			
<p>Workforce</p> <p>4.1. It is suggested that this development will result in 8,500 new jobs. Unemployment in this area is not high, and therefore it is considered that most of the workforce will need to travel into the area at present.</p> <p>4.2. The site is very poorly served by public transport. - item 8.256 onwards regarding the current availability of public transport is materially incorrect. This needs to be corrected to prevent an unduly favorable view of the potential use of public transport in relation to this site.</p> <p>4.3. If it is the intention to provide new subsidized public transport services to the site, this information should be provided, together with confirmation of whether these new services will also be available for use by the general public.</p> <p>4.4. The Parish Council is given to understand that some employers at Magna Park are transporting their workforces to</p>	<p>The proposed development does not create 8,400 new jobs in the sense that all employees are arriving from beyond the locality. The assessment anticipates that additionality of operational employment will be in the range of 4,400 – 5,400. ES Chapter 7 provides further commentary on how these levels have been determined.</p> <p>A full assessment on likely commuting behaviours has been undertaken and forms part of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Significant improvements are proposed to the X6 bus service which could also be used by members of the public. As the site becomes operational a demand response bus service will be rolled out on a phased basis. We have been in discussions with Vectare, the current provider of the New Lubbesthorpe on demand services. A strategy for creating a service with a focus on the site has been developed and will continue to evolve as the first occupants start at HNRFI.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Traffic and Transport (document reference 6.1.8)</p>

<p>the site by private bus. If there is a green travel plan to this effect, please confirm if this will be implemented at the construction phase or later.</p> <p>4.5. There are concerns that if the jobs are to be filled by people from outside the area, this will result in additional vehicle movements. It would also impact on the potential green benefits of this development.</p>			
<p>Highways and Traffic Issues</p> <p>5.1. Concerned about the impact of fleets of distribution vehicles at the M69/M1 junction at peak times when there is already congestion from existing traffic, and it is concerned to be advised that the data being used for the traffic modelling for this development is considered to be out of date.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that there is a knock on effect from the traffic/highways work being incomplete at the time of the commencement of the consultation period, namely that air pollution from vehicle</p>	<p>This has now been resolved, and traffic data has been agreed with the Transport Working Group, and this is detailed within Chapter 8 of the ES. For the avoidance of doubt, the new outputs do not significantly differ from the previous runs as they feature the same projected development traffic and infrastructure interventions.</p> <p>Further consultation on this matter is not considered necessary as the subsequent amendments to the proposal have not substantially changed the application or its associated impacts. This is in line with the Pre-Application Guidance for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.</p> <p>The routing of HGVs will be controlled by a HGV route management plan and strategy. Construction traffic will be</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management</p>

<p>movements cannot currently be properly assessed.</p> <p>5.2. There are widespread concerns amongst residents regarding the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the traffic modelling was not agreed with Leicestershire County Council before the consultations took place and may be subject to change</li> <li>• congestion on the roads surrounding the site caused by HGVs or the workforce and an increase in HGVs and other large vehicles using the B581 through Elmesthorpe</li> <li>• an increase in traffic using the B581 through Elmesthorpe, bearing in mind that the pavements through the village are so narrow that it is not possible to walk two abreast and there is a history of pedestrians on the pavement being injured by passing vehicles</li> <li>•</li> <li>• the proposal to install an uncontrolled crossing on the B581 which currently has a speed limit of 40mph</li> </ul>	<p>controlled by a construction management plan. A public transport strategy and travel plan appended to Es Chapter 8 support modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Reductions in traffic on the B581 are predicted as part of the implementation of the new link road. The access to junction 2 will remove some vehicles that currently route via Stanton Road and Stoney Stanton to access the M69.</p> <p>The uncontrolled crossing has good levels of visibility in both directions and is appropriate to the design speed of the road.</p> <p>The figure of removal of HGV mileage has been calculated on the basis that each freight train removes road carriage by up to 76 HGV's (Rail Freight Strategy 2016). An assumption has been applied to the distance between the proposal and the deep-sea freight port of Felixstowe. The proposed development has capacity for up to 16 trains per day which leads to the calculated reduction in HGV mileage. This is detailed within Chapter 8 of the ES.</p>		<p>Plan (document reference 17.6)</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------------

<p>5.3. The Parish Council considers the number of HGV miles that it is alleged will be removed from the roads as a consequence of use of rail freight is unlikely, and would welcome having sight of how this figure was calculated.</p>			
<p>6. Access to Site &amp; Parking Issues</p> <p>6.1. Concerns a that Burbage Common Road will be used for access either by HGVs or workforce vehicles</p> <p>6.2. Concerns remain that mistakes will be made by HGV drivers and they could inadvertently try to access the site via B581/Burbage Common Road- how will this be handled in practical terms - is it the intention to allow such vehicles access via the gate on Burbage Common Road, or is it proposed that any such vehicle will be required to reverse back</p> <p>6.3. The site boundary plan shows an area at the junction o Burbage Common Road and Stanton Road/Station Road as being incorporated in the proposed development. The Parish Council has opposed any alteration to the road layout at this point from the outset. We received</p>	<p>To prevent inappropriate use of Burbage Common Road a no through route sign and stopping up with Bollards is likely as the vehicular route is being stopped up.</p> <p>No vehicular access to the development will be possible from the B581/Burbage Common Road. However, should an HGV mistakenly travel down Burbage Common Road turning areas are provided. The HGV Management Plan sets out routing systems and management of HGVs. Signage will be provided at the junction of Burbage Common Road and Stanton Road/Station Road to advise no access to the site.</p> <p>A HGV route management plan and strategy will control the fining a reporting system for HGVs not adhering to the HGV routing system. The strategy will be secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Staff parking provided will be adequate for the demand. A full travel plan coordinator will be present on site sitting within the management company, and they will ensure compliance with the travel plan.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p> <p>Travel Plan (document reference 6.2.8.2)</p>

<p>assurances from DB Symmetry that no alteration to the road layout was being proposed but signage would be erected at this junction to show no access to the site via Burbage Common Road. We should be grateful for confirmation that this is also the proposal from Tritax Symmetry as well.</p> <p>6.4. During initial discussions, DB Symmetry indicated that it would put in place a "fines system" to deter drivers from using unapproved routes to access the site. The "unapproved routes" were to include B581 through Elmesthorpe. Please confirm whether Tritax Symmetry proposes to adopt a similar system, and if so, how this will work in terms of the residents of Elmesthorpe reporting "stray" HGVs causing issues in the village.</p> <p>6.5. Of greater concern is the likelihood that members of the workforce who do not wish to queue to get on or off site at shift changeovers, will choose to park their vehicles in Elmesthorpe Village and to walk along Burbage Common Road to gain access on foot via the gate on the north eastern boundary. This would cause chaos in the village.</p>	<p>On-street parking restrictions would disrupt resident's ability to park; however this can be reviewed and monitored by the travel plan coordinator post-occupation. The travel plan coordinator will be the point of contact for the community on these matters. This is set out within the submitted Travel Plan.</p> <p>Travel plans would be required from each warehouse occupier, these are to be secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>The lorry parking area would be for use of HGVs using the HNRFI site, it would not be open to non HNRFI vehicles and would be a paid for lorry parking area. There would also be HGV parking on each plot to accommodate vehicles accessing the warehouses. Driver welfare facilities would be available on a plot by plot basis which is standard for modern warehousing and other facilities would be provided in the site hub as well as the lorry park.</p> <p>The lorry park will have a secure access and only accessible to HNRFI users and clearly identified as such.</p> <p>LCC parking standards have been followed.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>The Parish Council should be grateful if details could be provided regarding how it is proposed to prevent the HNRFI workforce parking in Elmesthorpe, as we understand that the queuing time for similar sized workforces exiting employment sites elsewhere at shift changeover is up to 30 minutes. If there is no phasing of shift changeovers, then the option of parking in Elmesthorpe and walking for 5 minutes to access the site is likely to be attractive. Double yellow lines in Elmesthorpe would not be an acceptable solution.</p> <p>6.6. Will green travel plans be put in place for all of the occupiers of the warehouses.</p> <p>6.7. Parking of HGVs on site not supported as this will add to noise and air pollution, also concerns that drivers who run out of “tachograph hours” will find the nearest place to park up. . Will the lorry park be free or charged? In the event that there is a charge what steps will be taken to prevent drivers who do not wish to pay for the on-site parking from driving off site and parking on side streets in the villages close to the site.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>6.8. insufficient facilities to provide meals to drivers resulting in a greater likelihood of them choosing to park elsewhere.</p> <p>6.9. The parking provision for the workforce and HGVs is not in accordance with the current guidance from Leicestershire County Council and may possibly be based on a now superseded document from 2006.</p>			
<p>7. Noise</p> <p>7.1. One of the major concerns to residents is the noise that will be generated by the freight trains using the Interchange, and the gantry cranes loading and unloading the trains. Information on this matter appeared limited.</p> <p>7.2. In the light of the high level of concern about this aspect of the application, the Parish Council would ask for the following information to be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• results for the assessment of the current ambient noise levels in Elmesthorpe</li> </ul>	<p>7.1 Noise from freight trains and gantry cranes located within the interchange have been included within the assessment. This has included the passage of freight trains on the sidings and assumes diesel engines for both sources as a worst-case. The noise from this source has been assessed cumulatively and the noise levels associated with operational noise have been predicted at the receptors. In accordance with relevant guidance, penalties have been applied to the predicted noise levels, where appropriate to account for any characteristics, such as tonality, impulsivity etc. The resultant noise levels have been compared against the measured background noise levels to determine the impact. Where adverse impacts are predicted, mitigation has been recommended including a 6m high acoustic barrier and the selection of quiet plant.</p> <p>7.2</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• details of your forecasts for the noise levels in Elmesthorpe in years 1, 3, 5, 10 and 15 after the granting of any consent, and also the forecast for the level of noise when the site is fully operational</li>   <li>• details of the size and precise location of any proposed fencing or bunding intended to reduce the impact of noise levels resulting from the development as currently plans provided are mainly described as illustrative</li>   <li>• an explanation of why the noise mitigation works as proposed along the north edge of the existing railway line do not extend the full length of the site</li>   <li>• details of the construction materials to be used for any fencing</li>   <li>• data or other information to show how the fencing will reduce the noise levels</li> </ul>	<p>The current ambient noise levels have been quantified to the closest receptors to the HNRFI in the direction of Elmesthorpe. A long-term baseline noise survey has been undertaken to quantify the existing noise climate in this area, following agreement of the monitoring locations with Blaby District Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. The results have been used to inform the assessment works. The noise and vibration assessment has considered the development being fully operational as a worst case scenario. It is highly likely that in the initial years, the predicted noise levels as stated within the ES chapter will be lower as the development will not be fully operational.</p> <p>Given the outline nature of the proposals, the final layouts, including the locations of the units, are not fixed. Therefore, any mitigation will be dependant on the final fixed masterplan and finished floor levels. Notwithstanding this, the parameters have been assessed at this outline stage, with noise generating activities located close to the site boundaries to provide a robust assessment. The results of the assessment demonstrate the noise levels can be mitigated to acceptable levels with a suitable, realistic noise mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers.</p> <p>The acoustic barrier proposed along the existing rail line does not extend the length of the site as the residential dwelling associated with Bridge Farm is already screened from the site by the existing outbuildings associated with the farm. Providing additional screening by extending the proposed</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>and to what extent the noise levels will be reduced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• details of the size of the bunding - height and also the width at ground level.</li> <li>• details of the landscaping schemes to include the years (post commencement of construction work) in which any trees, bushes or other plants will be planted on the bunding, and the height to which each variety of plant or tree is expected to grow</li> <li>• proposals for re-planting (including time scales) of any trees, plants or other materials included in the landscaping schemes which fail to thrive</li> <li>• data or other information to show the extent to which you expect the noise levels to be reduced by the bunding</li> <li>• what mechanism will be in place to review the noise levels after planning consent has been granted</li> <li>• confirmation of whether you will be providing the results of post application</li> </ul>	<p>acoustic barrier does not provide any further reduction in the predicted noise levels.</p> <p>Given the outline nature of the application, these details are not available. Notwithstanding this, any acoustic barrier should have a minimum surface density of 15kg/m<sup>2</sup> and form a continuous unbroken barrier with no gaps at the bottom. There are a range of suitable barrier solutions available that can meet this specification.</p> <p>The resultant noise levels at receptors with the proposed acoustic barriers in place are detailed within Tables 10.55 to 10.58 within the Noise and Vibration ES Chapter.</p> <p>Bunds would be 3 metres high and wide.</p> <p>Trees would be planted in the first planting season following construction of the bund. Trees could grow up to 15 metres in height.</p> <p>Any planting which fails would be replaced in the first available planting season.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>monitoring of noise levels to Blaby District Council or other statutory authority on a regular and ongoing basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what mechanism will be put in place for you to undertake further noise attenuation works in the event that the current forecasts for the noise levels prove incorrect</li> </ul> <p>7.3. The Parish Council understands that when a resident of Bostock Close (which backs onto the railway line) raised the issue of additional noise and vibration from the increased number of trains with the consultant dealing with noise mitigation at the public exhibition, he advised that not only would there not be any increase in noise or vibration, there shouldn't be any now.</p> <p>As we understand that there is currently noise and/or vibration in some houses near to the railway line, the Parish Council would question whether the assessment(s) on</p>	<p>The bunding is proposed to reduce noise levels from the A47 Link Road. The difference with and without the bunding can be seen in Figures 10.5 and 10.11 (short-term with and without mitigation) and Figures 10.8 and 10.13 (long-term).</p> <p>There is the opportunity for suitable operational noise related conditions to be attached to a consent provided they meet the appropriate tests.</p> <p>Should post-completion monitoring be required as part of a consent, then results would be provided to the stated authority/authorities.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>which the noise attenuation works are based has been carried out appropriately.</p> <p>7.4. In addition to the noise of the moving trains and the motors/engines powering the gantry cranes, there is also the matter of trains currently sounding their whistle as they approach the outskirts of the village (as they are required to do), and often several more times as they move along the track past the proposed location for the rail freight interchange. The Parish Council understands that you will have had discussions with Network Rail about safety matters relating to the rail port, and we would ask for confirmation of whether it will be a continuing requirement for the sounding of train whistles on the approach to Elmesthorpe once the rail port is in operation.</p> <p>7.5. There are concerns about the quality of sleep that residents will get with the increased number of trains throughout the night and the limited noise attenuation proposals, with further implications for the mental health and well being of any affected residents.</p>	<p>The noise modelling works have been undertaken using accepted methodologies and assuming the maximum parameters. Notwithstanding this, there is the opportunity to include a suitable noise related requirement requiring further noise attenuation works if considered necessary.</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>To clarify, it is understood that the question regarded the existing noise and vibration being experienced by the resident. Our response was that if there is an existing noise and vibration issue, then this should be dealt with by the party responsible for the operation and maintenance of the rail line.</p> <p>7.4</p> <p>The results of the noise and vibration assessment indicates that the increase in noise levels due to the additional trains will be less than 2dB for both the daytime and night-time periods, which is not significant, and unlikely to be perceptible.</p> <p>7.5</p> <p>It is important to note at this stage that the additional trains using the line are not dependant on the HNRFI being brought forward and the capacity and running of the trains will be managed by third parties.</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>7.6. In view of the concerns about the increased noise levels, the Parish Council would like information about any circumstances in which it is anticipated that trains will be queuing on the line to enter the rail port for unloading.</p> <p>7.7. The Parish Council would also like details of how long each train will be at the rail port for unloading before it moves off again as this question was met with "don't know" as a response at the consultation events.</p>	<p>The noise attenuation works are based on the noise and vibration generated by the proposed development and not the existing levels experienced at receptors.</p> <p>At this stage, the additional trains using the line are not dependant on the HNRFI being brought forward and the capacity and running of the trains will be managed by third</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>parties. With the Proposed Development in place, the additional trains will stop at the HNRFI instead of continuing on the line. As speed is a determining factor in the noise level produced by the train, particularly in relation to instantaneous events which are linked to sleep disturbance, it is likely that the Proposed Development will provide a betterment. This is when considering noise from additional train movements on the existing line, due to the trains travelling at a lower speed to access the HRNFI.</p> <p>Trains will not be queuing on the mainline, the railport has been deigned to take trains of the mainline at the fastest speed possible.</p> <p>This will be dependent on the size of the train and the number of containers it is carrying, any train moving off will have to enter the mainline within a designated path for HNRFI.</p>		
<p>8. Light Pollution</p> <p>8.1. Concerns regarding the impact of overnight lighting on the village.</p> <p>8.2. Can confirmation be provided that buidlings would be lit at the top of the</p>	<p>The Lighting Strategy limits building mounted luminaires to a maximum mounting height of 10m. Up to 10m is necessary to adequately light the ~50m depth service yards. This is detailed in Lighting Strategy at section 5 and illustrated at Appendix 1</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>

<p>doors/loading &amp; unloading bays only, and specifically the buildings would not be lit at eaves level i</p> <p>8.3. The Parish Council would also ask for confirmation that the lighting in any vehicle parking areas and on the link road to the A47 will be at the height of normal street lighting.</p> <p>8.4. Turning to the rail port and gantry crane operating area immediately adjacent to the rail line, and referring to the illustrative sketch labelled "Section 7: Rail Freight Interchange" in the Landscape Strategy section of your presentation, the Parish Council notes that there is no reference to the height at which this area is to be lit and its relationship to the illustrative earth bund and landscaping.</p> <p>The Parish Council would ask that this information be provided, together with details of any steps being taken to minimize the impact of lighting on residents, particularly those on Billington Roads East &amp; West, and Bridle Path Road.</p> <p>Please note that the Parish Council is asking for more detailed information here than provided by one of your consultants who</p>	<p>Note that the Lighting Strategy does not provide a height limit on illuminated signage, but must be designed and installed in line with ILP PLG 05 'The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements'. This is detailed in the Lighting Strategy Paragraph 5.19 – 5.20</p> <p>External lighting will be provided wherever necessary to provide a safe and secure environment for staff and other users after dark. 'Secured by Design' principles will be adopted and emphasis will be placed on achieving good uniformity of light distribution. All illumination levels will be set as low as practicable while complying with safety and security recommendations. Spill of light onto building facades and outside of the target area for illumination will be minimised through careful design, specification and positioning of lighting equipment.</p> <p>The Lighting Strategy states that parking areas and A47 link road should be lit via standard height street lighting type columns (8m – 10m). This is detailed in Lighting Strategy Paragraph 5.36 and 5.47 and illustrated on Appendix 1</p> <p>The lighting strategy is provided as part of the DCO application and the impact assessment is provided within the full ES.</p> <p>Post-installation monitoring has not been set as a requirement within the Lighting Strategy, but is sometimes requested as a planning condition. This would require a post-installation</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>responded by advising a resident that the lighting would be "directed downwards". The Parish Council is specifically looking for information on whether it is possible to "shield" the lighting units in some way so as to provide the lighting required at ground level and for the operation of the gantry cranes but so that the lights don't shine out over the homes to the north west of the railway line.</p> <p>8.5. The Parish Council would like to know what is being put in place to monitor the impact of the proposed on-site / A47 link road lighting once construction work is completed and warehouse units are occupied.</p>	<p>lighting survey to verify that light levels / light spill do not exceed the limits as set out in the Lighting Strategy</p>		
<p>9. Air Quality</p> <p>9.1. The residents consider that this development will give rise to additional air pollution from the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• plant and equipment used during the building/construction phase</li> <li>• additional trains once the rail port is operational</li> <li>• increased HGV movements to and from the site</li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 9 of the submitted ES provides a full detailed assessment of air quality impacts during both the construction and operational phases. A construction phase dust assessment was undertaken in accordance with national guidance and mitigation measures proportionate to the level of construction activities are identified. These measures are incorporated into the CEMP with is a Requirement of the DCO and therefore the recommended mitigation is secured within the proposals.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of peak construction phase road traffic movements was undertaken which identified that construction</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increased workforce vehicle movements to and from the site</li> <li>the on-site power plant</li> </ul> <p>9.2. Request construction phase air quality modelling is provided as construction could be as long as 10 years.</p> <p>9.3. In light of the high level of concern about this aspect of the application, particularly amongst residents with asthma, the Parish Council would ask for the following information to be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a comparison of the current air quality assessments for Elmesthorpe and your forecasts for the air quality during the construction phase and post construction at years 2, 5 and once the site is fully operational</li> <li>details of how you intend to address issues relating to any deterioration in air quality</li> <li>confirmation of whether you will be providing the results of post application monitoring of air quality to Blaby District Council or other statutory authority on a regular and ongoing basis</li> </ul>	<p>vehicles and staff trips would have a negligible impact on local air quality at the height of construction activities. No measures were therefore required to offset any impacts however an HGV Routing Plan has been produced to direct construction vehicle traffic away from densely populated areas and to support deliveries of materials and equipment outside of peak hours to minimise local congestion.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the impact of development-generated traffic (HGV and work force) was undertaken in accordance with relevant national guidance. This assessment compared baseline air pollutant concentrations to predicted future baseline and future with HNRFI concentrations in both the earliest possible opening year, and the anticipated completion year. The assessment identified that pollutant concentrations are below current relevant air quality objectives and the impact of the HNRFI on human receptors was negligible in accordance with national guidance. Details of specific receptor locations considered in the detailed air dispersion modelling are provided in the ES and include receptors within Elmesthorpe to demonstrate the change in local air quality in Elmesthorpe; the impact was concluded to be negligible. Therefore mitigation measures were not required however, measures are incorporated into the HNRFI to further reduce emissions associated with the development. These include the installation of electric vehicle charging points, new and improved cycleways, footpaths and bridleways through the Main Site, a new Pegasus crossing and the installation of photovoltaics to generate power for the development.</p>		(Document 6.1.9)
--	--	--	------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what mechanism will be put in place for you to undertake further work in the event that the current forecasts on air quality prove incorrect</li> </ul> <p>9.4. The Parish Council notes that you consider the M69/A47 link road will remove some vehicular movements from the B581 through Elmesthorpe, and once the traffic/highway modelling work is agreed with the Highways Authorities, we look forward to receiving specific details of the forecast reduction of vehicles on the B581 so this can be considered in terms of air quality.</p>	<p>Consideration was also given to the cumulative impacts on local air quality from the operation of the on-site back-up CHP in addition to operational traffic. This identified that the cumulative impact of the HNRFI were negligible.</p> <p>Blaby District Council undertake local air quality monitoring in the vicinity of the HNRFI and on the road network that will experience a change in traffic as a result of the HNRFI. It was agreed with Blaby District Council that further ambient air quality monitoring was not required as BDC will continue to monitor ambient air quality in the area under its duty as part of the Local Air Quality Management regime. Details of the air quality monitoring undertaken by BDC are available on the BDC website and are also presented within the ES.</p> <p>Further details of traffic movements are contained in ES Chapter 8 Traffic and Transport.</p>		
<p>10. Visual Impact</p> <p>10.1. There are widespread concerns about the visual impact of the proposed development. This impact was not addressed by the poor visual images provided at the public consultation events on a pre-development and 15 years post</p>	<p>The draft photomontages used during the consultation were based on the illustrative masterplan at that time, with a focus on matters that were understood to be key areas of concern.</p> <p>The locations selected were based on a range of distances to illustrate views.</p>	N	ES Figure 11.6 Proposed Photomontages (Document 6.3.11.16)

<p>development basis. Whilst the Parish Council accepts that the public consultation events were for all local people and businesses, not just Elmhurst residents, there were concerns about the quality of what was provided. We would specifically highlight the image apparently intended to show M69 J2 but which did not include the new slip roads on the 15 year image.</p> <p>10.2. Residents felt that none of the images were "close up and personal" in the way that showed what they will face living with in the future should the development go ahead.</p> <p>10.3. Can the warehousing be constructed of materials in varying tones of colour so as to better blend into the landscape, and thereby reduce the visual impact.</p>	<p>A set of photomontages for all photoviewpoint locations are included within the submitted ES at Figure 11.16.,</p> <p>The units have been designed to 'blend' within their surroundings, particularly in winter when they would be more visible. In other locations such as at Symmetry Park Aston Clinton, different colours have been used. However, the standard Tritax colour palette is considered the most appropriate in this location.</p>		
<p>11. Flooding &amp; Drainage Issues</p> <p>11.1. Concerns as to the likelihood of flooding of the development site, and how any steps taken to alleviate the risk of flooding on adjoining watercourses.</p>	<p>To better understand the existing flood risk of the site and surrounding area, a hydraulic model of the local watercourses was developed in consultation with the LLFA and the EA. The model identified that the Main HNRFI Site is currently at risk of flooding from local surface water runoff, due to the poor permeability of the underlying ground and the restrictive</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (document

<p>11.2. A number of residents have advised that the fields off Burbage Common Road are regularly flooded, and we understand the site is known to have a high water table. Accordingly, the Parish Council would question whether this land is an appropriate location for an infrastructure project.</p> <p>11.3. Concerns that local drainage issues will be exacerbated.</p> <p>11.4. We are advised that the consultants were unable to gain access to several areas of land to undertake their research and it is therefore assumed that the modelling has included an element of guess work. We also understand that the hydraulic model used was created by the consultants with little independent input from other bodies.</p> <p>11.5. , Your consultant stated that following the survey with ground penetrating water radar, two land drains had been identified as not functioning, though the location of the land drains (on or off site) was not disclosed.</p> <p>Are the two malfunctioning land drains within the development site and therefore will be rectified during the construction</p>	<p>nature of the culverted connections into the downstream watercourses beneath the railway line. An existing flood risk was also identified on Burbage Common, Burbage Common Road, as well as along the watercourse corridor downstream of the Order Limits which includes Bridle Path Road and Elmesthorpe. These areas of flood risk correlate with anecdotal reports of historical flooding.</p> <p>To address the on-site flood risk, new surface water drainage infrastructure is proposed which will store storm water falling on the development within a combination of ponds and tanks. With the rainfall intercepted, the flood risk to the Main HNRFI Site will be reduced to an acceptable level and some downstream betterment provided.</p> <p>The surface water drainage will be designed to accommodate the 1 in 100-year storm, with additional capacity provided to accommodate future climate change. In storm events above the required design standard (i.e.: above the 1 in 100-year storm including an allowance for climate change) shallow surface water flooding would occur over external areas of the development (such as in car parks and yards). Any pass-on flows out of the site and into the downstream watercourses would be restricted by the capacity of the existing culverts beneath the railway line, as existing. To ensure the long-term performance of the drainage infrastructure, operational and maintenance procedures will be prepared to set out the routine inspection, maintenance, access, remedial actions and monitoring of the separate elements of the surface water drainage system where they are not adopted by a third party.</p>		<p>reference 6.1.14)</p> <p>Sustainable Drainage Strategy (document reference 6.2.14.2)</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>phase, or outside the development site and likely to cause ongoing problems?</p> <p>Your consultant further advised that some of the watercourses outside the development site needed attention due to the levels of sediment, and he went on to say that better maintenance of the brook to the north west of the site was needed. When asked about who would be paying for any improved maintenance in order to facilitate the outflow of water from the development site, your consultant indicated that the cost would be borne by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has subsequently advised that they will not be paying for this. Accordingly, the Parish Council is seeking reassurance about whether people who are not involved with this project will bear the cost of any drainage improvement works.</p> <p>11.6. There are concerns that the attenuation lakes are of insufficient size for the extent of the development proposed, and residents would like to know what will happen once the underground tanks and attenuation ponds fill up during any period</p>	<p>Further detail is provided in the Sustainable Drainage Strategy (document reference 6.2.14.2).</p> <p>No watercourse alterations outside of the Order Limits are required to accommodate the Proposed Scheme. Storm water runoff from the development is to be restricted and stored on site; therefore, there will be no increase in the flow leaving the site.</p> <p>The stored storm water will be released to the surrounding watercourse network at the equivalent greenfield (pre-development) annual average discharge rate. This will ensure that under normal rainfall conditions there is no increase in the rate of water leaving the site. In larger storm events this will represent a reduction in the peak flow leaving the development, offering downstream betterment.</p> <p>The hydraulic modelling is based upon topographical surveys of the ground, watercourse channels, and hydraulic structures. This has been supplemented with asset data from Network Rail, Leicestershire Highways, National Highways, and Network Rail, as well as aerial LiDAR survey. This is a standard approach for developing hydraulic models. The EA have undertaken a detailed review of the hydraulic model and have confirmed that it is fit for purpose.</p> <p>As the Proposed Scheme will not detrimentally alter the peak flows leaving the site or affect the flood risk in the wider area, there is no requirement for the Proposed Scheme to include watercourse or surface water drainage improvements outside of the DCO boundary.</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>of prolonged rain. The Parish Council would also like details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how the levels of water in the underground storage tanks and attenuation ponds are monitored</li> <li>• who will monitor them</li> <li>• how the outflow from the development site is determined at any given time</li> <li>• how the attenuation ponds are monitored to ensure that the outflow of water from the development site does not flood the adjoining area.</li> </ul> <p>11.7. Residents of Bostock Close are concerned that if the measures proposed to control the outflow of water from the site are insufficient, their homes will be flooded.</p> <p>11.8. Concerns that properties at Bridle Path Road crossroads will flood should the development go ahead.</p> <p>11.9. There are also concerns regarding how the site drainage scheme will feed into the existing drains/sewers in Elmesthorpe. The B581 floods close to Wortley Cottages &amp; Bostock Close during heavy rainfall, and there have been occasions in the last five years where the drain covers have lifted in</p>	<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency have reviewed the FRA (document reference 6.2.14.1), and the proposed mitigation measures and drainage strategy. They have confirmed that they are comfortable with the proposals.</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>Bostock Close due to the speed/volume of rising water.</p>			
<p>12. Wildlife &amp; the Loss of Farmland</p> <p>Surreys have failed to translate into any meaningful proposals to offset the extensive damage to the local ecology which is expected to result from this proposal. Furthermore, residents feel that the surveys have under estimated the extensive wildlife in the area.</p> <p>12.2. The Parish Council would question this being an ecologically friendly project. As an example, the earlier site designs included bunding on the north east boundary of the site with Burbage Common Road which the Parish Council understood was to be landscaped in such a way as to encourage flora and fauna to flourish. The current designs indicate that this bunding is being replaced with an 8 metre high solid fence and railway sidings.</p> <p>12.3. The proximity of the proposed development to Burbage Common and Woods is likely to cause significant damage to the variety of wildlife in the area. There</p>	<p>There is a low risk of indirect degradation impacts resulting from construction works on Burbage Wood and Aston Firs SSSI. This will be protected through the provision of the buffer and through the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)</p> <p>Chapter 12 of the ES sets out how the mitigation for the habitats and species will be implemented and managed, and includes an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). These detail the methodologies for protection of habitats and species and then their future management respectively.</p> <p>Where possible the proposals have aimed to reduce biodiversity impacts through the site layout and have looked at the onsite provision to ensure that the biodiversity gains can be maximised onsite. We have also looked at providing off-site compensation in the closest area possible to the site in order to provide the gains required in the locality.</p> <p>The BIA provided at Appendix 12.3 (document reference 6.2.12.3) sets out the BNG for the Order Limits and details how BNG has been achieved for the project. The onsite habitats have been designed to maximise benefits where possible. An area of offsite mitigation land is included within the proposals</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document 17.3)</p> <p>Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (Document 17.6)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>

<p>are specific concerns regarding the impact on the migratory routes of the roe deer.</p> <p>12.4. Concerns regarding the impact of the construction and subsequent lighting of the A47 link road.</p> <p>12.5. It is generally felt that the provision of a green area as an extension to Burbage Common will not be sufficient to offset the loss of natural habitat for the wildlife as the construction work alone will drive much of the wildlife away and it may never return. Further, the value of a green area close to the new A47 link road is considered to be limited.</p> <p>12.6. It is also felt that the new areas of ecological enhancement will not be suitable replacements for the long established habitats which are being built on.</p> <p>12.7. There are concerns that the land drainage proposals will have a devastating effect on the ecosystems in the existing watercourses as they are sensitive to changes in the water levels. The effects will extend not only to the smaller organisms present in the water, but also the fish,</p>	<p>but in close proximity to the Order Limits and the areas associated with the common and SSSI.</p> <p>A lighting strategy is submitted which demonstrates that sufficient mitigation can be implemented to ensure there is no adverse impact on the SSSI, as with the air quality assessment.</p> <p>No evidence of water vole have been recorded on site during detailed surveys for the species. Further surveys will be carried out prior to impacts on water courses.</p>		<p>Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) (Document 6.2.12.3)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p>
--	---	--	---



<p>dragonflies and water birds including the kingfishers.</p> <p>12.8. The Parish Council understands that there are water voles close to the development site and bearing in their rarity, we would like details about the steps that will be taken to protect them from any damage to their habitat.</p> <p>12.9. The area is also rich in other native species including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carrion crow, jackdaw, jay, magpie and rook</li> <li>• Collared dove and wood pigeon</li> <li>• Bullfinch, chaffinch, greenfinch, goldfinch, linnet and yellowhammer</li> <li>• Black backed gull, black headed gull and common gull</li> <li>• Buzzard, kestrel, and sparrow hawk</li> <li>• Partridge and pheasant</li> <li>• Coot and moorhen</li> <li>• House sparrow and tree sparrow</li> <li>• House martin and swallow</li> <li>• Canada goose, mallard, mute swan and teal</li> <li>• Blue tit, great tit, coal tit and long tailed tit</li> <li>• Blackbird, fieldfare, mistle thrush, song thrush and robin</li> </ul>			
---	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grey wagtail and pied wagtail</li> <li>• Greater spotted woodpecker and green woodpecker</li> <li>• Cuckoo, dunnock, heron, lapwing, nuthatch, skylark, starling, swift, tawny owl and wren</li> <li>• Badger, pipestrelle bat, muntjac deer, fox, frog, hare, hedgehog, wood mouse, harvest mouse, house mouse, mole, smooth newt, palmate newt, common shrew, pygmy shrew, smooth snake, rabbit, brown rat, grey squirrel, stoat, weasel, toad, bank vole and short tailed vole.</li> </ul> <p>12.10. A number of residents have commented on the destruction of farm land which is currently growing arable crops or being used for the grazing of livestock.</p> <p>12.11. The site adjoins the Elmesthorpe Land Settlement Area which is considered to be a unique area of open countryside, and is one of the few remaining areas in the country set up post second World War under the Land Settlement Acts for the purpose of the provision of food. It has its own unique character and there are concerns that this will be damaged as a result of the proposed development.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>13. Rights of Way &amp; Access to Burbage Common/Woods</p> <p>13.1. The access via Burbage Common Road to Burbage Common &amp; Woods is well used by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, horses and riders. Under the proposals, this route is to be closed.</p> <p>13.2. There is currently an extensive network of footpaths and bridleways across the site which the Parish Council understands are to be re-routed.</p> <p>13.3. The various pedestrian level crossings adjacent to the site are to be closed.</p> <p>13.4. The Parish Council understands that the railway crossings for the T89 footpath close to the 8581 railway bridge, and the U17 footpath which is some distance from the site are also to be closed with a diversion proposed for U17.</p> <p>13.5. The review of footpath usage was apparently carried out in 2018, this is likely to be out of date for current usage.</p>	<p>Users of the PRowS will continue to be able to access Burbage Common from Elmesthorpe via Bridlepath Road, Bridleway U52/9 and Burbage Common Road (west of the Site) via an underpass. PRow users will be able to access Burbage Common from the eastern end of Elmesthorpe via Burbage Common Road to the Site, then travel along the proposed new bridleway, around the eastern edge of the site which will continue within the southern area of the site linking to Burbage Common.</p> <p>A more direct route from the eastern edge of Elmesthorpe to Burbage Common can be made via pedestrian and cycle routes within the main body of the site.</p> <p>This is detailed within Chapter 11 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>The photographs of T89/1 have been reviewed. The condition survey of T89/1 erroneously duplicated the findings of T89/2,</p> <p>In terms of the railway bridge; a crossing point from Bostock Close is proposed via a dropped curb and alterations to create a footway.</p> <p>It has been agreed with Leicestershire PRow officer that the pedestrian level crossing at U17 will be diverted over (~or under) any nearby rail crossing.</p> <p>All PRow diversions will take place during the enabling works phase as detailed in Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
--	---	----------	---

<p>13.6. Some of the footpath analysis seems questionable.</p> <p>13.7. In the summary table in Annex 2 of Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Appraisal &amp; Strategy, for footpath T89/1, it states that in both winter and summer "Overgrown field vegetation. Stile from Station Road impassable, very little sign of use".</p> <p>The Parish Council would refer to the first and second photographs in Appendix 2 of this letter which were taken earlier this year. In neither photograph would the route be describable as "impassable", and the route is clearly in use as it can be seen running across the field to the pedestrian level crossing on the railway line.</p> <p>The Parish Council understands that the V23/1 has been similarly mis-described as "Poorly worn desire line/vegetation suppression defines some of the route. Parts entirely waterlogged."The Parish Council would refer to the third photograph in Appendix 2 where the path can clearly be seen going from right to left across the field.</p>	<p>Planting and landscaping has been proposed to conform with Network Rail guidance and the Tree Council.</p> <p>Agricultural land to the south of the proposed link road will be converted to an area of public open space which has been designed to reflect the character of Burbage Common and Woods country park.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>13.8. The walkers who have reviewed the information provided for this consultation advise that undue emphasis also seems to be put on the fact that the signage of the footpaths is poor, as if this indicates little usage of the path which is not the case. The paths are predominantly used by local people from the surrounding villages and Hinckley who know the paths well without needing recourse to signage. Any self respecting walker who happened to be from outside the area would be using an OS map or GPS, so again would have scant interest in the quality of the signage.</p> <p>13.9. There are a number of equine businesses on Burbage Common Road and it is estimated that there are approximately 100 horses kept at the various liverys in Elmesthorpe. The Parish Council understands that the proposal to re-route horses and riders along a new bridle path along the side of the M69 will add hugely to the time needed to exercise the horses and is generally considered to be unworkable due to risk of the horses being spooked by the vehicles on the M69.</p> <p>13.10. The pedestrian level crossings for the T89 footpath close to the B581 railway</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>bridge, and the U17 footpath, which is some distance from the site, are also to be closed with a diversion proposed for U17. Both proposals give rise to very specific concerns.</p> <p>13.11. Dealing firstly with the T89 footpath, it is understood that it is to be closed from Stanton/Station Road across the railway line and to the far end of Bostock Close with a new route from Station Road along the pavement on Bostock Close to the far end where it will pick up its onward route.</p> <p>The proposal includes the provision of a crossing on the B581 close to the bottom of the B581 railway bridge. Unfortunately visibility at the proposed point of the new crossing is severely restricted, endangering the lives of people attempting to use it. The railway bridge has a blind summit - please see the fourth photograph in Appendix 2 - so vehicles coming over the bridge from The Wentworth Arms direction and gathering speed on the downward slope will encounter pedestrians trying to cross the road. The Parish Council would ask that the proposed location for the crossing is reviewed as a matter of concern.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>13.12. Turning to the closure of the U17 pedestrian level crossing, the Parish Council understands that it is proposed to divert the footpath along the railway line to the west, over an existing farm bridge and back eastwards along the railway line to the same point on the opposite side, whereas the investment in a new pedestrian footbridge over the railway line would avoid this.</p> <p>13.13. Given the forecast 10 year period the development is expected to be in the construction phase, the Parish Council would like details of any proposed rights of way diversions which will be in place from the point in time at which the site is physically secured for construction purposes. It is not acceptable for the Burbage Common area to be inaccessible from Elmesthorpe at any time.</p> <p>13.14. In summary, the residents consider the proposed erasure, alteration or diversion of rights of way to be to the detriment of the whole community. The alternatives put forward to replace what is being lost are considered to be neither practical nor of the same quality.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>14. Construction</p> <p>14.1. The Parish Council understands from previous discussions with yourselves that it is proposed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• commence the construction work at the M69 J2 end of the site</li> <li>• the heavy machinery required for earth moving and other construction work will enter the development site at the M69 J2 end of the site</li> <li>• heavy machinery and construction traffic will not be travelling through the village</li> <li>• heavy machinery and construction traffic will not gain access to the site via Burbage Common Road</li> <li>• retain all soil on site</li> <li>• retain all earth moving and heavy machinery on site once the construction work commences</li> </ul> <p>14.2. The Parish Council would like confirmation that the above proposals still reflect how the construction work is to be undertaken.</p>	<p>14.1 - 14.2</p> <p>These statements confirm how construction will take place other than the statement relating to soil, sub-soil will be balanced on site however top soil will be re-used on site where possible. The residual topsoil that cannot be utilised in the above listed activities will be stockpiled for storage. Matters relating to construction and construction traffic are detailed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan and the Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>14.3</p> <p>As set out above soil removal from site would be minimised. 14.4</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 at paragraph 7.282 it is stated that on average 210 construction workers would be on site per annum, this number will fluctuate dependent on the build phase, some workers will be on site for short periods of time and some will be on site longer. Workers will access the site via the dedicated site access. Construction traffic will be managed via the Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>14.5</p> <p>All stopping up and diversion works in regard to PRow will be implemented during the 'Enabling Works Phase'</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 17.6)</p>
--	--	----------	---



<p>14.3. The Parish Council would specifically like reassurance that there are no proposals for fleets of HGVs to be removing soil from the site.</p> <p>14.4. The Parish Council would like an indication of how large the workforce for the construction phase is likely to be and whether it is expected that they will arrive and leave the site in private vehicles. If they are using private vehicles, please can we have confirmation that they will not be accessing the site via Burbage Common Road.</p> <p>14.5. The Parish Council would also like details of how it is proposed to protect the wellbeing of the large number of horses in liveries on Burbage Common Road during the construction work, particularly the construction of the rail port.</p>	<p>which will occur prior to any of the ‘Development Phases’. The diverted route will ensure a safe passage around the site for the duration of the development phases. During the enabling works there will be short periods when temporary diversions and closures will need to take place for health and safety reasons, but these will be programmed to minimise disruption to users.</p>		
<p>15. Green Credentials</p> <p><b>Green benefits</b></p> <p>15.1. It is generally felt that this proposal will not have the green benefits that are being put forward as a positive factor, with the benefits appearing to rely heavily on moving freight by rail rather than by road.</p>	<p><b>Green benefits</b></p> <p>The NPS recognises that moving freight from road to rail has an important part to play in a low carbon economy and in helping to address climate change (NPS para 2.53).</p> <p><b>Ecological Impacts</b></p> <p>Ecological impacts are mitigated or offset through the Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan and the</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document (17.3)</p> <p>Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (document</p>

<p><b>Ecological Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The warehouse units are stated to "built to net zero carbon in construction" but there doesn't appear to be any wider commitment to making the site itself carbon neutral or placing any expectation on the occupiers of the site to meet environmentally friendly targets</li> <li>Building to net zero carbon does not offset the ecological impact of the development</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainable transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the existing infrastructure and housing provision, there is little opportunity to employ a workforce who can walk or cycle to work, or even use public transport</li> <li>The freight trains will be diesel and not electric</li> </ul> <p><b>Rail Market</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The notion of moving freight by rail rather than road can only deliver benefits where the end market is sufficiently close to the rail hub (and the only information provided about the end market at the consultations was based on the misconception that MIRA has a need for automotive parts)</li> </ul>	<p>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan submitted as part of the ES. Building to Net Zero is not being advanced as ecological mitigation.</p> <p><b>Sustainable transport</b></p> <p>Opportunities for employees to walk to work will be limited however cycling and public with enhancements put in place will be viable options.</p> <p>A full assessment on likely commuting behaviours has been undertaken and forms part of the submitted ES.</p> <p>A transport strategy has been drawn up which reviews existing and new routes to the Site.</p> <p>Significant improvements are proposed to the X6 bus service, and as the site becomes operational a demand response bus service will be rolled out on a phased basis. We have been in discussions with Vectare, the current provider of the New Lubbethorpe on demand services. A strategy for creating a service with a focus on the site has been developed and will continue to evolve as the first occupants start at HNRFI.</p> <p><b>Rail Market</b></p>		<p>reference 17.5)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p> <p>Appendix 8.1 (document reference Sustainable Transport Strategy part 15 of 16 6.2.8.1)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>
---	--	--	---

<p><b>Energy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy for the site is primarily to be provided by an on-site gas power plant rather than from greener sources.</li> </ul>	<p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve.</p> <p><b>Energy</b></p> <p>Energy to the site is primarily to be provided by roof mounted PVs.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Enderby PC		Date of Consultee Response: 28/03/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Enderby Parish Council would make the following comments : -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The increase in rail traffic will severely affect the level crossing at Narborough with current estimates being that it will be closed for 45-50 minutes per hour.</li> <li>2. HGVs on B roads and smaller roads in the surrounding area will significantly increase.</li> <li>3. Branching off of the existing Hinckley to Leicester line when its use is currently under capacity will affect the local road network. There are currently two peak hour trains not in service which is creating a demand for more vehicles on the road and this demand will increase as Covid restrictions ease.</li> </ol> <p>Visual impacts due to height of buildings.</p>	<p><b>Narborough Level Crossing</b></p> <p>Network Rail have undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Based on the pre-pandemic timetable, in the morning peak hours 7 – 10 am, there is only one possible time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4 – 7 pm only two. Each train would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5 mins. This is far less than a stopping passenger train coming from Leicester, which is 4-5 minutes. In each hour the total barrier down time would be approximately 20 minutes, with 40 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p> <p><b>HGVs on Local Highway</b></p> <p>The HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy includes measures to deter HGVs from inappropriately using the local highway network. Enforcement and reporting arrangements are included within this strategy to secure compliance. The transport modelling undertaken by the Applicant demonstrates</p>	Y	<p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape (Document 6.1.8)</p>

	<p>that the impact of traffic on the local highway network will be acceptable, with offsite mitigation works. A full assessment of impacts is provided in Chapter 8: <i>Transport and traffic</i> of this ES.</p> <p><b>Hinckley to Leicester Line</b></p> <p>The capacity for freight trains into and out of HNRFI has been checked by Network Rail using the pre-pandemic timetable when more passenger trains were running. Any services into and out of HNRFI will have to fit into the working timetable without compromising other trains. The assumption is that there will be more passenger services in the future, as proposed by Midland Connect. Outside of the peak hours there is ample capacity to run up to 3 trains an hour into or out of HNRFI. Trains are all timetabled with dedicated train paths and those paths will only be allocated if they do not conflict with other train paths, whether they are running or not.</p> <p><b>Height of Logistics Buildings</b></p> <p>In consideration of this matter the applicant has reduced the maximum heights of building by between 2 and 5 metres.</p> <p>Under the proposed DCO parameters the maximum building height is 28 metres, as measured from ground level.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>It is however inevitable that the scale of buildings for modern logistics will have local impacts. These impacts will be minimised by good design on the elevational appearance of buildings and extensive landscaping.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<b>Consultee: Environment Agency</b>		<b>Date of Consultee Response:</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Regard to response</b>	<b>Scheme change</b>	<b>Relevant Document Reference</b>

<p><b>Flood Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposals include the extensive reprofiling of the Main HNRFI Site to form two plateaus on which the Proposed Scheme will be located. To facilitate the reprofiling, an unnamed ordinary watercourse (Reach 5), will be realigned to flow alongside within a new channel. Two culverts are to be constructed on the diverted Reach 5; the first culvert is beneath the A47 Link Road; the second is beneath a footbridge which crosses the M69.</li> <li>Three further new culverts are required on Reach 1, 2 and 8 to allow flows to pass beneath the A47 Link Road.</li> <li>The proposed development is to be arranged to fall outside of Flood Zone 3 on higher ground, in an area where it is afforded flood resilience from the watercourses by the intervening topography or, in case of the A47 Link Road, M69, and railway line, have been located on elevated embankments, raising them above the floodplain ensuring they can remain operational.</li> <li>To assess the potential off site flood risk impacts of the proposals, hydraulic</li> </ul>	<p><b>Flood Risk</b></p> <p>The loss and diversion of the stream corridor was assessed through a water framework assessment, which upon review the Environment Agency have confirmed that nothing further is required in that respect.</p> <p>Detailed topographical surveys were obtained wherever possible to help inform the hydraulic flood model and the Flood Risk Assessment. This included the watercourse reaches within the Main Order Limits which were the primary subject matter of the study. Certain reaches downstream of the Order Limits were inaccessible either because landowner permission was not granted, or because the channel was found to be heavily vegetated. As those reaches are of private ownership, vegetation clearance could not be undertaken. In these instances, the reaches were represented using LiDAR aerial survey data, and the details of key hydraulic structures (culverts and bridges) were taken from asset data made available from Leicestershire Highways, National Highways, and Network Rail. The flood model includes sufficient detail within the study area, and the channel capacity on the reaches defined by LiDAR are likely to be underestimated, a precautionary outcome for assessing upstream flood risk at the study site. Therefore, this limitation does not diminish the aim of the assessment. The Environment Agency have reviewed the hydraulic model in detail and have confirmed that it is fit for purpose.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (document reference 6.1.14)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (document reference 17.1)</p> <p>Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (document reference 17.4)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and</p>
---	--	----------	--

<p>modelling has been undertaken by the applicant at this preliminary design stage. The model has been reviewed by the Environment Agency and is considered fit for purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The model shows some changes to the offsite flood risk, but these are largely confined to the existing surface water and fluvial flood extents.</li> <li>In the absence of access to more accurate topographical data, the applicant has used LiDAR data for sections of the model. The use of site topographical data will make the model a more reliable representation of the condition. This data should be obtained if a reasonable opportunity arises.</li> <li>Given the elevated nature of the proposed development and the associated road infrastructure, safe, dry access and egress is achievable.</li> </ul> <p>With regards to the impact of the development on Flood Zones 2 and 3, the Environment Agency has no concerns with the proposals at this stage, based on the information provided to date.</p> <p><b>Surface water flood risk</b></p>	<p><b>Surface Water Flood Risk</b></p> <p>The proposed requirements for surface water drainage suggested by the LLFA and put forward by the EA are considered to be acceptable in principle.</p> <p><b>Contaminated land and groundwater protection</b></p> <p>The proposed requirements set out under contaminated land and groundwater protection area also considered to be acceptable in principle.</p> <p><b>Water Framework Directive</b></p> <p>The Water Framework Directive Assessment (WFD) was sent under separate cover and the Environment Agency confirmed 24 May 2022 that on review of the submitted report there were no adverse comments to make.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Impact Assessment</b></p> <p>The Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) provided at Appendix 12.2 (document reference 6.2.12.2) sets out the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for the Order Limits and details how BNG has been achieved for the project. This includes an assessment of hedgerow, stream and wet ditch habitat (i.e. linear habitat). The delivery of onsite habitats have been designed to maximise benefits where possible. An</p>	<p>visual effects (document reference 6.1.11)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 15 – Hydrogeology (document reference 6.1.15)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils and Contamination (document</p>
---	---	--



<p>Requirements have been suggested by Leicestershire Lead Local Flood Authority and put forward by the Environment Agency to secure and maintain a surface water drainage scheme.</p> <p>The EA have also been liaising with Warwickshire Lead Local Flood Authority to suggest an informative should a highway ditch, land drainage ditch, culvert be found.</p> <p><b>Contaminated land and groundwater protection</b></p> <p>We have no adverse comments to make regarding the information provided and proposed next steps in terms of further site investigation work and the production of a CEMP.</p> <p>The EA have suggested a suitably worded requirements in relation to contaminated land and groundwater protection.</p> <p><b>Water Framework Directive Assessment (WFD)</b></p> <p>In our response to the scoping consultation received in November 2020, the Environment</p>	<p>area of potential offsite mitigation land is included within the BIA <i>but in close proximity to the Order Limits and the areas associated with the common and SSSI.</i></p> <p><b>Offsite Biodiversity Net Gain</b></p> <p>With regards to the proposed off-site BNG compensation work is ongoing to provide BNG compensation on site and within the close proximity to the site to provide the benefits to the locality. If further measures are required, we will be looking at other off-site mechanisms, in order to provide the overall BNG compensation package.</p> <p><b>Pollution prevention</b></p> <p>The CEMP has been produced taking into consideration the feedback received from the EA including pollution prevention. Pollution prevention around surface water and hydrogeology are covered specifically in the CEMP under the surface water and hydrogeology section.</p> <p><b>Foul drainage</b></p> <p>Appropriate foul drainage will be included in the detailed designs and will be constructed to the Severn Trent Water standards.</p> <p><b>Waste</b></p>		<p>reference 6.1.16)</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.2 Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) provided at Appendix 12.2 (document reference 6.2.12.2)</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>Agency recommended that a Preliminary WFD assessment is undertaken. Despite references to a WFD assessment in the documents submitted as part of this s42 consultation, it is unclear if such a report has been produced.</p> <p>We therefore request that a WFDa is submitted for review by us.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain</b></p> <p>We support the implementation of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and the use of the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>Wet ditches and stream habitats have been omitted from the calculation</p> <p><b>Proposed off-site compensation</b></p> <p>We understand that BNG will be considered at design stage, however, we strongly recommend that BNG should be discussed and resolved at the earliest opportunity in the development process to ensure targets are met, and that efforts are made to achieve BNG on-site where possible, and follow the mitigation hierarchy: avoid, mitigation, compensation. Off-site compensation should</p>	<p>With regards to waste, a Site Waste and Materials Management Plan has been produced and included within the DCO submission.</p> <p><b>Environmental Permitting Regulations Proposed Energy Centre</b></p> <p>Any environmental permits required for the energy centre will be secured as necessary.</p> <p><b>Culverting and watercourses</b></p> <p>To facilitate the delivery of the Main HNRFI site, the unnamed ordinary watercourse present within the site will be realigned alongside the M69. The formation of new footpaths and bridleways alongside and over the watercourse are expected to require approximately three new bridge or culvert crossings of the channel. Additionally, the A47 Link Road will also cross over this watercourse necessitating a fourth culvert. At this illustrative design stage, hydraulic analysis has identified that a pipe diameter of 1.05m would be sufficient to convey flood flows and ensure there are no offsite impacts.</p> <p>The A47 Link Road will cross a three further ordinary watercourses between the Main HNRFI Site and Leicester Road (B4668), as well as an overland flood flow pathway. Culverted connections beneath the new highway will be provided to preserve watercourse and floodplain connectivity. At this illustrative design stage, hydraulic</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>only be considered as a last resort to supplement on-site gains.</p> <p><b>Pollution prevention</b></p> <p>If not properly controlled, suspended solids run-off from the construction site has the potential to cause pollution of the watercourses that run across the site and downstream.</p> <p>Chapter 15, paragraph 15.97 of the PEIR states that the issue of suspended solids runoff from the construction site will be addressed and planned for in a Construction Environmental Management Document (CEMP).</p> <p>the applicant should carefully plan their suspended solids runoff mitigation methods and ensure they are in place and functional prior to the beginning of any large-scale earthworks and topsoil stripping. Inspection of mitigation systems should also be included. The applicant should also consider strategies that can be used during the construction process to limit the amount of large areas of stripped soil and any other sources of runoff to the absolute minimum that are required and leave pre-existing vegetation, hedgerows</p>	<p>analysis has identified that 2.1 x 1m rectangular culverts on the watercourses, and a bank 1.05m diameter pipes at the overland flow pathway would provide the necessary capacity to convey flood flows beneath the highway embankment and ensure that there are no offsite impacts.</p> <p>Where the A47 Link Road meets Leicester Road (B4668) a new roundabout will be required (ref: HB3). Drainage channels on the northern side of the highway currently pass beneath the Leicester Road within a 0.5m diameter pipe. To accommodate the roundabout, the existing culvert will be relocated or extended to preserve connectivity from drainage channels to the eastern side of the roundabout. A new culvert beneath the highway will be required to preserve connectivity from the drainage channels to the west of the roundabout. At this illustrative design stage, hydraulic analysis has identified that a pipe diameter of 0.5m would be sufficient to convey flood flows and ensure there are no offsite impacts.</p> <p>The works required to reconfigure M69 Junction 2 will affect around 700m of the M69 motorway and require the widening of the highway and its embankment. This in turn will require the extension of an existing 1.7m diameter culvert which conveys a tributary of the Soar Brook beneath the motorway. At this illustrative design stage, hydraulic analysis has identified that extending the existing culvert would have no detrimental impact from a flood risk perspective.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>and areas of grassland in place for as long as possible in order to provide natural mitigation of runoff.</p> <p><b>Foul drainage disposal</b></p> <p>Foul drainage features are to be constructed up to the required standards for them to be adoptable by Severn Trent Water (STW) Ltd and the applicant should work closely with STW when constructing any temporary connections should be .</p> <p><b>Waste</b></p> <p>Site Waste Management Plans (SWMP) are no longer a legal requirement, however, in terms of meeting the objectives of the waste hierarchy and duty of care, SWMP's are a useful tool and considered to be best practice.</p> <p>If materials that are potentially waste are to be used on-site, the applicant will need to ensure they can comply with the exclusion from the Waste Framework Directive</p>	<p>The design of the all the culverts will be finalised at the detailed stage and agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority in a process mirroring the land drainage consent process.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>Where the applicant cannot meet the criteria, they will be required to obtain the appropriate waste permit or exemption from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Demolition waste will have to be dealt with appropriately.</p> <p>Where waste soil is to be exported from site it must be classified as either a Hazardous waste or as a Non-Hazardous waste.</p> <p>The CEMP must include a clear risk assessment of the construction and demolition environmental risks.</p> <p><b>Environmental Permitting Regulations Proposed Energy Centre</b></p> <p>The applicant should be aware that whilst the proposed Energy Centre may not meet the threshold for Large Combustion Plant (50MW Thermal Input), it may still need an Environmental Permit as Medium Combustion Plant or Specified Generators.</p> <p><b>Works to watercourses</b></p> <p><b>Culverting</b></p>			
--	--	--	--

The Environment Agency are generally opposed to the culverting of any watercourse (be it main river or ordinary watercourse) because of the adverse ecological, flood risk, geomorphological, human safety and aesthetic impacts. Culverting can cause

deterioration to currently open watercourses as it has the potential to change the physical and biological dynamics of a watercourse. Developing on top of culverts can have the effect of making the watercourse less accessible and limit future opportunity to carry out improvements to these watercourses in the future.

It is recognised that in some instances, culverting is necessary, such as for the provision of transport infrastructure. Open span bridges should be considered over culverts as a first option where feasible. It is acknowledged that some of the watercourses within the development site may become dry open channels during prolonged dry weather and an open span bridge may have a poor cost-benefit ratio.

**Watercourse improvement opportunities**

<p>In light of the adverse impacts of culverting described above, we strongly recommend pursuing opportunities to improve the morphology and ecological function of the watercourses on site. Where culverting is unavoidable, culvert design and implementation must be sensitive to fish present in the wider channel system.</p> <p><b>Pollution prevention measures during culverting and watercourse realignment works</b></p> <p>The proposed re-alignment and any culverting taking place on site will require the consent of the LLFA.</p> <p>In line with the Environment Agency's policy regarding main rivers, we recommend an undeveloped buffer zone is created and protected between the existing watercourses and any proposed built development; typically the buffer zone would be at least 8 – 10 metres wide.</p>			
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Forestry Commission		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Concerns relating to buffer zones and the need for buffers to reduce / mitigate damage.</p> <p>The PEIR indicates potential indirect impacts on tree roots through compaction; however the conclusion of the significance of this impact is unclear.</p> <p>No direct impact to Burbage Wood and Aston Firs SSSI are anticipated. There is a low risk that the SSSI may be subject to temporary indirect degradation. This is considered to be significant to a local level.</p> <p>It is suggested that the impact on Ancient Woodlands is assessed during the EIA using Standing Advice and plans to prevent damage as part of a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.</p>	<p>Appropriate buffer zones have been incorporated into the design.</p> <p>The text referred to within the PEIR was in relation to potential impacts from the proposal without mitigation. Therefore, this section suggests that there could be a significant impact on the SSSI and the areas of ancient woodland. However, the proposed mitigation measures were set out later within the PEIR and then the potential impacts of the proposals with the mitigation in place was set out. This was all set out within Table 12.6 of the PEIR and shows that the residual effect (with mitigation) for the SSSI and areas of ancient woodland there will be no significant effect.</p> <p>We can confirm that the impacts on the ancient woodland have been comprehensively assessed through the EIA and the details are included within the ES Ecology Chapter 12.</p> <p>The mitigation measures are further detailed within the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Ecological Construction Method Statements (ECMS) which will form part of the relevant phased CEMPs and the Landscape and</p>	Y	<p>Parameters Plan (document reference 2.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Ecological Construction Method Statement (Document 17.2)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan</p>



	<p>Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and Woodland Access Management Plan during the operational phase.</p>		<p>(Document (17.3)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils and Contamination (Document 6.1.16)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p>
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Historic England		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Historic England does not object to the application in principle but recommends additional details / evidence to demonstrate the impact on the setting of designated heritage assets. An explanation of how mitigation responds to heritage assets is also suggested.		N	Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)
<b>HISTORIC ENGLAND ADVICE</b> Historic England provided advice on these proposals at the scoping and screening stage in letters dated 10th April 2018 and 10th December 2020. Historic England supported the scoping in of cultural heritage and provided comments on the study area, the assessment approach, and current guidance.	Noted	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)

<p><b>PEIR and ES</b></p> <p>Historic England is pleased that the PEIR addresses previous comments and includes a comprehensive assessment of impact on the historic environment.</p> <p>The assessment at this stage is preliminary and other effects and mitigation requirements may be identified during further work. The submission of an Environmental Statement is supported.</p>	Noted	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)
<p><b>The Historic Environment</b></p> <p>There are a number of designated heritage assets within the 5km study area around the Hinckley Rail Freight Interchange Site. The historic environment chapter and the technical appendices has scoped this down to one scheduled monument, seven listed buildings, and a single conservation area.</p> <p>No additional comments made regarding non-designated archaeology survey and evaluation work.</p>	In respect of the four assets, the ES has addressed the comments raised in the Historic England consultation response.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)
<p><b>Impact &amp; Harm</b></p> <p>For all four heritage assets the assessment has concluded that the development would result in a noticeable change in their respective settings, but only a negligible change to each assets’ significance.</p>	Noted	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)

<p>The assessment concludes that this would result in a permanent minor adverse effect on these assets of high sensitivity, that is not significant.</p>			
<p><b>Relevant Policy Considerations</b></p> <p>A number of requirements as set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) are identified.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p>
<p><b>Historic England Position</b></p> <p>We consider that the impact could be more pronounced and potentially result in levels of harm to the significance of the designated heritage.</p> <p>Additional evidence on the impact of proposals and clarity on the level of harm/change to significance requested to help inform how mitigation will address negative effects.</p> <p>It is important that the assessment is undertaken in line with the current Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (The Setting of Heritage Assets).</p>	<p>Levels of harm are set out at ES Chapter 13 Cultural Heritage. It is not possible to mitigate these effects.</p> <p>The assessment has been undertaken in line with the current Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (The Setting of Heritage Assets).</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p>

<p><b>We would highlight the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestions are made to provide an improved demonstration of how heritage assets are experienced through the landscape and how the proposal effects setting.</li> <li>• Recommendations are made in respect of the Church of St Mary Barwell.</li> <li>• Further detail suggested on the experience and impact from historic footpaths, lanes and bridal ways across Elmsthorpe.</li> <li>• Additional material suggested to better understand intervisibility.</li> <li>• Additional photoviewpoints requested.</li> <li>• Clarification requested on whether impacts are likely from noise and/or light pollution.</li> <li>• More details on mitigation and how it responds to heritage assets suggested along with information on how impacts and harm would change over time.</li> </ul>	<p>Additional heritage-specific photographs, and annotations of the existing photo viewpoints are included in the ES at Appendix 13.2 and Chapter 13.</p> <p>Additional photographs will be included in Appendix 13.2 to Chapter 13 to show the experience from the churchyard of St Mary, Barwell. Additional photographs will also be provided from the paths leading to the church to illustrate this experience.</p> <p>Photoviewpoints from in the site and its surrounds will be annotated to illustrate this experience and how the churches are experienced in the context of the site, including from the PRoW to the north.</p> <p>Additional photographic evidence to illustrate these relationships, experiences and intervisibility are provided in Appendix 13.2 to Chapter 13. Furthermore, the Photoviewpoints from in the site and its surrounds will be annotated to illustrate how the churches are experienced in the context of the site.</p> <p>An additional photo viewpoint has been taken from the graveyard immediately in front of the scheduled monument and assessed in ES Chapter 13 and Appendix 13.2.</p> <p>The results of the noise and light assessments, and the implications in respect of the effect on the</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p>
--	---	----------	---

	<p>significance of each of these heritage assets, has been addressed in ES Chapter 13 and Appendix 13.2.</p> <p>The ES (Chapter 13) will set out how and where mitigation relates to the identified heritage assets and how this would affect the level of impact, including whether this would change over time.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Consultee: Historic Railway Estate		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
We thank you for the consultation and can advise that there do not appear to be any former railway lines or bridges within the area of interest that fall within our remit.	No further response.	N	N/A

Consultee: Huncote PC		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Need and Location		N	Environmental Statement Chapter 5 -

<p>In principle the idea of transferring goods from road to rail has some merit but, locations need to be well thought through, with excellent access to a variety of road routes and railway lines, allowing for redundancy of services should there be hold ups/closures. This proposal doesn't seem to yet offer sufficient evidence and justification to sway thinking that the presently proposed scheme has been sufficiently prepared to offer appropriate, and easily accessible alternative travel routes.</p>	<p>The site has excellent transport links to the road and rail network and is on the F2NM line which has recently been upgraded as a key freight route. Network Rail is satisfied that there is capacity in the current timetable to and through the key local nodes on its Strategic Freight Network to accommodate HNRFI traffic.</p> <p>Traffic modelling has been carried out for the development to demonstrate the suitability of the development in highway terms with appropriate access infrastructure and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Network Rail is considering upgrades to the Felixstowe to Nuneaton line. HNRFI has been designed to accommodate electric trains using Overhead Line Equipment (OLE) if this becomes the solution to achieve NetZero. However, Hydrogen Hybrid trains are now being developed and trialed internationally, which means electrification of the line may not be required.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states 'The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFI's' (paragraph 2.56). The NPS also states that the number of locations for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope of developers to identify 'viable alternative sites'.</p>		<p>Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>
---	---	--	--

	<p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 7.67). This suggests that there is a strong demand for SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI.</p> <p>The existing terminals are fully let, and there are no development opportunities for expansion that would enable an occupier to locate adjacent to an existing terminal that serves F2MN. A full assessment is provided within the submitted Market Needs Assessment .</p> <p>Spreading loads between local terminals for different routes and in times of problems cannot necessarily work efficiently when traversing across different regions.</p> <p><i>Existing Track Improvements</i></p>		
--	---	--	--



	<p>The Rail Operations Report (document reference 6.2.3.1). validates that the HNRFI can operate within the current rail network capacity. This confirmation is based on a detailed assessment of the current train timetable and consultation with Network Rail to ensure that freight associated with the HNRFI can be added without exceeding capacity constraints. Network Rail have confirmed through statement that the freight associated with the HNRFI can be added to the network without affecting capacity</p>		
<p><b>Carbon</b></p> <p>Huncote PC is unsure whether the transfer of freight to rail would play an important role in a low carbon economy and help to address climate change. Consideration needs to be had to production and supply chain processes, alternative routes, origin and destination locations. Queries regarding how much the SRFI will reduce the UK's carbon as a % of UK total.</p>	<p>The NPS recognises that moving freight from road to rail has an important part to play in a low carbon economy and in helping to address climate change (NPS para 2.53).</p> <p>Rail freight produces 76% less CO2 than HGVs and HGVs contribute to 46% of all CO2 emissions.</p>		
<p><b>Need</b></p> <p>Question the need for the site in light of the other nearby RFI's and question the location of so many RFI's in such a small area.</p>	<p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states 'The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFI's' (paragraph 2.56). The NPS also states that the number of locations for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope of developers to identify 'viable alternative sites'.</p>	N	Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)

	<p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 7.67). This suggests that there is a strong demand for SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI. Due to the volumes of freight that pass through the midlands and have destinations in the midlands there is a strong market for a network of RFIs in the midlands.</p>		
<p><b>Rail use</b></p> <p>Huncote PC does not support the proposal and indicates that the primary purpose of the development will not be rail freight and is more likely to be a road distribution site with impacts on the environment and transport network.</p>	<p>The proposed development as a nationally significant infrastructure project in line with the PA 2008 comprises a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange capable of handling a minimum of 4 trains per day. The market for rail use of the site is detailed in the market needs assessment which accompanies the application.</p> <p>A full assessment of environmental impacts is contained in the submitted ES and a full assessment of the transport network is set out in ES Chapter 8 Traffic and transport.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>

			Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Traffic and transport (6.1.8)
<p><b>Accidents and Disasters</b></p> <p>No measures are specific for mitigating major accidents and disasters.</p>	<p>The potential risks and associated impacts of accidents and/or disasters is set out within Chapter 19 of the ES. Measures to minimise risk, and to respond in the event of an accident or disaster are set out within the submitted CEMP, Lighting Strategy, CTMP, HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy and SWMMP.</p> <p>With regards to operational hazards, an initial Rail Hazard Identification workshop has been completed prior to the submission of the DCO. This workshop involved the review of hazards and identified actions for the detailed design stage. A key action involves a commitment to work with operators in ensuring that the operational and maintenance procedures are in place to cover all the hazards noted.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 19 - Accidents and disasters (Document 6.1.19)</p> <p>CEMP (document reference 17.1)</p> <p>Lighting Strategy (Appendix 3.3 - document reference 6.2.3.3)</p> <p>CTMP (document</p>

			reference 17.6)  HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (document reference 17.4)  Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (document reference 17.3)
--	--	--	--

<p><b>Traffic Impacts</b></p> <p>The investigation of impact on local roads doesn't go far enough and we would request that the Sapcote bypass is reconsidered to remove the potential for impact on local roads and more measures are considered to improve the B4114.</p>	<p>The Sapcote bypass removed some traffic, but a large number of vehicles were generated by the villages themselves. The Sapcote Bypass also drew more traffic to it (induced demand) which placed more pressure on the surrounding highway network. There are increases in general traffic through Sapcote village, however the numbers are at such a level that they do not justify the construction of a bypass. The proposed mitigation measures within Sapcote and Stoney Stanton are specifically designed to improve safety for residents and to discourage through-routing of vehicles from further afield.</p> <p>At the junction of the B4114 Coventry Road and B581 Broughton Road at Soar Mill, south-east of Stoney Stanton new traffic lights are already scheduled to be introduced as part of the Broughton Astley S278 works (Planning Ref: 19/00856/OUT).</p> <p>Should the above committed scheme not come forward in advance of the opening of the HNRFI access infrastructure, the applicant proposes to undertake a mitigation scheme. This would include signalisation of the ghost island junction with the Broughton Road with separate right and left turn lanes and connecting to the existing signalled junction at Coventry Road on the B4114. This layout differs from the S278 proposals by removing the Coventry</p>		
---	---	--	--

	<p>Road widening, as the traffic levels forecast do not require improvements on this arm. At the junction of B4114 Coventry Road and Croft Road, south-west of Narborough lane widening on junction approaches is proposed.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><b>Air Quality</b></p> <p>Additional planting should be encouraged along the full length of the M69 to reduce the spread of vehicle pollutants from local journeys.</p> <p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Additional planting should be encouraged along the full length of the M69 to shield communities from the noise and vibrations it creates.</p>	<p><i>Air Quality</i></p> <p>There is no conclusive scientific evidence to demonstrate that tree planting reduces road traffic emissions through absorption of pollutants, or restricts the dispersion of pollutants, especially where leaf coverage is lost in winter months. Appropriate mitigation is identified within Chapter 9 of the ES. There will however be additional planting adjacent to the M69 as part of the landscape strategy.</p> <p><i>Noise &amp; Vibration</i></p> <p>For the majority of receptors that have been assessed, noise levels are predicted to result in a temporary, minor adverse effect with mitigation.</p> <p>Construction is not likely to occur in close proximity to sensitive receptors for long periods. As the development progresses, an element of acoustic screening would be afforded by previously completed phases.</p> <p>The Framework CEMP sets out how the construction period will be controlled to minimise noise impact.</p> <p>All impacts and identified mitigatory measures are set out within Chapter 10 of the submitted ES.</p> <p><i>Landscaping</i></p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
---	---	----------	--

	The landscaping strategy has been designed to reduce visual effects of the proposed development and has responded to feedback received. The landscaping strategy is set out in Chapter 11 of the submitted ES.		
The idea of a community fund is supported.	Noted	N	Community Benefit Fund
<p><b>Traffic</b></p> <p>The proposed motorway junction works would cause additional traffic through surrounding villages.</p> <p>Alternative bypass solution suggested.</p> <p>Further detailed traffic studies suggested, including an assessment of impacts on existing highways infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposal will have a considerable impact on surrounding motorways which already have capacity issues. Additional traffic will exacerbate existing air pollution problems.</p> <p>Sequencing of motorway junction improvements suggested. Further improvement works suggested.</p> <p>Existing roads through Hinckley and Burbage already have high traffic levels resulting in air pollution. Widening of roads where road/railway meet should be considered.</p>	<p><i>Traffic</i></p> <p>The delivery of a bypass has been fully considered in the preparation of the proposal, and this is set out in detail in Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Three options were consulted upon in 2019, and the public feedback was very negative to the Stoney Stanton and Sapcote options. Ahead of the consultation the applicants transport consultants ran three separate scenarios for each of the options through the traffic model.</p> <p>The A47 link had the most significant benefit in terms of removing traffic from the B581 in Stoney Stanton and providing direct access to the M69 for settlements to the North and West of Hinckley.</p> <p>The Sapcote bypass removed some traffic, but a large number of vehicles were generated by the villages themselves. The Sapcote Bypass also drew more traffic to it (induced demand) which placed more pressure on the surrounding highway network. There</p>	Y	Environmental Chapter 8 Traffic and transport (document reference 6.1.8)



<p>No information on the criteria that the traffic modelling was based on and whether this conforms to prescribed standards.</p>	<p>are increases in general traffic through the village, however the numbers are at such a level that they do not justify the construction of a bypass. The proposed mitigation measures within Sapcote and Stoney Stanton are specifically designed to improve safety for residents and to discourage through-routing of vehicles from further afield.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the ES addresses transport and highways implications and identified mitigatory measures. A Construction Traffic Management Plan advises HGV routing during construction.</p> <p>The impact of the construction phase on air quality in Huncote is not anticipated to be significant as road traffic levels are lower than those associated with the operation of the proposal, which is deemed to have a negligible impact on air quality in Huncote, which is not significant as set out within ES Chapter 9.</p> <p>The power of strategic modelling has improved significantly since the construction of the M69 and can appropriately predict traffic flow using complex datasets.</p> <p>The main cause of congestion on development traffic routes appears to result from the capacity of the M1 northbound; and as such changes in carriageways will have no discernible benefit. Mitigation measures and</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>contributions will need to be proportionate and realistic to the likely impact.</p> <p>The modelling conforms with DfT guidance, WebTAG (Transport Analysis Guidance) , and inputs have been agreed with the Transport Working Group, as outlined within Chapter 8 of the ES. The strategic model is owned and maintained by Leicestershire County Council.</p> <p>The new A47 link road has been configured as a dual carriageway between J2 M69 and the final access roundabout to the Site. This is set out within Chapter 8 of the ES.</p>		
<p><b>Lorry Park</b></p> <p>Huncote supports the idea of a lorry park, albeit this will need to be secure.</p>	<p>The lorry parking area would be for use of HGVs using the HNRFI site, it would not be open to non HNRFI vehicles.</p> <p>The lorry park will have a secure access and only accessible to HNRFI users and clearly identified as such.</p>	N	
<p><b>Lighting</b></p> <p>Concerns regarding impacts of lighting during the night and subsequent impacts on the quality of sleep for local residents.</p>	<p>The proposed lighting scheme meets the ILP obtrusive light limitations and is therefore not considered to result in unacceptable impacts on residential properties. Any deviation to the indicative lighting design must also demonstrate this prior to any approval or installation.</p>	N	ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)

<p><b>Construction</b></p> <p>Timeframe and disruption caused by construction has not been established; including road closures, traffic, noise etc.</p>	<p><i>Construction</i></p> <p>The likely impacts during construction are included as part of each assessment and relevant chapter within the submitted ES.</p> <p>The phasing strategy is set out in ES Chapter 3 Project Description.</p> <p>The CEMP includes mitigatory measures that will be taken to reduce impacts as far as possible.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 3 Project Description (document reference 6.1.8)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (Document 17.4)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils and Contamination</p>
--	--	----------	--

			(Document 6.1.16)
<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>Development proposal doesn't conform with the policies of the Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p><i>Neighbourhood Plan(s)</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State will use the National Policy Statement for National Networks as the primary basis for making the decision on this project.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a comprehensive Planning Statement that includes analysis of all relevant planning policies (including relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies).</p>	N	<p>Planning Statement (document reference 7.1)</p>

Consultee: Kilby PC		Date of Consultee Response: 06/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Direct impacts on Kilby village are likely to be minimal.	Existing SRFI's are either fully let, serve different markets or cannot be expanded due to the lack of development space next to a rail terminal.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 -

<p>Economic justification – Kilby PC questions the need of the development and suggests existing facilities could be expanded. Attractiveness / use by the local motor industry has been exaggerated.</p>	<p>The clear demand for the proposed development is set out within the market needs assessment which accompanies the application and at ES Chapter 4: <i>Policy and Need</i>.</p> <p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study and its updates has consistently concluded the need for rail terminal capacity to be increased, and HNRFI meets that identified need.</p> <p>In terms of the motor industry, this relates to locally based end manufacturers that import parts and finished products.</p>		<p>Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>
<p>Rail connectivity – Rail connectivity improves sustainability but raises other issues including further traffic congestion particularly at Narborough level crossing and disturbance to residents especially from night freight.</p>	<p>Network Rail has undertaken detailed analysis of Narborough Station. Each train associated with the proposed development would result in a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5 minutes. During each hour, the total barrier down time would be approximately 20 minutes.</p> <p>The ES chapter has considered noise from the additional rail movements. However, it is understood that the additional trains using the line are not dependant on the HNRFI being brought forward and the capacity and running of the trains will be managed by third parties. With the Proposed Development in place, the</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>

	<p>additional trains will stop at the HNRFI instead of continuing on the line. As speed is a determining factor in the noise level produced by the train, (i.e a lower speed results in a lower noise level), it is likely that the Proposed Development will provide a betterment, when considering noise from additional train movements on the existing line, due to the trains travelling at a lower speed to access the HRNFI.</p>		
<p>HGV Traffic Effects on Local Communities – Rail connectivity will reduce road-borne freight traffic. The proposal doesn't adequately address the effects of increased HGV traffic on local roads and communities/villages. Suggestions provided to limit HGVs routing through villages including weight restrictions and alternative link road locations.</p> <p>Why does the new link road not connect directly to the A47?</p>	<p>Measures to discourage HGV vehicles routing through villages are set out in the Transport and Traffic chapter of the ES and include implementing a HGV Route Management Plan and ANPR monitoring and fines for non-compliance.</p> <p>The challenge of potentially introducing weight restrictions is that this could unfavourably penalise existing businesses operating in the area. An automatic vehicle registration recognition system may be more effective.</p> <p>The new link road has been designed to follow a safe and efficient route in terms of visibility and alignment. The proposed new roundabout on the B4668 provides an appropriate connection from the B4668 to the A47 without unnecessarily disrupting other land uses which an alternative route would involve.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (document reference 17.4)</p>

Construction traffic – consideration of measures to mitigate construction traffic routing via local roads and villages required.	A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will ensure the sufficient control and management of construction traffic. The CTMP identified routes and all contractors and sub-contractors will need to sign up to the plan. The CTMP will be secured by a DCO requirement.	N	Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 17.6)
Journey to Work – There is inadequate public transport to serve the site. The proposal will result in a lot of private car journeys.	<p>A full assessment on likely commuting behaviours has been undertaken and forms part of the submitted ES.</p> <p>A sustainable transport strategy has been drawn up which reviews existing and new routes to the Site.</p> <p>Significant improvements are proposed to the X6 bus service, and as the site becomes operational a demand response bus service will be rolled out on a phased basis. We have been in discussions with Vectare, the current provider of the New Lubbethorpe on demand services. A strategy for creating a service with a focus on the site has been developed and will continue to evolve as the first occupants start at HNRFI.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Appendix 8.1 (part 15 of 16) sustainable transport strategy (document reference 6.2.8.1)</p>
Environmental Impact on Local Residents – The impact on Rosevale Mobile Home Park and Aston Firs Traveller sites have not been considered. Night-time traffic will be disruptive to local residents.	Noise, dust, air quality and lighting have all been assessed in detail (including the associated impacts on adjacent sensitive receptors which	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality

	<p>specifically includes Rosevale Mobile Home Park and Aston Firs Traveller Site) has been undertaken and is set out within the relevant chapters of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Noise and dust resulting from the construction phase is also considered in the ES and will be controlled through an approved CEMP.</p> <p><i>Noise</i></p> <p>Noise associated with the construction phase would be temporary, and works would not take place close to individual receptors for pro-longed periods. Noise monitoring would be secured as part of the CEMP and a DCO requirement to ensure any particularly noisy works are addressed and mitigatory action taken as appropriate. The CEMP submitted alongside the ES will ensure that noise impacts relating to construction are minimised.</p> <p>A full noise assessment (including an assessment of impacts resulting from construction is set out within the Noise chapter of the submitted ES).</p> <p>The B4668 and B4669 have been assessed for the day-time period, and this is presented within the Noise chapter of the ES (Chapter 10). The predicted change in noise levels is assessed as</p>		<p>(Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Lighting Strategy (document reference 6.2.3.2)</p>
--	--	--	---



	<p>having a minor adverse effect at worst on these roads with mitigation in place, which is not significant.</p> <p><i>Dust</i></p> <p>It is standard for a development of this scale and nature to implement a Dust Management Plan which has been prepared and forms part of the submitted Framework CEMP. Measures, such as dampening, assist in controlling dust associated with the construction phase. With the identified measures in place, the dust emissions from construction are not expected to significantly influence amenity on air quality for local sensitive receptors. The Air Quality Assessment concludes that the construction phase is not anticipated to lead to any exceedance of relevant air quality objectives during construction, the full assessment and its conclusions are presented within the Air Quality chapter of the ES (Chapter 9).</p> <p><i>Lighting</i></p> <p>The indicative external lighting design included has been produced in industry standard lighting calculation software. The design includes Lux level contour lines which assume a level, clear site. In practice, the effect of changes in elevation and</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>obstructions such as trees and hedges will contain the light spill further than is shown in the plot, i.e., the Lux level contour lines represents the absolute worst case scenario.</p> <p>The maximum permissible illuminance in the vertical plane (Ev) for an Environmental Zone E2 area is 1 Lux. The residential receptors previously identified are located significantly beyond the 1 Lux contour line. As such the proposed lighting scheme meets the ILP obtrusive light limitations and is therefore not considered to result in unacceptable impacts on residential properties. Any deviation to the indicative lighting design must also demonstrate this prior to any approval or installation.</p>		
<p>Other Environmental Impacts – Impacts on Burbage Common and Woods have been underestimated, in terms of visual impact, rail and road traffic, air and noise pollution. The loss of local footpaths and the displacement of local rural businesses is concerning.</p>	<p><i>Visual</i></p> <p>An assessment of visual impacts is set out within Chapter 11 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land is unavoidable as a result of the proposal, however the majority of the site (83%) is Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3b, which is not considered ‘best and most versatile’.</p> <p><i>Air Quality</i></p> <p>The Air Quality Assessment, as presented at Chapter 9 of the submitted ES, includes an assessment of the impact of additional traffic emissions on Burbage Common and Woods. The</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>

	<p>Assessment has been considered by the project Ecologists to consider the impact on this habitat and it has been concluded within Chapter 12 of the ES. Specific mitigation has been identified to ensure that the potential for impacts to arise are minimised.</p> <p><i>Noise</i></p> <p><i>Noise impacts for Burbage Common Woods have been assessed at ES Chapter 10 Noise. A tranquillity assessment has been carried out and includes assessment of Burbage Common. It has been concluded that</i> Based on the above, with the exception of Burbage Common Woods on a weekend, it is considered that the resultant effect will be permanent, minor adverse, and further consideration to mitigation is not required at this time. A moderate, adverse impact is likely to remain at Burbage Common Woods on a weekend, and consideration is given to mitigation for both the construction and operational phases. The mitigation measures and future noise monitoring would be secured through the CEMP and DCO requirements.</p> <p><i>Accessibility and Public Rights of Way</i></p> <p>All stopping up and diversion works in regard to PRoW will be implemented during the 'Enabling</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Works Phase' which will occur prior to any of the 'Development Phases'. The diverted route will ensure a safe passage around the site for the duration of the development phases. During the enabling works there will be short periods when temporary diversions and closures will need to take place for health and safety reasons, but these will be programmed to minimise disruption to users</p> <p>While the existing routes will change as a result of the proposal, the proposed bridleway corridor along the eastern boundary of the Site will be a feature that will pass a Sustainable Urban Drainage System basin that will be enhanced for biodiversity, a rerouted stream corridor, and a variety of planting and hedgerows.</p> <p>Details on the proposed changes to PRow's is set out within Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Consultee: Leicestershire County Council Local Highways Authority		Date of Consultee Response: 05/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p><b>Access infrastructure</b></p> <p>The ITA at section 4 identifies the proposed access infrastructure.</p> <p>The ITA states that M69 J2 circulatory is proposed to be signalised. The LHA understands that the signalisation of this junction was not included in the model run on which the outputs of this ITA are based. In addition, the LHA have requested sensitivity tests of the A47 link dualled in its entirety. On this basis the LHA has not reviewed the proposed access designs in any detail.</p>	<p>Modelling for the consultation submission was based on the July 2021 run of the model. Subsequent work with the TWG has been included in a remodel with all data requirements signed off ahead of the model run. LCC as LHA have now agreed to all inputs including the signalisation of J2 and a sensitivity test looking at the dualling of the A47 link road This has been modelled in the latest run.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
<p><b>Public Rights of Way (PROW)</b></p> <p>The ITA at section 4 cross references a PROW Strategy (Also PEIR Appendix 11.2)</p> <p>The LHA would welcome engagement with the Applicant's appointed consultants EDP on the PROW proposals including vertical and horizontal alignment, routeing, surfacing, and ongoing maintenance, ideally through the TWG as previously</p>	<p>EDP had engaged with the PROW officers at LCC for advice on the routes through the site. This engagement is set out in ES Appendix 11.2 Public rights of Way Strategy. PROW proposals were in development at the time of the consultation submission and these have been fully aligned, both vertically and horizontally. An assessment is provided in the ES and associated appendices.</p>	N	Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)

<p>requested. At this stage limited engagement has taken place, and therefore there is currently no agreement on treatment of existing/future PROW. It is also worth noting that the submitted plans as presented do not appear to marry across the various documents resulting in some confusion.</p> <p>It would also be helpful for the LHA to have sight of Network Rail requirements where PROW's cross the rail line.</p>	<p>Additional details of treatment of PROW will be provided as part of the detailed design.</p>		
<p><b>Sustainable Transport Strategy</b></p> <p>The ITA at section 4 states that a “Sustainable Transport Strategy” is being developed for the proposed development with the TWG.</p> <p>The LHA welcomes the development of a Sustainable Transport Strategy given the substantial predicted trip generation to this site. The ITA states that the Sustainable Transport Strategy is being developed and does not appear to form part of the formal consultation documentation. It is noted that to date engagement and progress on this element has been limited. The LHA will continue to work with BWB (and the wider TWG) in this regard.</p>	<p>Much of the information from the Sustainable Transport Strategy was included in the TA and Travel Plan, which was submitted for the consultation. This has been developed further and submitted as a separate document alongside the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>PRTM v2.2 model</b></p>	<p>Noted, at the time of submission to the consultation, and to supply respective disciplines</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>The use of PRTM v2.2 to assess the impact of the development on the local and strategic highway networks is agreed by the LHA.</p> <p>The LHA have agreed trip generation and distribution inputs.</p> <p>However, the ITA is based on other key input assumptions that have not been agreed by the TWG/have been subsequently superseded.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the following inputs have been identified as requiring updating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning assumptions and trajectories</li> <li>• Network assumptions</li> <li>• Network coding (e.g. routes through the eastern villages not meeting DfT WebTag criteria, signal timing changes at Narborough level crossing)</li> <li>• Model brief (including signal timings at Narborough level crossing subsequently revised by Network Rail)</li> <li>• Access assumptions (M69 J2 previously modelled as priority junction i.e., not signalised)</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above, the findings in the ITA are not accepted by the LHA. For the avoidance of doubt, the LHA does not accept the impacts of development as defined in the ITA, nor therefore does it accept the proposed mitigation measures</p>	<p>with transport data, the July 2021 model run was the only dataset which had meaningful outputs to approximate the impacts from the site. We have worked with the TWG following this to agree all the respective elements to the modelling including the bullets listed in this LCC comment. The Transport Assessment and the mitigation put forward for the PEIR was labelled as ‘interim’ for the avoidance of doubt.</p> <p>A full assessment of impacts is provided in Chapter 8: <i>Transport and traffic</i> of this ES.</p>		<p>Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>identified in the ITA. The LHA continues to work with BWB (and the wider TWG) to agree input assumptions ahead of new model runs and will follow the agreed formal “sign off procedure” developed by BWB.</p>			
<p><b>Baseline traffic surveys</b></p> <p>The ITA states that a range of traffic surveys have been collected between 2017 and 2019. The appropriateness of these traffic surveys for use in local junction models will be considered by the LHA at the appropriate time in the assessment process. Normally, traffic surveys should be no older than 3 years and carried out in a neutral period. However, relaxations have been applied during the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>On the basis that the impacts of the development are not agreed (see comments above and below), it remains unclear if all junctions requiring further assessment have been surveyed.</p>	<p>Surveys had taken place during neutral months in 2018. The significant disruption of transport and traffic during the Covid 19 pandemic has meant that counts during this period were subject to factoring based on advice from DfT. The survey results obtained for the junctions subject to mitigation measures are more robust than those which would have been taken following March 2020. It is our view that these remain acceptable despite being marginally older than recommended surveys under normal conditions.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Assessment years</b></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A full assessment of impacts is provided in Chapter 8: <i>Transport and traffic</i> of this ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and</p>



<p>The ITA proposes assessment years of opening year 2026 and future year 2036.</p> <p>The LHA agrees with these assessment years. However, it is noted that additional interim assessment years may need to be agreed with the TWG to allow for phased testing to be carried out.</p>			<p>traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Assessment scenarios</b></p> <p>The ITA identifies the following scenarios for both assessment years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without development</li> <li>• Without development with proposed access infrastructure</li> <li>• With development with proposed access infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>The LHA agrees with these principal scenarios. However, it is noted that additional interim assessment scenarios may need to be agreed with the TWG to allow for phased testing to be carried out.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>We have worked with the TWG to agree all elements of the modelling.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p><b>Area of Influence (AOI)</b></p> <p>The ITA identifies a series of parameters to identify the AOI at paragraph 6.28.</p> <p>The LHA (and wider TWG) will agree the AOI at the appropriate time i.e., once revised forecast modelling (based on agreed assumptions) has been undertaken.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>We have worked with the TWG to agree all elements of the modelling.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Furnessing methodology</b></p> <p>The ITA states that the furnessing methodology used in the assessment is “largely accepted” by LCC The LHA await responses to queries raised on the proposed methodology and will continue to work with BWB (and the wider TWG) to agree an appropriate approach. Agreement to furnessing methodology must be reached prior to flows being inputted into local junction models on the basis that PRTM does not validate at turning count level.</p>	<p>Further information was shared regarding the methodology and subsequent agreement reached with LCC on the methodology. This includes for the previously agreed methodology and conversations with NDI’s framework consultants.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Highway Impact</b></p> <p>On the basis that the input assumptions to this modelling exercise were not agreed/have subsequently been superseded, the highway impacts as set out are not accepted/agreed by LCC as LHA.</p>	<p>Highway impacts were modelled with the data available at the time (July 21 run). These have subsequently been re-run with the revised model and shared with the TWG.</p> <p>We have worked with the TWG to agree all elements of the modelling.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

The LHA will of course review the identified highway impacts in detail at the appropriate time.			
---	--	--	--

<p><b>Highway mitigation</b></p> <p>On the basis that the input assumptions to this modelling exercise were not agreed/have subsequently been superseded, and the highway impacts as set out are not accepted/agreed, the LHA has not reviewed the proposed mitigation measures in any detail at this stage. However, there is currently insufficient robust evidence to eliminate the need for a Sapcote bypass at this stage. The LHA will of course review any proposed mitigation in detail at the appropriate stage in the assessment process.</p>	<p>Noted, new model runs have been done as above. The evidence from the previous run in relation to the Sapcote bypass was sufficient for the team to understand that the overall flows both existing and projected would not typically warrant a bypass of the size and configuration suggested.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy</b></p> <p>Included in the ITA at Appendix 12 The LHA has raised concerns with this Strategy not least of which include its deliverability, legality and enforceability. The LHA will continue to engage with BWB (and the wider TWG) on this Strategy, noting that it is awaiting a response to comments dated April 2021.</p>	<p>Legal precedents have been shared following discussion with the TWG about enforcement measures, the routing strategy is a key document in the suite of supporting information for the Transport Chapter.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p>
<p><b>Framework Site Wide Travel Plan</b></p>	<p>The Sustainable Transport Strategy and its links with the Travel Plan have been further updated to take</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>It is stated in the ITA that the Framework Site Wide Travel Plan sits alongside the Sustainable Transport Strategy. The relationship between the two documents remains unclear. The ITA states that the Sustainable Transport Strategy is being developed and does not appear to form part of the formal consultation documentation. It is noted that to date engagement on this element has been limited. The LHA will continue to work with BWB (and the wider TWG) in this regard, noting that safe and appropriate access to the development for all users by sustainable modes should be prioritised.</p>	<p>account of consultation feedback, the STS has been shared previously with LCC. Both are submitted as appendices to ES Chapter 8.</p>		<p>Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>Any Transport Assessment submitted would be expected to reference and explain all agreed inputs and outputs to the assessment process in full, as opposed to simply appending technical documents to a summary report. T</p> <p>Whilst the LHA has no direct rail responsibilities, through its Rail Strategy (developed jointly with Leicester City Council) it does have priorities that seek to promote modal shift but also priorities to significantly enhance Leicester and Leicestershire's rail passenger connectivity to cities elsewhere across the UK, including in the West Midlands (which would use the same rail corridor as the HNRFI). In that context, the LHA has the following Observations to make on the rail report:</p>	<p>Noted on Transport Assessment requirements a section on agreements has been added to the revised TA.</p> <p>Network Rail is satisfied that there is capacity in the current timetable to and through the key local nodes on its Strategic Freight Network to accommodate HNRFI traffic.</p> <p>The draft DCO protective provisions relating to LCC highways have been issued to LCC highways.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

- Further work is required to ensure that the analysis of rail impacts takes proper account of the Midlands Engine Rail proposals being promoted through Midlands Connect to ensure they can both be accommodated including a detailed review of timetabling.
- It is understood that the signalling system between Hinckley and Croft (the section on which the HNRFI would be located) is a relatively low capacity one. A more thorough assessment is required to identify to what extent additional signalling capacity would be required to accommodate the HNRFI proposals
- The geographical scope of any analysis should include the Leicester City area, which is a known rail capacity constraint for accommodating both increased passenger and freight services. Neither the LHA, nor LCC Legal Services were invited to input into the development of the Draft DCO. Whilst in general terms the Draft DCO contains the general headline provisions required, the detail is subject to further comment and the LHA would welcome engagement from Eversheds. Amendments will be required to align the document with the standard requirements of LCC. It should be noted that based on the comments on the PEIR submission above, none of the site-specific details in the Schedules can be agreed at this stage.

Consultee: LCC Lead Local Flood Authority		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Suggested wording for a surface water drainage scheme.</p> <p>Whilst approval of this development would supersede the need for consent by the LLFA under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, the applicant has agreed to demonstrate flood risk mitigation.</p> <p>It is advised that the council opposes the culverting of watercourses however, we recognise there are situations where culverting may be necessary. In these cases, open span bridges should be considered first as alternatives to culverts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed scheme is at an acceptable level of flood risk and, subject to the implementation of the flood risk and surface water management principles outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 14.1 of the ES), the proposed scheme will have no significant impact on flood risk within Leicestershire.</li> <li>Approval will be sought from the relevant authority before undertaking works to any Ordinary Watercourse. This process will mirror the authorities land drainage consent process.</li> <li>Before any phase of the development takes place, a surface water drainage scheme will be submitted to and approved by the appropriate authority.</li> <li>Before any occupation of any phase of the development occurs details of the long-term</li> </ul>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)

	maintenance of the surface water drainage scheme will be submitted to and approved by the appropriate authority.		
--	--	--	--



Consultee: Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group		Date of Consultee Response: 26/01/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>The themes identified in the consultation documents will impact upon the wider determinants of health and thus welcome consultation to minimise health and wellbeing that is impacted.</p> <p><b>Air quality</b></p> <p>Within the formal consultation air quality (AQ) considerations, the presence of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) are recognised, which is welcomed. We would support comments made by Public Health England that evidence indicates no threshold below which health effects do not occur for NO2 or PM2.5. The focus on AQMAs and a AQ within certain distance around the site is noted, but inequality around groups more vulnerable to health impacts from air quality are not. A full list of these groups can be found in the original response.</p> <p>Short term exposure to air pollution can impact on the life expectancy and healthy life expectancy of residents, demand on clinical services and ability to attend work and education.</p>	<p>The Leicester, Leicestershire &amp; Rutland CCG comments related to health are acknowledged. Health and wellbeing are impacted by many factors such as individual-level factors (age, genetics, sex) to wider social determinants of health such as access to resources and socio-economic status.</p> <p>The submission DCO application includes a concise Health and Equality Briefing Note where the document draws together each of the overlapping technical disciplines (including air quality, noise and transport as highlighted in the comment), and where appropriate, expands upon the conclusions to help put risk into a health context and respond to residual health concerns and opportunities.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the use of electric vehicles post-consent. At this stage, the air quality and noise assessments have considered the use of diesel operated vehicles which presents a robust assessment. Should electric vehicles be used in the</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Appendix 7.1 Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference 6.2.7.1)</p>

<p>Some recent work from the Leicestershire Public Health team and University Hospital Leicester has explored children and young people’s Emergency Department admissions due to viral wheeze and asthma, and identified Blaby district and areas of Hinckley and Bosworth for future areas to focus health inequality work due to admission rates. We would like to understand further whether the prospect of electric vehicles has been considered within construction fleets.</p> <p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Mitigation considerations around noise pollution are welcomed. Noise pollution has a wide spanning impact on health and wellbeing across the life course.</p> <p><b>Wider impacts on local people</b></p> <p>Circular recreation and cycling and walking connection routes are identified as being developed for site staff and contractors, and we would like to understand whether considerations have been made around the behaviour change factors to inspire and increase use of these.</p> <p>The potential issue around travel restrictions/road closures during construction could impact on the</p>	<p>future, then this will present a betterment in terms of noise.</p> <p>As agreed during the formal Scoping Process with the Secretary of State and all Statutory Consultees, including Environmental Health Officers, the Health and Safety Executive and Public Health England (now the UK Health Security Agency and Office for Health Improvement and Disparities), the approach to considering the health and wellbeing of communities, was to focus on environmental socio, cultural and economic precursors protective of the environment and health. For instance, Transport and Traffic is a socio-cultural and environmental health pathway that investigates the impact of changes in transport flow and nature upon local road networks, safety, public access and community severance.</p> <p>The Health and Equality Briefing Note helps put risk into health context and respond to residual health concerns and opportunities for the community.</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>community accessing key services and social connectivity which would impact on physical health, social isolation and mental health and the local NHS would welcome further consideration to this.</p> <p>A health impact assessment on the proposed project could support the exploration of health impacts thoroughly and offer options for mitigation of risks to health and identify any positive impacts of the project too. The local NHS would be willing to work with the LA PH team to contribute towards this.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<b>Consultee: Leicester, Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Local Resilience Forum</b>		<b>Date of Consultee Response:</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Regard to response</b>	<b>Scheme change</b>	<b>Relevant Document Reference</b>
<p>The LRF notes the consultation but has no observations to make other than to ask that all appropriate organisations be included as part of this consultation.</p>	<p>No further response required</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Consultee: Leicestershire & Rutland Wildlife Trust		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
As well as solar panels, are you planning green and brown roofs in a biodiversity context?	The use of green roofs and walls has been considered in detail. Green walls are not compatible with insurance requirements so massing has been broken up via the design process and with finishes. Roofs are extensively equipped with PV and are not visible from the surrounding area.	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p> <p>Construction Method Statement (Document 17.2)</p>

			Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document (17.3))
Not much detail on invertebrates.	<p>Further details of the invertebrate surveys carried out at the site are reported within the ES Ecology Chapter 12 and within the updated baseline report at Appendix 12.1 of the ES. These surveys have been used to look further at the potential impacts on invertebrate as part of the proposed development..</p> <p>The final LEMP submitted as part of the DCO application provides details for the landscape and ecology designs for the HNRFI.</p>	Y	
<p>Have you thought about the impacts of LEDs on moths</p> <p>Perhaps the LEDs could be fitted with blue light filters</p>	<p>We have worked with a lighting engineer to look at the potential of lighting impacts on the biodiversity interest of the site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>We have looked at the use of LED lighting and the information that you have provided has been reviewed.</p> <p>We have produced a lighting strategy to ensure that lighting impacts are limited in extent and we have designed to ensure that the most appropriate lighting is used.</p>	N	<p>ES</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Ecology (document reference 6.1.12)</p> <p>Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy</p>

	The lighting strategy is provided as part of the DCO application and the impact assessment is provided within the full ES.		(Document 6.2.3.2)
--	--	--	--------------------

Consultee: Leicestershire Fire & Rescue		Date of Consultee Response: 05/04/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>This response is based on the principles of the proposals and does not relate specifically to the design, building construction or materials stored on site.</p> <p>The proposal may affect traffic congestion within the vicinity of Junction 2 of the M69, potentially affecting LFR ability to respond to life threatening incidents within their target time of 10 minutes. Conversely, it may improve their attendance times as a consequence of the changes proposed to the M69 junction. It would be helpful if the applicant could consider the impact of the road layout and traffic management solution so that congestion does not impede LFR ability to proceed to emergency incidents from their fire station located in Hinckley, with particular focus on the B4669 towards Junction 2 of the M69 and onwards to Sapcote.</p> <p>The buildings on site will need to be in accordance with the “Building Regulation and Fire Safety Procedural Guidance” where comments in relation to fire safety, engineered solutions and fire detection will be given.</p>	<p>Comments noted and relevant matters will be considered for detailed design.</p> <p>Detailed designs will be in consideration of “Building Regulation and Fire Safety Procedural Guidance” and ‘Fire Safety -Approved Document B Volume 2 Buildings other than dwellings’ as well as the location and number of fire hydrants.</p>	Y	N/A

The availability of water is essential for dealing with most fires and consideration should be given to the provision of adequate and suitable supplies to support any firefighting operations on site. The proposals indicate that there will be a number of buildings over 280m<sup>2</sup> and it would be helpful if you consider the government's 'Fire Safety -Approved Document B Volume 2 Buildings other than dwellings' regarding private ring mains, fire hydrants, open water or tanks.

There are limited options to secure suitable firefighting water supplies adjacent to the site, however the proposals include the creation of balancing pools. It would be helpful if you could consider using these as Emergency Water Supplies with hard standing provided for fire engines as part of your overall firefighting water strategy.

A single hydrant would not meet the logistical requirements for effective interior firefighting. 'Fire Safety -Approved Document B Volume 2 Buildings other than dwellings' makes this case quite clear. Support the siting of public fire hydrants within the footway where possible making them safer to use. Payment for the provision and ongoing maintenance of public hydrants on the site is likely to be sought under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.



--	--	--	--

Consultee: Narborough Parish Council		Date of Consultee Response: 21/03/22	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>The Council's primary concern is about the impact additional rail traffic may have on the closure of Narborough level crossing.</p> <p><b>General observations</b></p> <p>The NPS states that SRFIs should have good rail and road connectivity, be located near the markets that they serve, generate economies of scale and operating efficiencies to handle increased capability whilst reducing community severance.</p> <p>Expansion of the existing RFls in the area would avoid costly and extensive road improvements. Added to this, the lack of refuge loops and sidings on the main Leicester to Birmingham track in this vicinity will be a limiting factor especially if planned passenger service improvements on that route are made.</p>	<p><i>Narborough Crossing</i></p> <p>Network Rail have undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Based on the pre-pandemic timetable, in the morning peak hours 7 – 10 am, there is only one possible time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4 – 7 pm only two. Each train would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5minutes. This is far less than a stopping passenger train coming from Leicester, which is 4-5 minutes. In each hour the total barrier down time would be approximately 20 minutes, with 40 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p> <p><i>Meeting Identified Need</i></p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p>

<p><b>Specific concerns</b></p> <p>Down time at the Narborough level crossing is a major problem with it being closed on average more than 16 minutes an hour. This causes significant vehicles queuing in both directions which has numerous adverse effects.</p> <p>Some estimates suggest planned increases in rail services and the increase in car journeys from additional housing in the area during the period covered by the next Blaby Local Plan in combination could double the existing closure times.</p> <p>The RFI proposal suggests a planned maximum of 12 additional closures of 2 minutes - a figure we dispute and believe to be over 6 minutes with all but one outside of peak times. We acknowledge that the issue with the level crossing is already an issue and not necessarily of Tritax Symmetry's making. However, its proposals will make a difference and a significant one. Its proposals have not been assessed to include longer term and cumulative impacts in respect of this issue as the NPS requires or their impact in combination with other likely changes, nor are there any measures to avoid or compensate for adverse impacts or to reduce community severance.</p>	<p>A Market Needs Assessment has been submitted which describes the rail-freight markets that the proposed development will serve. The Market Assessment takes account of existing rail freight interchanges, and this does not negate the need for the proposed development.</p> <p>Chapters 4, 5 and 7 of the submitted ES outline the specific need for the proposal. The submitted Market Assessment confirms that there is no available development space for occupiers to locate next to an existing terminal that is also on the F2MN line. The Assessment sets out that existing freight terminals are fully let, with the most recent terminal to open being occupied much faster than initially anticipated.</p> <p><i>Capacity</i></p> <p>Network Rail has undertaken its own review of capacity on the network. Part of the operating procedure will be that trains are only released to go direct into HNRFI, they will not need a local refuge loop. Network Rail are satisfied that HNRFI will not limit or be limited by the planned passenger service improvements.</p> <p><i>Expansion of existing RFIs</i></p> <p>Expansion of existing RFIs will not improve the rail connectivity to the area and where expansion is possible, this is underway with existing consents, which</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>We acknowledge that it is problematical to quantify air quality impacts as there is no baseline data as no monitoring currently takes place. Narborough and Littlethorpe should also be included in the air quality assessment.</p> <p>Regardless of a DCO being granted, a voice warning system should be put in place at Narborough Station.</p> <p>The proposal should deliver Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	<p>have been taken into account. HNRFI fills a gap in the Midland region’s network of terminals; and provides a much needed ready access to the ports for exports and imports as it is directly on Network Rail’s Felixstowe to the Midlands and North Strategic Freight Route.</p> <p><i>Air quality at Narborough level crossing</i></p> <p>Chapter 9 of the submitted ES comprises a robust assessment of the potential Air Quality impacts that could result from the proposed development. By statute, the Assessment, along with Chapter 20 of the ES takes consideration of cumulative impacts.</p> <p><i>Voice warning system at Narborough Station</i></p> <p>This is an existing concern which applies to fast through passenger services as well as existing freight trains. This concern was passed to Network Rail who have taken it up with East Midlands Railway who we understand are investigating solutions. This is understood to be required regardless of the DCO and is to be addressed directly with East Midlands Railway.</p> <p><i>BNG</i></p> <p>In terms of BNG, where possible the proposals have aimed to reduce biodiversity impacts through the site layout and have looked at the onsite provision to</p>		
---	--	--	--

	<p>ensure that the biodiversity gains can be maximised onsite. We have also looked at providing off-site compensation in the closest area possible to the site in order to provide the gains required in the locality. The full Biodiversity impact Assessment (BIA) sets out all the measures that have been put in place in order to ensure that the BNG requirements are met. The BIA is provided in the ES at Appendix 12.3 and Chapter 12.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Consultee: National Grid Land Rights & Acquisitions		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>NGG has no apparatus within the consultation area however wish to consult further whilst the impact to apparatus is assessed.</p> <p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGET's apparatus, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights. NGET requests to be consulted to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application.</p> <p>National Grid infrastructure within / in close proximity to the order boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity Transmission – overhead line</li> <li>• Electricity Infrastructure – see plan showing location of NG overhead lines.</li> </ul>	<p>The presence of existing NGET assets within the proposed Redline Boundary and the requirement for these to be retained is acknowledged. We have previously obtained record details of the towers and lines immediately adjacent to our works and have designed our scheme to avoid the requirement to relocate or divert any NGET Assets.</p> <p>Protective provisions have been included within the final draft of the Development Consent Order (DCO) and a statement of common ground has been agreed with National Grid.</p>	Y	draft Development Consent Order (Document Reference 3.1)

Consultee: National Highways		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Based on our assessment of the supporting documents submitted as part of S42 including the draft Development Control Order (DCO), we have identified the areas of concern that we would wish to see considered prior to the DCO being granted. These are identified in greater detail within the attached Technical Note (TN).</p> <p>It should be noted that the proposal is located within close proximity of the corridor of the A5 Hinckley to Tamworth RIS3 Pipeline scheme as identified in the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2). The current commitment for us is up to option development. Progress into further stages, including construction, will be determined through the RIS3 process.</p> <p>Whilst we are currently considering a variety of options, some of these could include offline options which may interface with the development proposals. Given the location of the site, it is considered that the development has the potential</p>	<p>Accepted. However, no proposal options have been made available to the project team for the RIS3, so we cannot at this stage provide further comment. The development impact on the A5 has been taken into consideration in the work agreed with you to date and this is reflected in the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The RIS3 optioneering does not fall with the WEBTAG criteria for certainty and as such has not been taken account off in the PRTM model run.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

<p>to prejudice the options which may be available for the RIS3 Pipeline scheme. We therefore request that you continue to engage with us as the RIS3 Pipeline scheme develops to minimise the risk of delivery of a major SRN improvement.</p>			
<p><b>Transport Assessment approach</b></p> <p>As part of the pre-application discussions, the following matters are considered to be agreed in relation to the current proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trip generation</li> <li>• Opening (2026) and Future (2036) Years of assessment</li> <li>• Suitability of the base year PRTM model</li> <li>• PRTM Forecast Modelling Brief including planning and network assumptions</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that agreement has been based on the proposals as presented and should any element change then a further consultation and review is likely to be required on the above.</p> <p>There are also significant areas which we consider to be outstanding. This is reflected in the submitted Interim Transport Assessment (ITA) dated 1 December 2021 submitted as part of the consultation, which states that “It is not the finalised assessment but provides an indication of the analysis to date. At the time of writing a further</p>	<p>The PRTM modelling has been an ongoing and iterative process of refinement along with the Transport Working Group. This is to best represent the existing and forecast scenarios. We used outputs from a model run from summer 2021 for the consultation ahead of full sign-off from the authorities to produce the PEIR . The requirement to re-run and reconsult was based on the later summer announcement from NH that the Dodswell/Longshoot widening scheme had been removed from RIS2 plans.</p> <p>We have since achieved sign-off and the latest model run inputs have been approved. The new outputs do not differ significantly from the previous runs as they feature the same projected development traffic and infrastructure interventions. Network changes have been included since the July run which are some distance from the site but may influence movement on the trunk road network. Therefore, the data processed was a best estimate at the point in the planning process and provided a reasonable point to consult formally.</p> <p>Initial reviews of junctions and their capacities within the ITA outputs are useful as the trip generation and infrastructure connected with the site remain the same.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p>iteration of Leicestershire’s Pan Regional Transport Model version 2.2 (PRTM) is being carried out following adjustments to background infrastructure within the model itself and the recent additional validation to the HNRFI Core Base Mode”.</p> <p>We consider this to be a fundamental point which may highlight prematurity of the current consultation as the transport assessment conclusions and any mitigation measures are likely to be subject to some level of change. Once additional information is available, we request to be re-consulted.</p> <p>Our detailed comments are outlined within the TN however, the key points are identified but not limited to those listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the development as given in the TA is based upon a previous run of the PRTM model, and a new forecast assessment is being undertaken, therefore, the impacts cannot be agreed at this time. The Area of Influence (Aoi) is not yet agreed. ;</li> <li>• Further analysis of the road safety data is required following the receipt of an updated report, although some clusters of accidents along the A5 do not appear to have been identified, this should then be clarified;</li> </ul>	<p>The removal of the A5 widening scheme also has limited impacts beyond the immediate vicinity of the junction. It was our view that the ITA provided a reasonable initial view of highway impacts, however, we continued to work with National Highways to ensure the all necessary junctions for the site are considered.</p> <p>Additional work on road safety data has been carried out, including a COBALT assessment of future accident risk across a wider area of the network. Particular attention has been given to the A5 corridor.</p> <p>The modal share of pedestrians has been reviewed and amended where appropriate. Further detail has been provided within the Sustainable Transport Strategy.</p>		
--	--	--	--



<p>A revised Sustainable Transport Strategy is being prepared (and has been omitted from the current submission). Our key concerns relate to the base mode share for pedestrians which is considered to be high at 11% given the location of the site and the need to demonstrate a viable public transport solution;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of the PRTM model and all input data and assumptions have been agreed, and we await the revised forecasting assessments. The impact of the development within Warwickshire will need to be included within any revised assessment; and</li> <li>• As stated above we cannot yet agree the impact of the development upon the highway network and will await the revised assessment.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Highway Impact</b></p> <p>The highway impacts have been determined based upon the PRTM v2.2 model, and it is noted that this section will need to be updated as the proposed Longshot to Dodwells scheme has been cancelled as part of the RIS2 Delivery Plan Update. We cannot therefore provide any agreement on the modelling, the resulting Area of Influence (Aoi) nor on the likely highway impact until this new assessment has been undertaken and reviewed.</p>	<p><b>Impact of the development on the highway network;</b></p> <p>The PRTM modelling has been an ongoing and iterative process of refinement along with the Transport Working Group. This is to best represent the existing and forecast scenarios. We used outputs from a model run from summer 2021 for the consultation ahead of full sign-off from the authorities to produce the PEIR . The requirement to re-run and reconsult was based on the later summer announcement from NH that the</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p>We would agree with the overall methodology to use PRTM to predict the impacts of the proposal in Leicestershire, with the results then being used for the assessment of individual junctions. However, within Warwickshire the PRTM does not offer a suitable level of detail and an appropriate assessment methodology is required to be agreed.</p> <p>PRTM Forecast Reports have been appended to the ITA. These have been reviewed but not approved by us as they will be superseded. Therefore, any understanding and analysis of the transport impacts of the proposed development drawn from this document should be used with caution as they are subject to change with the new forecasting model runs. In particular, the reported mitigation strategy has not been agreed, and we consider that further areas of the SRN are required to be considered, which were highlighted in our scoping response. These include:</p> <p>PRTM reports have been reviewed but not approved as they will be superseded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M69, along its entire length</li> <li>• M1, between Lutterworth (J20) and Leicester (J21)</li> <li>• A5, between Gibbet Hill (A426) and Tamworth (M42)</li> </ul>	<p>Dodswell/Longshoot widening scheme had been removed from RIS2 plans.</p> <p>We have since achieved sign-off and the latest model run inputs have been approved. The new outputs do not differ significantly from the previous runs as they feature the same projected development traffic and infrastructure interventions. Network changes have been included since the July run which are some distance from the site but may influence movement on the trunk road network. Therefore, the data processed was a best estimate at the point in the planning process and provided a reasonable point to consult formally.</p> <p>Initial reviews of junctions and their capacities within the ITA outputs are useful as the trip generation and infrastructure connected with the site remain the same. The removal of the A5 widening scheme also has limited impacts beyond the immediate vicinity of the junction. It was our view that the ITA provided a reasonable initial view of highway impacts, however, we continued to work with National Highways to ensure the all necessary junctions for the site are considered. Work has included an agreed approach to the interface with Warwickshire, resulting in the PRTM data being utilised and modelling being undertaken within the Rugby Rural Area Model. The modelling has been completed and early indications conclude no further impacts to those already identified. The outputs are to be presented by</p>		
--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M6, at Coventry (between J2 and J3)</li> <li>• A46, at Coventry (between M6 to A444)</li> </ul> <p>As the locations of mitigation are identified through the revised PRTM runs, individual junction assessments should be submitted for review and approval.</p>	<p>WCC consultants and BWB to WCC and NH for final agreement.</p> <p>Comments regarding the standalone models are noted. Full VISSIM assessments have been produced for J1 and J2 of the M69. Reviews of impact and mitigation is considered for J21. This includes the provision of merge/diverge assessments and wider potential measures to reduce the development impact. RIS3 proposals are noted.</p> <p><b>Area of Influence (Aoi);</b></p> <p>As above we have a new AOI from the revised model output.</p>		
<p><b>Road Safety</b></p> <p>Further assessment is required on the likely road safety impacts.</p>	<p><b>Further analysis of the road safety data including detail on the A5;</b></p> <p>A large quantity of road accident data was collated for the ITA. However, we noted that further detail was required within the analysis. This has been completed for the ES chapter along with COBALT assessment of future accident risks.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
<p><b>HGV Routes</b></p>	<p><b>HGV Routing Strategy;</b></p>	Y	HGV Route Management Plan &

<p>Overall, the proposed routing strategy for most of the routes seems reasonable however, this would only work if drivers are well informed and the strategy is enforced. Further details are required on these matters, in particular the delivery, monitoring and enforcement of the proposed routes. We also require consideration of potential mitigating measures during the construction phase when the A47 link road forming the basis of the HGV strategy will not be completed. Furthermore, any proposals for monitoring equipment that needs to be fitted along the SRN will need to be agreed with us.</p>	<p>The HGV routing strategy is now fully developed. This includes a review of existing systems deployed elsewhere in the Midlands, which were deemed to provide a precedent for the HNRFI site. These include mitigation and monitoring options and legal agreements regarding infrastructure on the adopted highway. Construction routing has also been considered fully as noted.</p>		<p>Strategy (Document 17.5)</p>
<p><b>Sustainable Transport Strategy</b>  In line with our Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan, we support the overall principles within the STS and would consider that bus and cycle travel have the greatest potential for encouraging non-car modes of travel. Therefore, we recommend that you continue to engage with operators in order to develop further the bus strategy and improve cycling facilities and availability of cycle routes.</p> <p>Further confirmation should be provided of how funding will be secured.</p>	<p><b>Revised Sustainable Transport Strategy addressing modal split and public transport provision;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base Mode share has been reviewed. The evidence was based on the ONS Census statistics for the site and surrounding postcodes which is readily available online. This is a useful starting point but will be adjusted as occupants are present on site to suit the land usage and typical modal splits.</li> <li>• A Sustainable Transport Strategy has been developed to address, non-car movements to site to align with the Site Wide Framework Travel Plan and will be secured by a DCO requirement.</li> </ul>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>

<p><b>General Preliminary Design</b></p> <p>A number of proposed works plans have been submitted and whilst these may be subject to change as a result of the additional PRTM run, points have been raised for future consideration. the following points are raised for future consideration:</p>	<p><b>General Preliminary Design;</b></p> <p>The comments related to the preliminary design are noted and have been addressed for the submission stage. Ongoing engagement with the relevant departments within NH will continue to be maintained. At areas not subject to access infrastructure changes, merge/diverge assessments with the latest model run data are to be carried out.</p>	Y	N Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic, Appendix (Document 6.1.8)
<p>Draft Development Consent Order</p> <p>Points raised around deemed consent protective provisions and Traffic Regulation Orders.</p>	<p>The points raised have been taken into consideration in the drafting of the draft DCO for submission.</p>	Y	Draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1)
<p><b>Summary and Conclusion</b></p> <p>Through the pre-application discussions a number of aspects has been agreed. However, there are significant considerations which are still required, as highlighted in this letter, and detailed in the accompanying TN. We consider the lack of an agreed transport model to be a fundamental point which may highlight prematurity of the current consultation as the transport assessment conclusions are likely to be subject to some level of</p>	<p>The conclusion is noted. A detailed response to each point is provided in the rows above.</p> <p>Further amendments to the modelling as suggested within the further detail of the Technical Note have been accounted for in the revised Transport Assessment and supporting models that have subsequently been agreed by National Highways and Leicestershire County Council..</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic, Appendix (Document 6.1.8)

<p>change. As such once additional information is available, we request to be re-consulted.</p> <p>We trust our response provides clarification of our concerns and identify other matters which we consider need to be addressed. However, if you have any questions or comments regarding the contents of the letter then please do not hesitate to contact me on the details provided.</p>			
---	--	--	--

Consultee: NATS		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
NATS operates no infrastructure within 10km of the site in question. Accordingly, it anticipates no impact from the proposal and has no comments to make on the consultation.	No further response required.	N/A	N/A

Consultee: Natural England		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p><b>Air Quality</b> Consideration should be given to in-combination effects between the CHP plant and the other operational phase emissions.</p> <p>We agree that the large scale construction adjacent to the SSSI gives rise to concerns regarding dust smothering plants on the site, and potentially causing chemical changes in the soil at the site. We note the mitigation measures and advise that where all of these measures are practised and included within the CEMP, impacts to the site via air quality during construction are unlikely.</p>	The Environmental Statement (ES) includes the additional information with regards to the CHP plant assessment and in –combination information on construction and operational traffic assessment in Chapter 8. Further details on construction phase management are included within the CEMP.	N	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p>No impacts are expected to designated sites as a result of changes to air quality from the development. We recommend that monitoring air quality at the sensitive receptors identified should be undertaken in the longer-term, to identify any real-life impacts during the operational phase of the development.</p>			<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p>
<p><b>Noise and Vibration</b></p> <p>We would advise that the worst case scenario may be closer to the real life scenario for this particular SSSI. We would not anticipate any impacts to any interest features of the SSSI, however, we would still recommend further protection of this area in particular and where possible woodland planting to the south west for screening.</p>	<p>The full impacts of noise and vibration are assessed fully in the Ecology Chapter 12 of the ES. As noted later in this response the changes within the landscape design within the southwest of the site will provide further buffering to the SSSI.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p>



<p><b>Landscape and Visual Effects</b></p> <p>Development should match local surroundings with woodland planting and green buffers used to enhance biodiversity and complement existing habitats. We would also like to suggest the use of green walls/roofs within the development, which may provide the benefit of reducing the landscape impacts of the development.</p> <p>The diversion of footpaths through the wildlife area will play a role in maintaining the rural character of these PRow and provide a greenspace resource for users of the site.</p> <p><b>Soils and Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>Natural England are satisfied that the ALC survey methodology used is appropriate. It illustrates that the site only contains approximately 3ha of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land.</p> <p>We consider this application falls outside the scope of the Development Management Procedure Order (as amended) consultation arrangements, as the proposed development would not appear to lead to the loss of over 20 ha 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land.</p>	<p>The use of green roofs and walls has been considered in detail. Green walls are not compatible with insurance requirements so massing has been broken up via the design process and with finishes. Roofs are extensively equipped with PV and are not visible from the surrounding area.</p> <p>Natural England's comments on soils and agricultural land have been noted. Defra's guidance has been considered within the CEMP submitted as part of the DCO application. Soils will be sustainably managed during construction and markets will be sought for the surplus topsoil.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils and Contamination (Document 6.1.16)</p>
--	--	----------	--

<p>The Soil Management plan should aim to minimise risks to the ecosystem services which soils provide, through appropriate site design / masterplan / Green Infrastructure. This should be produced in line with the Defra guidance Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites.</p> <p>The British Society of Soil Science Guidance Note “Benefitting from Soil Management in Development and Construction” should be followed in order to safeguard soil resources as part of the overall sustainability of the development.</p>			
<p><b>Ecology and Biodiversity Impacts to Designated Sites</b></p> <p><b>Light</b></p> <p>Light spill during construction is unlikely to cause any direct adverse impacts on interest features of Burbage Wood and Aston Firs SSSI, however, other wildlife using the SSSI, including bats, may be impacted significantly. We suggest that where construction lighting is required, this is positioned as</p>	<p><b>Light</b></p> <p>A lighting Impact Assessment has been submitted as part of the ES process. It looks at the operational impacts of lighting within the development as well as the potential construction lighting impacts. Mitigation has been proposed and incorporated into the CEMP to ensure that construction lighting impacts are minimised to the full extent.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan</p>

<p>to avoid all light spill into the adjacent woodland habitats.</p> <p>During the operational phase, lighting design should avoid any potential impacts to the SSSI and other nocturnal species using the SSSI habitat.</p> <p><b>Recreation</b></p> <p>Users of the SSSI should keep to the footpath A50 within the woodland; would expect measures to ensure this to be included in the access management plan.</p> <p><b>Direct Construction Impacts</b></p> <p>Natural England’s standing advice for ancient woodland suggests that the root protection zone for ancient woodland should be at least 15m; we note the woodland here is not designated to be ancient, however would recommend the EPZ being a minimum of 15m, and ideally 25m or larger, to completely rule out any impacts to the SSSI via root compaction.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain</b></p> <p>NE recognise the difficulties in providing all of the necessary biodiversity gains on-site, however would recommend that all possibilities for on-site</p>	<p><b>Recreation</b></p> <p>The access management plan forms part of the ES. It details the measures that have been put in place to ensure that recreational impacts on the SSSI have been minimised and detail the recreational opportunities that are provided by the onsite provision.</p> <p><b>Direct Construction Impacts</b></p> <p>The CEMP sets out the proposed EPZ, how this will be managed and the set back distances from the areas of ancient woodland and the SSSI. A buffer of 25m has been incorporated where possible in the design and this will be managed within the CEMP. Elvesthorpe Plantation has been given a buffer from built form which is in excess of 25m.</p> <p><b>BNG</b></p> <p>Where possible the proposals have aimed to reduce biodiversity impacts through the site layout and have looked at the onsite provision to ensure that the biodiversity gains can be maximised onsite. We have also looked at providing off-site compensation in the closest area possible to the site in order to provide the gains required in the locality. The full Biodiversity impact</p>		<p>(Document (17.3)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)</p> <p>Woodland Access Management Plan (6.2.11.4)</p> <p>Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) (Document 6.2.12.3)</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>enhancement should be explored prior to resorting to off- site enhancement. Where not possible, a rationale should be included within the BIA.</p> <p>A possibility for further on-site gains includes green roofs/walls. Other possibilities include further greening of road verges within the site and design alterations to include a larger area of biodiversity enhancement.</p> <p>No locations for off-site enhancements have been put forward at this stage. Natural England would like to see detailed plans for any off-site enhancements; would welcome the opportunity to comment on any future proposals.</p> <p>We would like to see a clear rationale included as to why water features are not included in net gain calculations.</p> <p>Any areas of on-site and off-site biodiversity enhancements should be included in the LEMP. We advise that this should include specific measures to ensure establishment of the new habitats, i.e. proposed wildflower meadow areas, which may require specific maintenance to ensure successful establishment and prevent out-competition by other species due to potentially high nutrient levels on former arable land.</p>	<p>Assessment (BIA) sets out all the measures that have been put in place in order to ensure that the BNG requirements are met. The BIA is provided in the ES at Appendix 12.3 and Chapter 12.</p> <p>River units were not included within the original BIA assessment as this was a more recent element of the Metric that had not been included previously. A Water Framework Directive Assessment had been carried out and has been provided to the Environment Agency (EA) who have confirmed that no further assessment is required in this regard. We have since completed the River assessment as part of the BIA which is provided in the ES at Appendix 12.3 to Chapter 12.</p> <p>The LEMP includes the areas of Biodiversity enhancement that have been included within the BIA. It sets out the measures for both the establishment phase of the habitats and the management over the establishment phase and the long term management requirements.</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>The removal of the arable use of the fields adjacent to the SSSI may also remove any possibility of pesticide use impacting the SSSI.</p> <p>The inclusion of the wildlife area is welcomed, and will work to provide further on-site biodiversity benefits and screening</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of Wych Elm within the shrub planting mix, which is beneficial to white letter hairstreak butterfly.</p> <p>A complex of ponds would provide an even better habitat in the SW area.</p> <p>We would advise omission of any sycamore planting on the site.</p> <p>We advise that to create further benefits for local bird species, the border to the SSSI could benefit from shrub planting between the proposed shade resistant wildflower meadow and the SSSI.</p> <p>The strategy appears to show some form of raised ground level/bund to the south-west, but we cannot find reference to this anywhere within the PEIR. We would welcome its inclusion, due to the additional screening/buffering effect it would have, however we recommend that the gradient of this bund, particularly surrounding the SuDS pond adjacent to</p>	<p>The removal of the arable land adjacent to the SSSI will lead to a reduced risk of potential herbicide and pesticide impacts.</p> <p>This is further buffered through the open space provision within the areas in proximity to the SSSI and a minimum buffer of 25m (greatly exceeded in most instances), to the SSSI and adjacent areas of ancient woodland.</p> <p>The landscape strategy has been updated to include the recommendation made by Natural England. These include the provision of a series of ponds within the southwest biodiversity area adjacent to the SSSI, the inclusion of a woodland ecotone from ancient woodland to wildflower grassland. This includes the revision of planting schedules.</p> <p>The area of open space will be separated from the built form by a bank and landscaped bund with tree and shrub planting forming the edge of the built form. The gradient of the bund and slopes to the wildlife ponds and SuDS ponds will not exceed 1:3 gradient and have been designed with biodiversity in mind.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document (17.3))</p>
---	---	----------	--

<p>the wildlife pond in the SW of the site, is kept to below 1:3, as too steep a gradient may prevent wildlife from using this pond.</p>			
<p><b>Surface Water and Flood Risk</b></p> <p>During operation, there is potential for oil spills and other pollutants from the site to enter the surface water environment and reach Narborough Bog SSSI. We welcome the use of the CIRIA SuDS Manual in the design of the SuDS, and advise that the proposed Concept Drainage Strategy Plan should provide suitable water quality improvements prior to any surface water discharging to the wider water environment.</p> <p>In addition, we advise that for the SuDS scheme to remain functioning in perpetuity, with a maintenance and monitoring plan put in place.</p> <p>We note that the most south-westerly pond indicated in the Illustrative Landscape Strategy is not included within the Concept Drainage Strategy Plan (Appendix 14.1). We would like to confirm our understanding that this pond will be included within the development, but is only omitted from this plan as it is not part of the SuDS strategy?</p>	<p>These comments have been considered and incorporated as part of the Sustainable Drainage Strategy (SDS) (Document reference 6.2.14.2).</p> <p>A series of connected wildlife ponds will be created in the lower western edge of the site, planting with native marginal and aquatic species and set within native wet grassland. Wet woodland will be established to the west of the pond network. These features are in addition to the SDS.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (document reference 17.1)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (document reference 6.1.14)</p> <p>Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference 6.3.11.20)</p>

<p><b>Annex 2</b></p> <p>The railway bridge's importance as a commuting feature should also be considered in addition to it's potential to support roosting bats.</p> <p>Updated surveys would be expected in either the current or most recent activity season prior to the works taking place if required.</p> <p><b>Trees</b></p> <p>Further surveys will be expected</p> <p><b>Post development disturbance</b></p> <p>A precautionary method has been proposed regarding lighting, further details would be expected in anticipation of a licence application.</p> <p>.</p> <p><b>Mitigation proposed</b></p> <p>A licence will be required to carry out any works that involve the destruction of a roost. Further information will be required from additional surveys to confirm the impacts of the works which will affect the trees before any mitigation and/or compensation can be proposed and therefore commented on.</p>	<p>The Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan will set out when surveys will need to be updated in order to establish the appropriate mitigation for the type of roosts affected prior to any works that may affect roosting bats, including any works to buildings and trees. This also includes the bat mitigation strategy setting out the proposed licencing and mitigation requirements.</p> <p>Appropriate surveys will be carried out in the correct activity season and follow the appropriate guidelines</p> <p>The Lighting Strategy has been designed to minimise light spill and illumination on to the retained and created habitats. Dark corridors around the Development Proposals will ensure that flight lines are maintained.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12)</p> <p>Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (document reference 17.5)</p>
---	---	----------	---

<p>Provision of additional hedgerows and buffers of existing hedgerows, provision of a large wildlife area, new habitat, and new linear features will provide compensation for loss of foraging and commuting habitat.</p> <p><b>Timescale</b></p> <p>The scheme should be satisfied that no wildlife offence will take place and may wish to keep records of any decision making in this regard.</p>			
<p><b>Badgers Surveys</b></p> <p>The survey methodology undertaken in 2018 and 2021 would be considered appropriate by Natural England to inform a future badger mitigation licence on conditions stated by Natural England.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Exclusion and closure of the sett If closure of subsidiary sett and outlier setts is deemed necessary, then it is recommended to take place in conjunction with the destruction of all inactive setts on site.</p>	<p>The LEMP sets out the required timing of further survey requirements, and the mitigation requirements for both the current situation with regards to badger activity and for future activity if circumstances have changed prior to construction.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Ecological Construction Method Statement (Document 17.2)</p>



Further recommendations are made on the management of setts.			
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Network Rail		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Network Rail have completed a technical evaluation of the proposals in line with their Licensing Condition obligations, including assessing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Strategic fit</li> <li>b) the viability of connecting the terminal to the Network Rail network</li> <li>c) Affected level crossing assessments</li> <li>d) An assessment of indicative network capacity to support the proposed level of train movements.</li> </ul> <p>Due to increased demands for freight, the Strategic Freight Network programme was created to enhance the capability of key UK rail freight routes to support the movement of longer and heavier</p>	<p>Comments noted in support and regarding the appropriate DCO provisions. Network Rail asset protections will be included and level crossing works will be addressed appropriately in the ES. Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing.</p>	Y	N/A

<p>freight trains and supports Government freight mode shift objectives.</p> <p>For rail intermodal mode shift and growth forecasts to be achieved there needs to be investment in high quality inland terminals in key regional locations. The benefits of this investment are evidenced by accelerated levels of rail traffic growth to/from these terminals including movement of deep-sea container traffic.</p> <p>Network Rail is therefore satisfied that, strategically, the Hinckley proposal, if consented, will support Government and rail industry targets for intermodal rail freight growth and delivering freight mode shift from road to rail.</p> <p>Having satisfied itself in a strategic context Network Rail has entered into a Basic Services Agreement with the promoter to support development of the rail works (excluding the internal rail terminal itself) in support of the promoter making an application via the NSIP process for a DCO to develop and build the terminal. This Agreement was entered into in December 2020.</p>			
<p><b>Timetabling</b></p> <p>In order to assess the availability of network capacity, Network Rail requires the promoter to</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>define the maximum volume of trains/day the terminal is likely to handle along with an assessment of the ramp-up profile for traffic growth.</p> <p>At this stage it is impossible for an accurate estimation as this will totally be governed by commercial demand which may change over time. However, it is noted that, for all SRFI developments to date, there has been no problem in securing actual paths at commencement of operations.</p> <p>Based on a full capacity scenario of the physical capabilities of the sidings to be provided (two sidings of 775m length), it is estimated that there will be a total of around 32 trains per day serving the terminal, with 20 heading east and 12 heading west from the terminal at peak terminal capacity.</p> <p>Network Rail is therefore satisfied that at this stage sufficient capacity has been identified in the working timetable to support the planned level of traffic to/from HNRFI and that there is a high level of confidence that paths identified through development analysis will largely be available at commencement of SRFI operations.</p>			
<p><b>Detailed Site Issues</b></p> <p>It is noted the proposal is to provide two 775m terminal sidings with a turnout at each end onto the</p>	<p>These points are all noted and have been taken into account in the studies on the rail elements specify these and will be taken forward in the Statement of Common Ground.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>ES Appendix 3.1 - Rail Operations Report</p>

<p>main down line on the Leicester-Nuneaton route, along with associated trap points. This layout is considered to be acceptable and is standard for a freight terminal connection onto the network.</p> <p>Some earthworks are necessary to provide a level platform for the loading/unloading terminal. As a consequence, there will be a need for earthworks on the Network Rail/ terminal boundary which will need to tie in with and not compromise the earthworks on the Leicester – Nuneaton line.</p> <p>The access will need to be fully signalled, with entry and exit signals and a protecting signal to guard against head on collisions for trains using the main-to-main crossovers. Signalling control for the connections will be undertaken from the signalling control centre at Derby and specifically the workstation responsible for all wider train movements on the Leicester – Nuneaton line.</p> <p>The scope of telecoms works related to the proposal have been set out.</p> <p>Although services to/from the terminal are expected to be diesel hauled at commencement passive provision for future electrification would also be incorporated.</p> <p>One over line structure, over bridge WNS13 Burbage Common Lane, is impacted by the proposals. The</p>	<p>Following discussion with Network Rail, it has been assessed that the Thorney Fields Farm No 2 Level Crossing sight lines would be impeded for pedestrians crossing from south to north, by a west bound 775m train held at stop lights. This level crossing should be closed and the footpath diverted over an existing bridge.</p> <p>Similarly, for the Outwoods level crossing it has been assessed that the sight lines would be impeded for pedestrians crossing from north to south, by an east bound 775m train held at stop lights. The level crossing is proposed to be replaced by a new footbridge providing an equivalent level of pedestrian access.</p>		<p>(Document 6.2.3.1)</p>
--	---	--	---------------------------

<p>existing structure is a Network Rail owned three span masonry arch structure. The proposal requires reconstruction of this structure as part of the highway works associated with the development. The reconstruction works also require the structure to be widened to accommodate a bridleway alongside the railway. This will involve changes to the Network Rail boundary.</p> <p>Provision of a bridleway alongside the operational railway will require appropriate containment and screening provisions such that there can be no planned or unplanned incursion from the bridleway onto the operational railway by equestrian users and that the risk of horses being startled by a passing train is appropriately mitigated. Such screening should be the subject of approval by Network Rail via a bespoke addition to the protective provisions or via a requirement within the Order.</p> <p>A bridge agreement covering all matters pertaining to design, construction methodology, easements and future maintenance will need to be entered into following the grant of the Order.</p>			
<p><b>Level Crossings</b></p> <p>A number of level crossings are directly impacted by the proposal. These are crossings that either fall</p>			

<p>within the proposed red line boundaries for the Scheme or that are within the “blocking back” zones for a train waiting to enter the terminal. Works to these crossings must be included within the DCO. There are five level crossings directly affected.</p>			
<p><b>Other Related Network Issues</b></p> <p>The other main issue for the rail network relates to other level crossings outside the Order limits of the proposals.</p> <p>These crossings do not currently form part of the DCO but in certain circumstances the potential impact of the terminal traffic will warrant Network Rail seeking a contribution from the promoter to works to offset the impact of that traffic.</p> <p>Special circumstances also relate to Narborough level crossing. The particular sensitivities of this town centre located crossing are recognised and for this reason it has been considered separately.</p> <p>Network Rail has assessed 6 level crossings in this category (excluding Narborough) Narborough Station level crossing has been considered separately because of the nature of the surrounding built up area, heavy usage (over 7,000</p>	<p>Further discussions have been had and further research undertaken by NR which we understand identifies that the existing risk profile on the level crossings and commitments outside of HNRFI, mean that work on these cannot be dependent on the DCO; and as such have to be treated separately from the DCO.</p> <p>Network Rails position on the worst case scenario at Narborough level crossing is noted.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Statement of Common Ground Rail (Network Rail) (Document 19.15)</p>

<p>vehicles per day) and constrained highway features present. There is a history of blocking back over the crossing, which largely relates to the existing road layout and poor driver discipline.</p> <p>However, many of the issues relating to the crossing are pre-existing and the direct impact of the Scheme would be to increase the barrier down time by only another five minutes in the hour. Currently the barriers are down for between 17 and 19 minutes in the hour. This would be increased to a maximum of 24 minutes overall, well within the limits for a town centre level crossing down time of 40 minutes maximum. As such Network Rail is satisfied that the small increase in barrier down time will not impact significantly on the risk profile at the crossing as regards rail traffic and thus it is not considered the Terminal would trigger the need for further works at the crossing.</p>			
<p>Draft DCO</p> <p>Specific wording recommended for the DCO.</p>	<p>The recommendations have been taken into consideration in the drafting of the DCO.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1)</p>

Consultee: North Warwickshire Borough Council		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
It resolved to OBJECT to the proposals requesting that the Secretary of State does not grant a Development Consent Order unless he is satisfied with the evidence in respect of the following four matters.	We note that North Warwickshire Borough Council objects to the development unless the Secretary of State is satisfied with the evidence in respect of the following four matters, each of which are addressed in turn.	N	N/A
a) The applicant can demonstrate that there is a robust system in place to ensure that occupiers – both initial and subsequent – of the associated buildings do indeed conduct the majority of their business through the rail freight terminal.	<p>At West Midlands Interchange the Examining Authority (EA) concluded that the requirements in the final draft DCO provide a much greater incentive for the undertaker to complete the works at West Midlands Interchange than those included in the East Midlands Gateway RF1. The EA concluded (paragraph 5.6.53).</p> <p>'I consider that these controls provide for a great deal of confidence that the rail facilities would be delivered as soon as is reasonably possible. There can be no guarantee that either the occupiers of the early phase warehouses or those taking space in later stages of the development would use rail facilities. However, on the evidence submitted, there would be a very good prospect that the SRFI would achieve its potential for contributing to the transfer of freight from road to rail'.</p>	N	DCO Requirements



	A requirement covering similar grounds can be included in the Draft DCO for HNRFI.		
b) The applicant can demonstrate that this facility can assist in delivering some of the outcomes of the West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study.	The application site falls just outside of the geographical area identified by the West Midlands Strategic Employment Study.	N	N/A
c) The applicant can demonstrate that the traffic impact on the A5 between the M69 and the M42 Motorways, will not take up capacity on the A5 that has already been accounted for in the allocation of the strategic housing and employment allocations set out in the North Warwickshire Local Plan 2021.	Modelling of impacts on the A5 fully account for developments within North Warwickshire and its Local Plan	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
d) That the applicant can provide assurance that there is capacity in the rail network to accommodate the proposal.	<p>The capacity for freight trains into and out of HNRFI has been confirmed by Network Rail using the pre-pandemic timetable when more passenger trains were running. Any services into and out of HNRFI will have to fit into the working timetable without compromising other trains. The assumption is that there will be more passenger services in the future, as proposed by Midland Connect.</p> <p>There is ample capacity to run up to 3 trains an hour into or out of HNRFI. Trains are all timetabled with dedicated train</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

	paths and those paths will only be allocated if they do not conflict with other train paths, whether they are running or not.		
--	---	--	--

Consultee: North West Leicestershire Borough Council			
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>NWLDC does not wish to comment on the planning merits of the site. The proposal, if permitted, would address the longer-term need for additional rail-served logistics space. In this respect, it will be important that the proposal is demonstrably rail-served.</p> <p>Officers consider the only real impact to the District would be the potential for distance glimpsed views to be established from those settlements in the south part of the District (e.g. Ellistown and Ibstock). It would be useful for the ZTV plan to be expanded in order to give a better idea of the level of visibility achieved from the District.</p>	<p>The parameters plan allows for development in zones D, E and B3 to accommodate rail connected units. These 3 zones have the ability to accommodate up to 355,629sq m of warehouse space which is circa 55% of the total ground floor floorspace having the ability to be rail connected. The balance of floorspace can be 'rail served' i.e. containers could be moved to and from the Terminal using HGV or Tugmaster vehicles over the relatively short distances involved.</p> <p>Further photomontage viewpoints have been agreed with the relevant local authority officers, and following Statutory Consultation revised lower building heights have been proposed for the DCO submission.</p>	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)

Consultee: Office of Road & Rail		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>It is noted that there will be work undertaken on the M69.</p> <p>National Highways are the Highway Authority (acting on behalf of the Secretary of State) for the M69, and consequently should be the conduit for any discussions around the scope of required improvements, access, safety, traffic demand, and operational land. However, the Highways Monitor within ORR independently monitors National Highways' management of the strategic road network (SRN) – the motorways and main A-roads in England – and will monitor the delivery of any improvements that are agreed between the developer and National Highways.</p>	No further response required	N	N/A

Consultee: Open Spaces Society		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>The HNRFI site is adjacent to one of Leicestershire's last open formal registered Common, namely Burbage Common and Woods. We see no evidence of direct impact on the Common, but we are concerned about indirect impact, for example through increased recreational use by employees during and either side of the working day and wish to understand what funding will be provided to address this.</p>	<p><b>Funding for Burbage Common and Woods</b></p> <p>Any necessary funding would be made through the S106. Open space will be created as part of the development as well as new walking and cycling routes and well-being areas which would be available to employees as well as members of the public.</p>	N	N/A
<p>We note that there are effects on public rights of way, crossing or adjacent to the site, including a proposal to create a new bridleway to connect the existing routes north and south of the site, which are currently separated. The public rights of way strategy plan does, however, appear to show no connection between the proposed new bridleway, running through the western side of the site, and footpath U50 at the eastern edge of Burbage Common and Woods; footpath U50 is shown to be closed eastwards from the perimeter of Burbage Common and Woods, leaving a gap between the remaining footpath and the proposed new</p>	<p><b>Public Rights of Way</b></p> <p>With regard to footpath U50 at the eastern edge of Burbage Common and Woods, this will connect through Aston Firs/ Elmesthorpe Plantation into the site and to the proposed bridleway. This was an error on the previous plan as you correctly spotted. This has been updated for the DCO application.</p>	Y	Public Rights of Way Strategy (6.3.11.14)

bridleway, thereby creating a cul-de-sac footpath and no formal access to the Common at this point. It is not clear if this is intentional or an error on the plan. Please could you clarify. Thank you			
---	--	--	--

<b>Consultee: Rail Safety &amp; Standards Board</b>		<b>Date of Consultee Response:</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Regard to response</b>	<b>Scheme change</b>	<b>Relevant Document Reference</b>
Following our earlier conversation, I can confirm that RSSB are not an affected party and as such will not be commenting on the proposal.	No further response required.	N	N/A

<b>Consultee: Royal Mail</b>		<b>Date of Consultee Response:</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Regard to response</b>	<b>Scheme change</b>	<b>Relevant Document Reference</b>
<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Royal Mail supports Tritax Symmetry's proposed new National Rail Freight Interchange (NRFI) at Hinckley. However, Royal Mail is concerned about the scheme's potential construction phase and operation phase impacts on its road-based operations.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises the operational interests and assets that Royal Mail hold.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that a DCO requirement pertaining to notification will be required given the information and advance warning will be available through the highway authorities. The Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be submitted at DCO submission will look where</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

<p>Royal Mail carried out an initial review of the potential risks presented by this scheme in late 2020, at which the scheme was classified as having potential for HIGH risk to Royal Mail's operations.</p> <p>Royal Mail and its consultant BNP Paribas Real Estate have reviewed the statutory consultation documents and in particular PEIR Chapter 8 – Transport. Royal Mail notes that the Draft Construction Traffic Management Plan is not available as yet, but that it will be submitted with the DCO application.</p>	<p>reasonably possible to do so to limit temporary closures and diversions.</p> <p>The Applicant will liaise with the relevant highway authorities to enact the highway improvement works on a phased basis, and so as a road user Royal Mail will need to liaise with in respect of traffic management the highway authorities to ensure the current position at the relevant time is known to them</p>		
<p>Royal Mail has nineteen operational properties within 12 miles of the proposed Hinckley NRFI DCO boundaries. The operations run from these locations have potential to be affected by the proposed Hinckley NRFI.</p> <p>Royal Mail requests that the Construction Traffic Management Plan includes an obligation for Tritax Symmetry or its contractors to notify Royal Mail in advance about works to the local highways network which may affect operational journey times and routes, with particular regard to Royal Mail's distribution facilities in the vicinity as identified in this representation.</p>	<p>Advance warning information will be available through the highway authorities to inform Royal Mails operation therefore Royal Mail will not need specific provisions in the CTMP.</p>	N	n/a

Consultee: Sapcote PC		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>Need for the development not justified.</p> <p>Concerned about increase in traffic during construction and operation and concerns about redirected traffic.</p> <p>Even with optimistic rail use, majority of traffic would be road based.</p> <p>The consultation should have been postponed as the evidence was not ready.</p> <p>Concerns in relation to noise, air quality, landscape and ecology.</p> <p>The case has not been proven to show that the proposals are consistent with a reduction in CO2 emissions in line with the Governments commitment to net-zero.</p> <p>The Consultation Period of six weeks has not allowed detailed scrutiny of all the material related to the proposals and we reserve the right to seek further professional advice specifically in relation to noise and air-quality.</p>	See detailed responses outlined below.	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p>

<p>We are concerned that the Questionnaire provided by the applicants encourages respondents to reply to specific questions which are inherently leading.</p>			
<p>2. Need</p> <p>The success in achieving reducing trip mileage of freight movements is unclear and brings into question the effectiveness of the proposal.</p> <p>Turning to the perceived shortfall, there are, in fact, a significant number of existing and proposed logistics sites within the Midlands. Further sites exist at Birch Coppice, Hams Hall and the West Midlands Rail Freight terminal recently granted permission in South Staffordshire.</p> <p>Without a proper examination of the overall capacity across the West and East Midlands, it is likely that some of these will be in competition with one another leading to over-capacity and cumulative impacts.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Leicestershire Logistics Study (2021) is an industry-led study which appears to be solely predicated on projections of future demand. Demand was calculated for both rail and road freight and it is unclear if the reduction of road freight is considered</p>	<p><i>Demand</i></p> <p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states ‘The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFI’s’ (paragraph 2.56). The NPS also states that the number of locations for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope of developers to identify ‘viable alternative sites’.</p> <p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 7.67). This suggests that there is a strong demand for SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve as well as the operator interest. The business market recognises the existence of</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.)</p> <p>HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference 16.2)</p>



<p>following the introduction of rail freight with risk of double counting.</p> <p>Even if that is not the case, the study identified a total shortfall in rail-served provision from 2020 across Leicestershire, of 307 hectares or 718,875 sqm is considerably less than the 850,000 sqm proposed at the Hinckley site with 15% of the site not required to meet the need assessed by the study.</p> <p>Moreover, the HNRFI is not being assumed to contribute to any of the road-based need in the county. North West Leicestershire, for example, in their draft plan assume there is a need to supply all the road-based provision.</p> <p><i>Rail connectivity</i></p> <p>It is also unclear in the study how much of a site should be connected to a rail- terminal for it to qualify as rail-served. In this case, the majority of the site is not and even those facilities which have direct rail connections are not obliged to use them.</p> <p><i>Employment</i></p> <p>Some of the jobs will come from relocation from existing premises to the park (7,222). The PEIR shows that the surrounding area is below the national average for unemployment and youth unemployment (Tables 7.6</p>	<p>other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI.</p> <p>As well as The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) a Savills report HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment which sets out the up to date trends in the market and demand for warehousing.</p> <p><i>Rail connectivity</i></p> <p>The parameters plan allows for development in zones D, E and B to accommodate rail connected units. These 3 zones have the ability to accommodate up to 355,629sq m of warehouse space which is circa 55% of ground floorspace which has the ability to be rail connected. The balance of floorspace can be 'rail served' i.e. containers could be moved to and from the Terminal using HGV or Tugmaster vehicles over the relatively short distances involved.</p> <p>The most recent DCO for a SRFI for West Midlands Interchange allowed for development in zones A1 and A2 to be rail connected which was 20% of the proposed floorspace, the balance of floorspace would be rail served. (WMI recommendation report 5.6.24)</p> <p><i>The Parameters Plan demonstrates that Zones D1, D2, E1, E2 and B3 have the ability to be 'rail</i></p>		
--	---	--	--

and 7.7). This suggests that the new job projections are modest.

*Employee commuting*

The PEIR is also somewhat vague about where the workers will come from. It says that currently 91% of such workers come from less than thirty miles in the Study Area (Para 7,8), but that will include sites better located in terms of larger population areas.

*Housing*

It is suggested that the provision of additional housing will help accommodate workers on the site. The distribution of this housing is not currently agreed and a review of the SGP is being considered as the HEDNA outdated and the housing assumptions are out of kilter with recent ONS evidence. Housing would have large additional impacts on the countryside and so should be considered a negative environmental impact resulting from the proposals.

*connected', meaning a warehouse with its own dedicated rail siding or which is sufficiently close to the rail terminal to allow containers to be moved from the rail wagons into the warehouse by overhead cranes or reach stackers without the need for them to be loaded onto a HGV or Tugmaster vehicle. (Examining Authority's Report on Findings and Conclusions West Midlands RFI. Paragraph 1.1.4)*

The Examining Authority for West Midlands Interchange commented on the benefit of the remainder of the scheme being 'rail served'

*'As explained by the Applicant in response to my questions at ISH5, the balance of the floorspace, in Zones A3 to A7, would be rail-served as containers could be moved to and from the Terminal using HGV or Tugmaster vehicles over the relatively short distances involved. This would involve additional loading and unloading operations, but this is standard practice at SRFIs and does not negate the cost benefits to warehouse occupiers of co-location with the Rail Terminal. The use of Tugmasters is a viable proposition as no more than 1km of the journey would be on public highway and the operator could, therefore, benefit from the cost savings that these could provide'.*

The Secretary of State agreed with the Examining Authority that the proposal at WMI 'meets the

	<p><i>criteria for function transport links locational requirement, scale and design of an SRFI as set out in paragraphs 4.83 - 4.89 of the NPSNN'. (DL paragraph 18). It is submitted that in the context of the NPSNN, Hinckley National similarly satisfies the criteria for function as an SRFI.</i></p> <p><i>Employee commuting</i></p> <p>AECOM developed the HNRFI employee trips model in 2018 which shows the likely location of HNRFI workers. This forms the main area of impact where employment opportunities are anticipated during the operation of the HNRFI. Further information and details on the model are provided in Appendix 4 to the Transport Assessment.</p> <p><i>Employment</i></p> <p>The assessment anticipates that additionality of operational employment will be in the range of 4,400 – 5,400. The new employees would arrive from a range of locations as identified by the trip generation model provided by AECOM. ES Chapter 7 provides further commentary on how these levels have been determined.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Progress has been made since the close of consultation on the distribution of housing</p>		
--	--	--	--

	following BDCs signing of a Statement of Common Ground with Leicester City to accept a proportion of their unmet housing needs.		
<p>Transport</p> <p>Sapcote and Sharnford Parish Councils are concerned about increased traffic. Longstanding problems at M1 / M69 junction (J21).</p> <p>Usage of rail terminal</p> <p>Firstly, the level of usage of the rail terminal is based on that of existing terminals. Given, the number of competing terminals coming forwards, the level of usage may be lower, increasing the level of road-based usage above the 30-70 split envisaged in the assessment.</p> <p>Rail Capacity</p> <p>The amount of rail traffic may be limited by capacity constraints on the railway system itself.</p> <p>The HNRFI Interim Rail Study does not consider capacity constraints on the route to Felixstowe, which includes traversing critical junctions, for example north and south of Leicester, Peterborough and Ely.</p>	<p>Transport</p> <p>The traffic modelling has now been agreed with the Transport Working Group. A robust assessment forms part of Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Trip generation data is robust and based on worst-case scenarios using data for similar development sites. This approach has been agreed with National Highways and Leicestershire County Council.</p> <p>Further analysis of Junction 21 has been undertaken and forms part of the assessment.</p> <p>Allowing direct access to Junction 2 reduces the need for freight to use local routes. The model used for transport forecasts is controlled by Leicestershire County Council. All future projections of employment and housing has been factored into the model as far as possible, with further allowance for background growth.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (document reference 6.1.8)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (document reference 17.5)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (document reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (document reference 6.1.8)</p>

<p>The HNRFI Interim Rail Study area only looks at the section between Water Orton and Wigston. It notes that Wigston North Junction (Para 4.4.1) is already close to capacity and that some trains entering and leaving the SRFI would create a conflicting movement when crossing the southbound track.</p> <p>Constraints remain during certain periods of the day which may hinder 24-hour operation and lead to bunching of trains</p> <p>While some unused freight paths may exist in the national timetable there is no guarantee that these could be used to serve the SRFI.</p> <p>M69 closure</p> <p>Secondly, we are concerned that the routing of the development traffic assumes the M69 will be the main road used by HGVs. However, the impact on other roads will be much more serious at times when the M69 is not available and this needs to be considered.</p> <p>Concerns about additional traffic and the traffic modelling methodology.</p>	<p>Development traffic through Sapcote village is predicted to be local light vehicles as HGVs will find the route unattractive. Measures have been proposed to discourage HGV routing through the village. This is detailed within Chapter 8 of the ES and within the HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy.</p> <p>Following the comments received a standard assessment has been adopted in the ES in terms of sensitivity of routes through Sapcote.</p> <p>Usage of rail terminal</p> <p>The strong demand for the rail terminal and the market it will serve as well as a terminal operator are set out in the market needs assessment which accompanies the application.</p> <p>Rail Capacity</p> <p>Rail capacity has been reviewed and approved by Network Rail, including assessing rail paths for passenger services and existing freight to reach the conclusion that there is capacity for up to 16 trains per day for HNRFI.</p> <p>For operational reasons within the terminal and signalling, a max of 2 trains per hour from the</p>		<p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>It is also noticeable that neither the transport chapter, nor the chapter dealing with accidents and disasters models the routes that would be taken by HGVs and other development traffic in the event of incidents on the M69 which lead to delays or closure.</p> <p>Taking all these elements into account, the development would amplify the increase in traffic on local roads which are already at capacity and cannot cope. It brings into question the compliance with the NPS requirement to reduce HGV mileage on local roads despite Tritax's assertions that mitigation methods will reduce traffic volumes however these are deemed inadequate with the current mitigation almost certainly encouraging traffic (including HGVs) to route along the B4669 with all the issues described above.</p> <p>The Interim Transport Assessment also includes an assessment of the accessibility of the site to other modes. A map shows bus routes which it considers to be close to the site. In reality the only regular services, the 158 and 48L are services which go to centre of Hinckley. The X6 and X55 are longer distance services with limited stops, however, they are highly infrequent.</p> <p>There are some cycling facilities on the A47, including a dedicated cycle lane, but limited provision to the site. In terms of pedestrians the site would be poorly situated for access and thus discouraging sustainable modes of transport.</p>	<p>east can be serviced and 1 from the west per hour, allowing considerable capacity for other freight and passenger services to run.</p> <p>M69 closure</p> <p>It is not possible to mitigate for single events, such as SRN closures. However, the A47 link road does provide significant relief for highways around Burbage and Aston Flamville should a closure happen. This will enable National Highways and the emergency services to re-route traffic away from sensitive residential areas and on to the key A and B roads in the unfortunate event of a motorway closure.</p> <p>PROWs</p> <p>The network of PROWs through and around the site has been designed to provide an appropriately landscaped route that provides acceptable access to Burbage Common within a reasonably designed environment. Routes within the site are shielded from noise from the M69. These routes also provide pedestrian access to the site. Cycle access and storage is also provided. These aspects have been modified to respond to the points raised.</p> <p>HGV routing</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>The Assessment consider the impacts on the Public Right of Way Network and identifies improvements that it suggests can result from development.</p> <p>However, the impact on the PROW network of the development appears to us to be severe. The network between Hinckley and the motorway, as well as the opportunity to walk on the quiet Burbage Road are curtailed drastically and Pedestrians wishing to access the PROW network on those routes are forced to walk along a newly-constructed link road and through the Industrial Park itself. While some diverted walkways may be provided, they have none of the attractions of the current routes which are through open countryside.</p> <p>Equally, residents of Stoney Stanton, Sapcote and Sharnford would find the PROW links to Burbage Common restricted both in quantity and quality by the development.</p> <p>What is clear is that this development would be highly car dependent and that very significant amounts of new traffic (including large (OGV2) articulated HGVs) would route through local villages, even if the Interim Traffic Assessment is correct. We consider the impacts to be unacceptable.</p>	<p>modelling accounts for normal conditions for the understanding of impacts on infrastructure. Long-term infrastructure design regrettably cannot be put in place for short term issues on the network.</p> <p>Growth has been based on the Uncertainty Log, which accounts for reasonably foreseeable projects and is based on DfT WebTAG guidance. This includes Local Plan allocations and Strategic growth and presents a more nuanced approach than applying fixed growth.</p>		
<p>4. Air Quality, Noise, Vibration</p>	<p>Air Quality, <i>Noise &amp; Vibration</i></p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>The success of mitigation is not something we are convinced about.</p> <p>All the assessments are currently limited in relation to construction traffic, in line with the traffic assessment.</p>	<p>Chapter 9 of the submitted ES includes a detailed air quality assessment as well as further air dispersion modelling that utilises traffic data as agreed with the Transport Working Group.</p> <p>The ES also now includes detailed construction phase road traffic emissions assessment which considers the impact of construction traffic during peak construction on local air quality.</p> <p>Unmitigated construction noise would likely be temporary major adverse for sensitive receptors as a worst-case scenario; however Chapter 10 of the submitted ES identifies a number of measures that can be implemented to mitigate that impact and reduce residual effects.</p> <p>Construction near sensitive receptors would be temporary and an element of screening would naturally occur as the development is built out.</p> <p>A Construction Environmental Management Plan has also been submitted detailing how the construction phase can be managed to minimise impacts as far as reasonably possible.</p> <p>Noise barriers and bunds have been incorporated and amended in light of consultation feedback.</p>	<p>Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document (17.3))</p>
--	--	---



<p>Landscape, Ecology and Heritage</p> <p>a. Visibility</p> <p>We cannot find comprehensive photomontages of the development from the locations identified in the landscape report.</p> <p>It is clear from photomontages at Exhibition that the tree cover will not fully mitigate the presence of the development as the height of the buildings mean they will be above the tree line. A further problem is that the view of the development from both the surrounding roads and rail services, as well as for people enjoying the countryside and recreational amenities in the area, will not be static so that the presence of the buildings coming into and out of view will increase the impact.</p> <p>The impact at night is particularly difficult to assess from the photos provided by the applicant but the change in light pollution could be significant.</p> <p>There is no separate assessment of lighting and a lighting strategy is not currently provided making it difficult for exterior bodies, particularly local residents, to assess its adequacy.</p> <p>The assessment should include the visibility and conspicuousness of the project during construction and of the presence and operation of the project and</p>	<p><i>Visual Impact</i></p> <p>Chapter 11 of the submitted ES considers the visual impact of the proposed development. Photomontages are included at Figures 11.12 and 11.16 (document references 6.11.3.12 and 6.11.3.16)As noted, the height of the buildings is such that tree planting will not be able to completely screen the development from all views but as seen in the Photomontages at Figure 11.16 (document reference 6.11.3.16) tree planting will form an effective screen by Year 15 from Burbage Common and Woods Country Park.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the views experienced from some viewpoints and locations will be experienced as part of a journey. There are too many potential journey options for this to form part of an overall assessment but this should be considered as part of the overall decision- making process.</p> <p>Night Photomontages are provided with the ES at Figure 11.12 (document reference 6.11.3.12)</p> <p>A consideration of night-time effects is included within Chapter 11, based on the Lighting Strategy included as ES Appendix 3.2</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document (17.3)</p> <p>Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (Document 17.6)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy</p>
---	---	----------	--

<p>potential impacts on views and visual amenity. This should include any noise and light pollution effects, including on local amenity, tranquillity and nature conservation yet, in fact, there is very little that is clearly identified and where receptors have a high impact they are often downgraded as being of low significance, including areas of the Country Park. And we particularly note the comment of Burbage Parish Council.</p> <p>The Applicant states ‘no Registered Parks and Gardens lie within the 5km search area’. This clearly shows no consideration of Burbage Common has been made. This is an important asset to the local community and should have specific safeguarding references built into the ES.</p> <p>While we accept this is not a Registered Park or Garden it is clearly important for local residents. And by relying solely on Local Character Area Assessments there is a risk that results are not sufficiently weighted to take account of amenity value.</p> <p>b. Loss of Biodiversity</p> <p>What is clear is that the development will not only have direct impacts on specific sites but that it will substantially change the wider biodiversity landscape. The presence of noise and lighting as well as the barriers created by the development on the site itself as well as new road infrastructure may well impact on biodiversity.</p>	<p>Burbage Common and Woods Country Park is not a Registered Park and Garden and it would not be correct to assess it as such. Those areas that are Common Land have however been assessed as such, as have those areas that are identified as part of the Burbage Common and Woods Country Park.</p> <p><i>BNG</i></p> <p>Chapter 12 of the ES sets out how the mitigation for the habitats and species will be implemented and managed, and includes an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). These detail the methodologies for protection of habitats and species and then their future management respectively.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Net gain strategy has been devised that will ensure that net gains for biodiversity can be delivered, this has focused on providing the gains in close proximity to the site.</p> <p>Where possible the proposals have aimed to reduce biodiversity impacts through the site layout and have looked at the onsite provision to ensure that the biodiversity gains can be maximised onsite. We have also looked at</p>		<p>(Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>It is also worth noting the compartmentalisation of impacts. Clearly in the case of Burbage Woods, for example, there are impacts on landscape, amenity and biodiversity, yet the assessment does not appear to take this into account or allow for the combined impact being greater than each compartmentalised assessment.</p>	<p>providing off-site compensation in the closest area possible to the site in order to provide the gains required in the locality. The full Biodiversity impact Assessment (BIA) sets out all the measures that have been put in place in order to ensure that the BNG requirements are met. The BIA is provided in the ES at Appendix 12.3 and Chapter 12</p> <p>If further measures are required, we will consider other off-site mechanisms, in order to provide the overall BNG compensation package.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment is divided into different topics for the purposes of assessment. The impacts on landscape, amenity, biodiversity and arboriculture are all assessed in relation to Burbage Woods. It is then for the decision maker to consider the overall impact on an area or feature, taking into account the various individual assessments that have been undertaken.</p>		
<p>6. Amenity</p>	<p><i>Amenity</i></p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy</p>

<p>Concerned about the amenity impact of the proposals including the cumulative impact on residents close to the proposals as well as the impact on those wishing to utilise and enjoy the countryside, especially the Burbage Common Country Park and the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge whose importance is identified in Policy 6 of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan.</p> <p>The chapter in the PEIR dealing with socio-economic impacts does not refer to Open Space and Recreation Study 2016 or consider the overall impact on the amenity of that green wedge or the surrounding countryside (currently linked through the PROW network). Para 7.128 briefly refers to the plan designation but does not appear to give it much weight.</p>	<p><i>An assessment of potential views from residential properties has been undertaken and is included in ES Chapter 11.</i></p> <p><i>The effects on visual amenity from Burbage Common and Woods Country Park has been assessed by way of representative viewpoints from within the country park.</i></p> <p><i>The Green Wedge Policy has been considered and the additional recreational land provided is seen to respond to that policy context.</i></p>		<p>(Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
<p>7. Carbon Dioxide</p> <p>The PEIR does not include an overall assessment of the additional CO2 emissions resulting from the development and we consider the current assessment is limited and does not answer that fundamental question.</p> <p>The first and obvious problem is that it excludes significant areas of greenhouse gas emissions, including energy use on site and embedded carbon from the site construction as set out in Table 18.3.</p>	<p><i>CO2</i></p> <p>Chapter 18 of the submitted ES considers the likely significant effects of energy and climate change, including CO2 emissions.</p> <p>The scope of that assessment includes the ‘embodied carbon’ from manufacture of construction materials, construction traffic, and the earthmoving works.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>

<p>The second problem is that the assessment compares the impact of the operational traffic within the study area with the total network traffic in 2036. Not surprisingly the operational traffic forms a small part of the overall traffic on the network within the study area. Much of the traffic in the overall study area exists whether or not this development takes place.</p> <p>There will also be traffic which is both rerouted and generated by the changes to the network implemented to allow development, as considered above. All those impacts need to be considered as part of the carbon balance of the site.</p> <p>Table 18.18 gives a 'do something' difference of 9% in emissions from traffic following development, but Para 18.147 goes on to say that only 7% of the total increase is from development traffic. This is problematic, especially since the model seems to assume increases of traffic result from changes to traffic routing rather than generated traffic. In other words, all the additional emissions result from the decision to build the terminal and related works. The conclusion that there is a less than 1% increase in emissions seems to be comparing apples and pears.</p> <p>Not only that but, in reality, the emissions are likely to be increased further because there would almost certainly be additional generated traffic as the new slips allow different and longer journeys to be made, as well</p>	<p>It also includes the greenhouse gas emissions from operational energy use and the changes in operational transport, both rail and road.</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>as determining where further new development might occur.</p> <p>There is a further issue with the assumptions about rail emissions. Some 221 ktCo2 are directly projected (assuming the rail terminal is used to capacity, called a 'worst-case' scenario). This is then compared with the equivalent road freight and a reduction 32ktCo2 is calculated. This then becomes a 'best-case' scenario in terms of emissions because it assumes all the trains are used and that all the freight on those trains is replacing freight which would have been on the roads. Neither of these assumptions seem likely in reality and certainly are not being guaranteed.</p>			
<p>8. Cumulative Impacts and Future Development</p> <p>As we have already set out, we consider the impact of the proposals will be wider than simply the terminal. The PEIR includes an assessment of cumulative impacts which it bases on the definition on the NPS. Those are listed in Appendix 20.1.</p> <p>However, that assessment has not been undertaken so no concrete evidence is currently presented on the impact of those in-combination effects.</p> <p>Also, importantly that excludes in-combination effects from other junction changes. We are concerned that this</p>	<p>The cumulative effects of traffic are included in the traffic chapter of the ES. Other cumulative effects are considered in chapter 20 of the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 08 - Transport and Traffic (Document Reference 6.1.08, Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

<p>may lead to transport effects in combination which are not considered.</p> <p>HNRFI is effectively providing enabling infrastructure for developments, which could, in effect, constitute a new settlement around the HRNFI. We question whether large-scale housing on either side of the HRNFI would be a sustainable community, what facilities would be provided and what impact this would have on carbon emissions.</p> <p>The enabling of further development on the other side of M69 to the HRNFI would certainly have significant additional impacts on the setting and amenity of the villages of Sapcote and Sharnford, as well as increasing traffic through those settlements.</p>			
<p>Appendix:</p> <p>Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange: Questions</p> <p>2. Do you agree with the principle of transferring freight from road to rail?</p> <p>Yes, but this is a leading question.</p> <p>The scope for transferring freight from road to rail is limited because of its origin and destination. The proportion of freight that would be transferred from road to rail would not be very significant compared with</p>	<p>HNRFI has the potential to save 83 million HGV miles as set out in table 8.30 of ES Chapter 8. The HNRFI is also able to operate as a hub, transferring freight onwards by rail, as well as exporting freight from the region.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Transport and traffic (document reference 6.1.8)</p>

<p>total of road freight that would be generated by the proposed development. Most rail freight is moved by diesel locomotives and there are no plans to electrify freight routes.</p>			
<p>3. Do you agree that the transfer of freight from road to rail has an important part to play in a low-carbon economy and in helping to address climate change?</p> <p>No. This is also a leading question.</p> <p>The amount of carbon saved by switching freight from road to rail would be low and is likely to be outweighed by additional carbon produced by constructing and running the overall terminal including the B8 component. Nearly all assumptions err on the optimistic side, for example by assuming that freight trains will utilise their maximum capacity.</p> <p>The development's commitment to tackling climate change is not demonstrated in the supporting documentation. In particular it does not address the issues related to traffic generation from changes to the road network beyond the development traffic and compares emissions from site traffic with overall traffic levels.</p>	<p>Chapter 18 of the submitted ES considers the likely significant effects of energy and climate change, including CO2 emissions. Its appendices including the Energy Strategy at Appendix 18.1 and Embodied Carbon Report at Appendix 18.2 set out key carbon reduction commitments made. These include commitments to achieving net zero carbon in construction and to reducing emissions in operation such as via substantial solar photovoltaic panel provision.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p>4. Do you think that this is a good location for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange?</p>	<p>Possible sites within Leicestershire were considered and then tested against the required</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>



<p>HNRFI is centrally located between the West Coast Main Line and the East Coast Main Line, on Network Rail's Strategic Freight line connecting Felixstowe and London Gateway to the Midlands and the North.</p> <p>NO.</p> <p>There is no need for a further rail freight terminal in Leicestershire. There are already five others within 36km of the proposed location. The road and rail networks are already at or close to being congested. More developments are already committed and there are little plans to tackle or mitigate the impact of the additional traffic.</p>	<p>criteria appropriate for a SRFI, initially physically, including rail connectivity; and then in the context of the local plans such as the LLEP Strategic Economic Plan.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a Market Needs Assessment report which sets out the market which HNRFI will serve and the operator demand for the facility.</p>		<p>Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1)</p>
<p>5. Do you support the proposals for up to 850,000m<sup>2</sup> of logistics floorspace, railway sidings and a rail terminal on the Felixstowe to Nuneaton railway line to the south west of Elmesthorpe?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>For all the above reasons and because of the more direct impacts on Sapcote and Sharnford residents of additional traffic, loss of local biodiversity and amenity and landscape deterioration. Our extensive objections are set out in the main objection document.</p>	<p>Responses to the specific points are made in the relevant sections above and below.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>6. Do you support our proposed mitigation that is set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Given the type and scale of the development it is hard to see how it could be adequately mitigated. However, if the proposal does go ahead there will be a need to mitigate its impact. We are not convinced that the current mitigation is adequate and would consider this further if the scheme progresses.</p>	<p>The proposed mitigation is either incorporated in the design or set summarised in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC).</p> <p>A suite of management plans have been prepared and are submitted with the application and will be secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Construction Environmental Management Plan Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Site Waste and Materials Management Plan HGV Management Plan and Route Strategy Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan Construction Traffic Management Plan</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (document reference 17.1)</p> <p>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (document reference 17.2)</p> <p>Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (document reference 17.3)</p> <p>HGV Management Plan and Route Strategy (document reference 17.4)</p> <p>Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (document reference 17.5)</p>
---	---	----------	--

			Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 17.6)
<p>7. Do you have any comments on the proposed highway improvements?</p> <p>We do not consider that the proposed improvements alleviate our concerns. They are all geared towards facilitating more traffic.</p> <p>The introduction of south-facing slip roads would lead to increased traffic on unsuitable roads, including routes through Sapcote and Sharnford. It is also likely to facilitate more development and far more traffic in the future, - further to that from the development.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling has now been agreed with the Transport Working Group. A robust assessment forms part of Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Transport and traffic (document reference 6.1.8)</p>

<p>8. Do you support the idea of a lorry park with welfare facilities and HGV fuelling facilities in this location?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>There is no currently need for such a facility in that location. Should development be agreed, despite our objection, some facility may be required and should be a matter for discussion with local residents.</p>	<p>A lorry park is proposed to serve the users of the HNRFI site. There will be further opportunity for Sapcote PC to review and comment on the proposals for the lorry park.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>9. Do you support the proposed landscaping incorporated into HNRFI?</p> <p>Not Sure.</p> <p>While it is impossible to hide such large buildings, other structures or lighting, landscaping would be required to mitigate the impact if permission were granted. The Parish Councils have identified significant impacts of development and we may wish to make further detailed comments on the effectiveness of the mitigation if the scheme progresses.</p>	<p>Further comments on the landscaping scheme and management plans would be well-received.</p> <p>Lighting and landscaping proposals have been advanced since consultation and scheme changes include a reduction in the height of buildings between 2 and 5 metres and the incorporation of additional land for landscaping adjacent to the northern boundary of the railway line.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Document 17.2)</p>
<p>10. Do you have any other comments about the proposals?</p>	<p>Chapter 18 of the submitted ES considers the likely significant effects of energy and climate change, including CO2 emissions.</p> <p>The scope of that assessment includes the 'embodied carbon' from manufacture of</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 - Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>

It has not been demonstrated that the development will contribute to the mitigation of climate change. It is therefore not acceptable.	<p>construction materials, construction traffic, and the earthmoving works.</p> <p>It also includes the greenhouse gas emissions from operational energy use and the changes in operational transport, both rail and road.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Southern Gas Networks		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Southern Gas Networks Plc are not responsible for the gas network in the Leicester to Hinckley area.	No further response required	N	N/A

Consultee: Sport England		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Part of the rail freight interchange and associated highway works proposed would prejudice the use, or lead to the physical loss of use (on either a permanent or temporary basis), of land being used as a playing field at the cricket pitch at Leicester Road Sports Club, Hinckley. Therefore, consultation	The applicant recognises its highways mitigation proposals on the Leicester Road (essentially a new roundabout) do encroach on an area of scrubland within the ownership boundary of the Leicester Road Sports Club, Hinckley.	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)

<p>with Sport England on this application is a statutory requirement.</p> <p>Sport England’s policy is to oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of or would prejudice the use of all/part of a playing field unless one or more of the five exceptions stated in its policy apply.</p> <p>The proposal for the A47 link road, which would cross the railway via a new bridge and connect with the Leicester Road in a new roundabout junction, would appear to include land within/Adjacent to the cricket and football grounds.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposal should identify the Leicester Road sports facilities as a receptor. An assessment should then be undertaken on the impact of the proposal on the playing fields and the users of this receptor. Any impacts identified should be mitigated against in accordance with paragraphs 99 and 187 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Contact has been made with the Club and discussions to acquire the area required for permanent highway works, and temporary compound is progressing, as it is recognised by the club that the area affected by the application has limited or no impact on the sporting activities onsite.</p> <p>The impact of the development on the sports club is addressed within the planning statement.</p>		<p>Planning Statement (document reference 7.1)</p>
---	---	--	--

Consultee: Stoney Stanton Parish Council		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
The overarching concern is the quantum of development proposed and whether it represents overdevelopment.	The proposed development has been appropriately designed in terms of the environment it sits within and this is addressed in detail within the Environmental Statement.		Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1)
<p><b>Location and Need</b></p> <p>There does not appear to be a national requirement for the facility in this specific location.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the evidence base / policy context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No justification for using the Leicestershire boundary as a search area;</li> <li>- Areas of search are not robust and alternative locations do not appear to have been properly considered.</li> <li>- Consideration of where predominant transport movements in the region occur should be given weight in the consideration of location.</li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 4 of the submitted ES sets out the site selection process. Seven sites were identified and studied further based on specific criteria.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states 'The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFI's' (paragraph 2.56). The NPS also states that the number of locations for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope of developers to identify 'viable alternative sites'.</p> <p>The Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended 2022) forecasts a need of 2,570,000sqm of warehouse floorspace by 2041 (para 7.67). This suggests that there is a strong demand for SRFI in Leicestershire in addition to the East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Distribution Centre SRFI schemes.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 – Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)

<p>The M69 is considered to be a secondary highway, with lower traffic movements and of less importance than other motorway movements / routes. The provision of any facility should only be serving a comparatively localised need for the southwestern part of Leicestershire / north eastern part of Warwickshire. If it expands beyond this then potentially detours along half the length of the M69 would be required for HGVs to connect between the rail facility and the final destination of goods. It is questionable if this section of the railway network is the most appropriate location for such a facility and any such HGV miles it would save as many alternative miles would be created.228 Expansion of existing facilities is considered preferable.</p>	<p>The application is accompanied by a market needs assessment which provides further information on the business market which HNRFI will serve. The business market recognises the existence of other SRFIs, which do not prevent the need for HNRFI.</p> <p>Expansion of existing RFIs will not improve the rail connectivity to the area and where expansion is possible, this is underway with existing consents, which have been taken into account. HNRFI fills a gap in the Midland region’s network of terminals; and provides a much needed ready access to the ports for exports and imports as it is directly on Network Rail’s Felixstowe to the Midlands and North Strategic Freight Route.</p>		<p>Market Needs Assessment (Document 16.1)</p>
<p><b>Highways</b></p> <p><i>Highway modelling</i></p> <p>Stoney Stanton request a re-consultation where the highways solution is affected by updated modelling work.</p> <p><i>Exact use and vehicle movements</i></p>	<p><i>Highway modelling</i></p> <p>Modelling work has been on going with the Transport Working Group. Outputs have been run from Summer 2021 for the consultation purposes with sign off from the authorities. The latest model run inputs have now been approved. The new outputs do not significantly differ from the previous runs as they feature the same projected development traffic and infrastructure interventions.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (document reference 6.1.8)</p> <p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp;</p>



<p>Exact use and vehicle movements are unknown and this ambiguity is not appropriate for consultation.</p> <p><i>The link road</i></p> <p>Concern over the layout and impact on new link road and highways safety issues. Accidents or delays on the link road would affect the efficient operation of the proposal.</p> <p><i>Consultation material</i></p> <p>The supporting highways information that has been consulted on differs from the information presented during consultation events.</p> <p><i>HGV routing</i></p> <p>Difficulties in limiting HGV routing through villages and local minor roads.</p> <p><i>Bypass</i></p> <p>Significant impacts on surrounding highways and settlements and the potential need for a new bypass to Sapcote as well as additional bypasses.</p> <p>Existing traffic problems and associated pollutants in villages would be exacerbated by the proposal and new bypass / improved access.</p>	<p><i>Exact use and vehicle movements</i></p> <p>End users will be part of detailed design. Detailed design will have to sit within the approved parameters of the development. Trip generation (vehicle movements) were agreed with the TWG ahead of consultation.</p> <p><i>The link road</i></p> <p>The interface with the A47 link road will be mainly vehicles routing to or from the site externally. The Link Road will be built to up-to-date Standards which maximises safety in terms of visibility, alignment and facilities. In terms of delay, modelling has taken place that tests a worst case in the future design year. This is to understand the likelihood of delay due to road capacity constraints, therefore, the new link road been designed to ensure minimal delay occurs.</p> <p><i>Consultation material</i></p> <p>The presentation boards used at the exhibitions were based on information provided in much greater detail in the PEIR.</p> <p><i>HGV Movements and Restrictive Routing</i></p>		<p>Strategy (document reference 17.5)</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>Existing highways will need to accommodate increased traffic levels as new routes will result in additional traffic rather than mitigate existing traffic.</p> <p>Provision of a bypass needs to be analysed as a minimum.</p> <p><i>Strategic Growth Plan</i></p> <p>The upgrade of motorway junctions is unclear in the context of the Strategic Growth Plan. Any discussions regarding integrated connectivity as set out within the Growth Plan are not evidenced and cannot be ignored.</p> <p><i>Junction capacities</i></p> <p>Motorway junctions and trunk road have capacity issues. The proposal and associated new jobs will require a high level of commute by private car which are likely to use cross country routes regardless of any bypass and in the absence of any improvement to key highways links.</p> <p>No assessment has been made of M69 J3 and M69/M1 nor upgrades proposed which undermines the strategy of directing traffic towards the M69.</p> <p><i>Highways impact</i></p>	<p>A HGV Routing Strategy has been developed to acknowledge and set up a mechanism to limit development generated HGV trips on the local road network.</p> <p>Innovative solutions using enforced ANPR systems ultimately accountable to the Local Highways Authority have been investigated and are being included<sup>230</sup> as part of the strategy.</p> <p>Modelling does not suggest that roads are unable to facilitate demand.</p> <p><i>Bypass</i></p> <p>The delivery of a bypass has been fully considered in the preparation of the proposal, and this is set out in detail in Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>Three options were consulted upon in 2019, and the public feedback was very negative to the Stoney Stanton and Sapcote options. Ahead of the consultation the applicants transport consultants ran three separate scenarios for each of the options through the traffic model.</p> <p>The A47 link had the most significant benefit in terms of removing traffic from the B581 in Stoney Stanton</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>The results of the impact assessment are skewed due to errors. Three junctions are referenced in this respect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Road/Broughton Road/Sapcote Road/Long Street, Stoney Stanton – no mitigation is proposed despite flow changes exceeded the threshold. The impact is unacceptable and an alternative overall highways solution will be required where it cannot be mitigated.</li> <li>- Stanton Lane/Hinckley Road, Stoney Stanton – the high level of harm is assessed as being minor due to it not being near sensitive receptors. Stoney Stanton consider there are identified 231orward231e receptors at this location. The level of harm given underplays the existing situation. Proposed upgrades are welcomed, however this will result in more use and potential harm to safety.</li> <li>- B4669 Hinckley Road, Sapcote (between Stanton Lane and Sharnford Road) – Sensitivity has been downplayed and sensitive receptors are identified and footpaths are substandard with no alternatives (photographs provided). Increasing the231orward231eity to accurately reflect the existing position would</li> </ul>	<p>and providing direct access to the M69 for settlements to the North and West of Hinckley.</p> <p>It is concluded that an Eastern Villages bypass is not necessary as the levels of anticipated traffic do not warrant such measure.</p> <p><i>Strategic Growth Plan</i> The A46 Expressway plans as indicated within Leicestershire’s Strategic Growth Plan has since been downgraded and is no longer being pursued as a strategic link. Regular meetings have been held with the Leicestershire Growth team to discuss strategic issues connected with this and other sites.</p> <p><i>Junction Capacities</i> Further analysis of J21 has been undertaken and results are included within Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p> <p><i>Highways Impact</i> Alternative solutions at the junction of New Road / Broughton Road / Sapcote Road / Long Street have been considered. The signalling of this junction is the only potentially viable solution.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>result increase the magnitude of change to major impact. Substantial works are therefore required.</p> <p><i>HGV miles</i></p> <p>Number of HGV miles removed is extensively inconsistent between the Applicant material and the Highways Report and in any case is over-emphasised and misleading.</p>	<p>Impacts at Stanton Lane / Hinckley Road have been assessed and included as part of Chapter 8 of the ES.</p> <p>The impacts on the B4669 (between Stanton Lane and Sharnford Road) and associated sensitive reports have been revisited as part of the submitted ES. The HGV Routing Strategy and Plan will assist to reduce impacts within Stoney Stanton.</p> <p>HNRI has the potential to save 83 million HGV miles per year, this is set out in table 8.30 of ES Chapter 8.</p>		
<p><b>Ecology</b></p> <p>The ecology work undertaken is considered to be a ‘tick-box’ activity that doesn’t consider the full impact.</p> <p>The loss of the site is considerable. Presence of hedgerows, foraging grasslands, watercourses are known for bat and bird breeding and foraging. The loss of hedgerow and absence of further mitigation would result in a district level negative effect.</p> <p>Significant impact to both bats (protected) and birds (red and amber listed).</p>	<p><i>Ecology</i></p> <p>Full ecological considerations, assessments and necessary mitigation is set out within Chapter 12 of the submitted ES.</p> <p>The results of the surveys have been considered rigorously and used to inform mitigation strategies.</p> <p><i>Great crested newts and badgers</i></p> <p>No Great Crested Newts have been recorded within the site that would be lost as part of the development.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>

<p><i>Great crested newts and badgers</i></p> <p>Concerns regarding impacts on Great crested newts and badgers.</p> <p>New vehicle movements will increase risk of harm to protected badgers, along with harm to SSSI and LWS. The planting proposed to the new A47 link road will draw animals closer to the highway.</p> <p>Impact of lighting on breeding and feeding patterns is noted and considered difficult to mitigate.</p> <p>The assessed impact on habitats and wildlife is considered to be underplayed. The mitigation proposed does not replace the same quantum or higher quality of that which will be removed. Planting and meadows of higher quality that connect with the LWS/SSSI are welcomed, but there is a reduction in the scale of habitat proposed.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Impact Assessment does not assess 'rivers' which is a shortfall given the water bodies removed/altered/replaced.</p> <p>Extensive quantum of shortfall of land required to mitigate habitat loss is considered to have a significant negative impact on ecology, biodiversity</p>	<p>The ES, the Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan and the Landscape and Landscape Ecological Management Plan identify the specific mitigation measures that will be implemented and managed. These detail the methods for protection of habitats and species and the future management.</p> <p>The lighting strategy ensures lighting impacts are minimised and ensures light spill into dark areas of retained habitat is kept below 1 lux to ensure there are dark corridors around the site.</p> <p>Additional land has been provided to increase the biodiversity provided on site and options are being explored to ensure offsite creation is as close to the site as possible.</p> <p>River units were not included within the original BIA assessment as this was a more recent element of the Metric that had not been included previously. A Water Framework Directive Assessment had been carried out and has been provided to the Environment Agency (EA) who have confirmed that no further assessment is required in this regard. We have since completed the</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 – Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 – Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document (17.3)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 – Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>and protected species. Biodiversity gain should be provided on site.</p>	<p>River assessment as part of the BIA which is provided in the ES at Appendix 12.3 to Chapter 12.</p>		
<p><b>Drainage / Flood Risk</b></p> <p><i>Flood risk</i></p> <p><i>The indicative scheme design seeks to provide all the new buildings outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3, providing just the rail interchange within these higher zones. Whilst protection of the proposed buildings through their positioning outside of the flood zone is welcomed, it is surprising that the critical infrastructure considered of national importance is still incorporated within the flood zone.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of the flooding of the site in question, there is photographic evidence of the site being flooded in recent years on multiple occasions. The proposal should fully consider the reasoning behind this flooding and the implications it would have upon any proposed scheme, including the drainage solution so that there are not potentially catastrophic issues elsewhere as a result.</i></p> <p><i>Drainage</i></p>	<p><i>Flood risk</i></p> <p>To better understand the potential flood risk, a hydraulic model of the local watercourses was developed in consultation with Leicestershire LLFA and the EA. The model identified that the existing rail line is raised above flood levels and is at a low risk of flooding from the local watercourses. Similarly, the connection to the railway line from the Main HNRFI Site would also be raised above flood levels to also be a low flood risk. Detail of the assessment is provided in the FRA (document reference 6.2.14.1).</p> <p>The flooding within the Main HNRFI Site is a product of runoff from within the Main HNRFI site itself and its inability to drain into the ground or into the downstream watercourses quickly enough. To address this on-site risk, new surface water drainage infrastructure is proposed which would store storm water falling on the Proposed Development. Further detail is provided in the SDS (document reference 6.2.14.2).</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 – Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)</p>

<p><i>In terms of the design of the drainage scheme, there are three fundamental elements that need to be given careful additional consideration.</i></p> <p><i>The first relates to culverting of the existing unnamed stream to run along the edge of the M69. This culvert will be set above the level of the M69 and thus its design, capacity and maintenance programme needs to be robustly designed in order to prevent flooding of the motorway at a future date.</i></p> <p><i>The second major concern is the ability to store the surface water so that it can be discharged at an appropriate rate.</i></p> <p><i>Reflecting the high water table, ground level changes and water storage capacity concerns, the provision of the flood water ponds on the northern part of the site by the higher flood zone area represents the third concern.</i></p>	<p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>The realigned watercourse would flow along a corridor that would be designed to contain the necessary flood flows; this would include an allowance for future climate change. Any necessary culverts would also be designed to convey the necessary flood flows. To ensure the long-term performance of the watercourse and culverts, operational and maintenance procedures would be prepared to set out routine inspection, maintenance, and remedial actions in line with land owner riparian responsibilities.</p> <p>The shallow groundwater on the Main HNRFI Site is a product of impeded drainage conditions brought about by the cohesive underlying geology. The cohesive geology means that there is not a significant groundwater reservoir or flow pathway that could be negatively impacted by the Proposed Development. Where the shallow groundwater is encountered during construction, it can be safely addressed through localised dewatering.</p> <p>The LLFA and the EA have reviewed the FRA (document reference 6.2.14.1), the proposed mitigation measures, and the drainage strategy and have not raised any concerns.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Consultee: The Coal Authority		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
The Coal Authority has no specific comments / observations to make on this project.	No further response required	N	N/A

Consultee: UK Health Security Agency		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) welcomes the opportunity to comment on your proposals and Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) at this stage of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). Please note that we request views from the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) and the response provided is sent on behalf of both UKHSA and OHID.</p> <p>Please note that we have replied to earlier consultations as listed below and this response</p>	<p>The UKHSA's and OHID comments are acknowledged. As detailed in the PEIR, each of the individual technical disciplines has considered the most sensitive receptors pertinent to what is being assessed. This includes all residential properties, communities (including residents at the traveller site), amenities, facilities and schools. A precautionary assessment has been applied in each context to ensure any disproportionate risk is accounted for, and that sensitive/vulnerable communities and any protected characteristics within them have been appropriately considered.</p>	N	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Appendix 7.1 (Health and Equality Briefing Note 6.2.7.1)</p>



<p>should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence.</p> <p>All developments will have some effect on the determinants of health, which in turn will influence the health and wellbeing of the general population, vulnerable groups and individual people.</p> <p>We have assessed the submitted documentation and wish to make the following comments:</p> <p><b>Environmental Public Health</b></p> <p>We note that with the Rochdale Envelope approach, fuller design (including energy centre including Combined Heat and Power plant and Photovoltaics) and mitigation details (including within the CEMP) will be provided in later stages when design is approaching finalisation.</p> <p>We have considered the submitted documentation and can confirm that we are satisfied with the approach taken in preparing the PEIR.</p> <p><b>Human Health and Wellbeing</b></p> <p>OHID has focused its approach on determinants of health and wellbeing under four themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access</li> <li>• Traffic and Transport</li> </ul>	<p>Furthermore, to as part of the final DCO application, a Health and Equality Briefing Note has been prepared and submitted. The document draws together the technical disciplines and expands upon their conclusions to put risk into a health context.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socioeconomic</li> <li>• Land Use</li> </ul> <p><b>Vulnerable populations and health inequality</b> The impacts on health and wellbeing and health inequalities of the scheme may have particular effect on vulnerable or disadvantaged populations. The PEIR does not identify any especially vulnerable groups within the consultation.</p> <p>It is noted that a traveller’s site is positioned immediately adjacent to the site entrance and will require additional noise mitigation. This community is not identified as a vulnerable community, which may affect the level of assigned sensitivity.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The ES should review the level of sensitivity and assessments of any impacts on the traveller site in recognition of being a vulnerable population.</p>			
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Ullesthorpe Parish Council		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Inadequate traffic information	<i>Traffic Data</i>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 –

<p>More suitable alternative sites should be explored</p>	<p>Since consultation, the traffic generation figures have been agreed with the Transport Working Group and assess the surrounding infrastructure on a worst-case basis.</p> <p>A full review for the model for Leicestershire has been carried out and includes an uncertainty log for all sites that were reasonably foreseeable. Major strategic sites have been considered with estimated build out projections to provide an accurate estimation of concurrent development.</p> <p>This is presented within Chapter 8 of the submitted ES.</p> <p><i>Site Selection</i></p> <p>Chapter 4 of the ES sets out the site selection process. The submitted Market Assessment also describes the rail-freight markets that the proposal will serve.</p>		<p>Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 – Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (Document 16.1)</p>
---	--	--	---

Consultee: WCC Highways		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p>It is noted within the documents that updated PRTM modelling is to be carried out and that additional assessments may be required for the WCC and SRN networks, as that information has not been provided it is not possible to advise as to the acceptability or not of the proposals in so much as they could impact. It is also noted that specific details for HGV routeing (construction and operational phases) has not been provided for the WCC network and further information would be required to assess any potential impacts and mitigation as necessary.</p>	<p>The modelling has been an ongoing and iterative process of refinement along with the Transport Working Group. This is to best represent the existing and forecast scenarios. We used outputs from a model run from summer 2021 for the consultation ahead of full sign-off from the authorities. We have since achieved this and the latest model run inputs have been approved. The new outputs do not differ significantly from the previous runs as they feature the same projected development traffic and infrastructure interventions.</p> <p>A HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy has been submitted with the application to manage HGV routing and would be secured by a DCO requirement.</p>	Y	HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (document reference 17.4)
<p>Reference is made to availability of rail path freight capacity. Should the anticipated rail freight capacity not be available and the development proceed, what would be the resultant impact of additional road traffic on the local and strategic networks? Details/clarification should also be provided in regard to any impacts on rail passenger capacity.</p>	<p>Discussions and negotiations have taken place with Network Rail throughout the process. They have undertaken a detailed analysis of train path availability. This is closely controlled by them, and it is highly unlikely that allocated train paths would be removed. Network Rail have upgraded the line to allow for additional freight and passenger services. The assumption is that there will</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

	<p>be more passenger services in the future, as proposed by Midland Connect. Rail capacity has been reviewed and approved by Network Rail, including assessing rail paths for passenger services and existing freight. HNRFI would not adversely affect passenger services.</p>		
<p>The only junctions identified close to the WCC network for assessment in the modelling presented are Cross in Hands roundabout (junction 48) and Gibbet Hill roundabout (junction 47). Notwithstanding that other junctions may be identified –</p>	<p>As agreed with WCC as part of the TWG, outputs from the PRTM have been supplied from the latest model run. This has been in a pre-agreed format to enable input and checking of impacts on the WCC network interface using their own suite of strategic models.</p>	N	N/A
<p>Further clarification is required over the assessments carried out for the A5 Gibbet Hill junction and the A5 Longshoot/Dodwells junctions. It is understood that National Highways are currently evaluating a future improvement scheme for Gibbet Hill that is not yet in the public domain, and the Interim Transport Assessment shows that LINSig assessments have been carried out – for what scheme? The model used for the A5 Longshoot Dodwells junctions as WCC is in discussion with National Highways over the VISSIM model.</p>	<p>Gibbet Hill assessments have been based on the information contained within the planning application for the extensions to Magna Park. This includes amendments at Gibbet Hill. VISSIM information has been seen in relation to the junction but has not been deployed directly due to the additional extents of this model and requisite validation information not being available. The Dodwells/Longshoot junction has been removed from the latest iteration of the PRTM model and latest outputs do not suggest significant enough impacts for a full VISSIM run to be carried out.</p> <p>Full zoomable plots of traffic flow changes and VoC requirements are being provided as part of the next phase of the delivery. As discussed at length within the monthly TWG sessions.</p>	N	N/A

The reduction in modelled flows on the A47 Dodwells Road and the B4114 Coventry Road approaching the A5 (Table 8.67 of chapter 8 PEIR) is noted, but information should be provided on the changes in flows on the A5 and potentially other routes to understand the traffic routeing. Cross-ref this to the request for 'difference' plots.	Noted, change in flow difference plots have been provided to the TWG (including WCC) with zoomable PDFs	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
Further clarification is required over the information presented in the Forecasting Report figures 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 and forecast VoC ratios. Whilst the Area of Influence derived generally appears reasonable, it should be extended to include the A5 west of Atherstone to M42 jct 10 and south-east of Magna Park to DIRFT and the M1. Both of these areas of the network have a significant amount of allocated/committed development and the performance of the network and impacts of the development should be considered.	Latest modelling outputs do extend to areas identified within the WCC network and Uncertainty Logs/ Infrastructure Logs have been discussed at length and signed off by the TWG.	N	N/A
Whilst traffic impacts are yet to be assessed using WCC models, it does not appear that commercial sites such as Magna Park and DIRFT have been identified as sensitive receptors – when others have? Given the comment at Table 8.1 4.2.7 why have these not been considered/included?	WCC models are being used to understand specific impacts on their network. We have worked closely with their modelling consultants and officers to develop the methodology. Sensitivity of transport impacts relate primarily to vulnerable road users. However, driver based	N	N/A

	delay, which is of key interest to commercial sites is incorporated within the modelling and mitigation. .		
Chapter 8 of the PEIR (para 8.266) refers to the potential for a mechanism to check for high sided vehicles leaving the site, and the use of ANPR monitoring, and such measures would be beneficial in association with the proposal. However what consideration has been given to those similar vehicles travelling to the site from the wider network? Reference should be made to other HGV Management Strategies previously agreed with WCC (eg, SW Rugby, Redditch Eastern Gateway)	The HGV routing strategy has since been updated and references innovations developed with WCC at Redditch. Specifically ANPR technologies and recording/reporting. This looks more widely and covers sites within Warwickshire.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
The ‘permitted’ HGV routes are noted (chapter 8 of PEIR para 8.268), however given the levels of congestion on the routes to the M1 and M6 these routes will not be the only ones used by HGVs. There are likely to be vehicles travelling ‘East’ that will continue on the A5 via Gibbet Hill onto the M1 or via the A426 and the M6, as shown in Figure 3.2 in the Forecasting Report (July 2021), and there are likely to be occasions when HGVs use satnavs and follow inappropriate routes through villages (as previously advised) to avoid queues and congestion. WCC will require this to be considered and where necessary modelled/assessed, and measures proposed to mitigate impacts where necessary. Similarly for vehicles travelling to the ‘North West’, given the	HGV routing measures have been further developed using precedents from the WCC network, including Redditch ANPR.	N	HGV Route Management Plan & Strategy (Document 17.5)  Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

<p>congestion at times for the M6/M69 interchange and M6 itself, the impacts of vehicles travelling along the A5 (either from M69 jct 1 or A47 Dodwells Rd) will need to be modelled and reported.</p>			
<p>The provision of a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be a key document, and WCC would expect such traffic to be using, and where necessary directed to use, major routes designed to cope with such traffic.</p>	<p>The CTMP has been developed with the nominated contractor team to identify key routes within the wider network used for construction traffic.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy (Document 17.5)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>It is noted (PEIR chapter 8 para 8.238) that the proposed access infrastructure (link road and slip roads) would provide an alternative diversion route should the A5 between Dodwells and the M69 be closed e.g. due to a rail bridge strike. However, clarification is requested if the design of the access infrastructure has taken this into consideration, or has the link/junction design been based on the level of capacity forecast for the development proposal?</p>	<p>Please note link design and junctions are based on robust estimates of both background and development traffic operating under normal conditions. This is a standard approach to infrastructure design- emergency routing would place extra pressure on any network and capacity should not be based on such scenarios.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>



<p>Potential measures for sustainable travel are detailed in the various documents, however without some certainty over the provision/delivery of pedestrian and cycle and public transport infrastructure, then the targets for sustainable travel will be less certain to be achieved. More detail should be provided as to what infrastructure will be provided in order to connect to the existing networks and facilitate a choice of modes for staff travel.</p>	<p>Sustainable and public transport provision has been considered in detail to connect to the existing networks. Discussions with public transport providers has been very useful and services have been discussed for further provision.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment includes Appendix 15 – Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan which gives further information on the topic of sustainable travel.</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p>Further consideration should be given to the public transport proposals. Diversion of services or new services to connect the site with the local area should be investigated. The potential for bus services to be operated and timed to connect with rail services at Hinckley rail station could be beneficial.</p>	<p>A revised Sustainable Transport Strategy has been produced, which provides details of bus and rail connectivity including engagement with Demand Responsive Transport operators, Vectare and enhancement of the X6 bus service.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Appendix 8.1 (part 15 of 16) Sustainable Transport Strategy (document reference 6.1.8.1)</p>

<p>WCC would recommend that as part of the Travel Plan that a Transport Review Group should be considered. This would assist with providing regular updates, monitoring and allow issues to be raised. WCC are happy to engage further on this matter.</p>	<p>Full commitment to developing the travel plan will take place with the on-site management team. Occupier specific travel plans will be required and secured by a DCO Requirement.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>ES Appendix 8.2 - Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (Document 6.2.8.2)</p>
--	--	----------	---

<p><b>Consultee: WCC LLFA</b></p>		<p><b>Date of Consultee Response:</b></p>	
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Regard to response</b></p>	<p><b>Scheme change</b></p>	<p><b>Relevant Document Reference</b></p>
<p>It is noted that only a small part of the proposals are located in Warwickshire; this being the supporting highway works to the A4303/A5 roundabout. According to the Design and Access Statement, those works are minor highway widening works.</p> <p>We have been engaged in the flood risk review of the proposals with BWB Consulting, Environment Agency and Leicestershire LLFA for some time. Although the details in the submission are limited, we are satisfied that there is unlikely to be any significant impact on flood risk from surface water, groundwater, or ordinary watercourses. We do, however, make the following comment regarding the need for any Land Drainage Consent should this be relevant to the aforementioned highway widening works.</p>	<p>No Further Response Required.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Design and Access Statement (Document 8.1)</p>

<p>In accordance with Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, prior written Land Drainage Consent must be obtained from Warwickshire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority for any works within an Ordinary Watercourse within Warwickshire. This is likely to include, but not limited to, any proposed drainage outfalls, culverts or other temporary or permanent obstructions and the diversion or stopping up of the Ordinary Watercourse. Further information is available at <a href="http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/watercourse">www.warwickshire.gov.uk/watercourse</a>.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<b>Consultee: Western Power Distribution</b>		<b>Date of Consultee Response:</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Regard to response</b>	<b>Scheme change</b>	<b>Relevant Document Reference</b>
<p>There is existing electricity network on the site which will need to be diverted. If you aren't already in contact with our Hinckley Office, please contact them to discuss.</p>	<p>We note the comments regarding the presence of existing WPD assets within the proposed Redline Boundary and the requirement to engage with the local Hinckley Office. We have previously obtained diversion and connection quotations on this scheme and have made due allowance within our proposals to accommodate the WPD requirements.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	The necessary protective provisions have been included within the draft of the Development Consent Order (DCO).		
--	---	--	--

Consultee: Wolvey PC		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
Any proposals should take into account the road infrastructure and the parish council requests that a condition be included which restricts vehicle movements to motorways and A roads only. This would restrict travelling along B roads, minor roads and through villages which are not considered suitable for heavy vehicles.	We do not have the power to restrict access to public roads. However, we do have HGV routing plans in place which are designed to ensure all HGV traffic is encouraged to use the motorway or A roads as far as possible for their journeys to and from the site. The regime for enforcement is to be agreed with the respective highway authorities .	N	HGV Route Management Plan & Strategy (Document 17.5)
Any upgrades to the M69 junction be made prior to the commencement of any works in order that the two slip roads at the top end of the M69 are in place for use by construction vehicles.	The Junction 2 slip roads and the A47 link road are both to be constructed in the earliest phases of the programme to permit optimum access for construction vehicles from the strategic road network.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 – Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

			Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 17.7)
--	--	--	--

Consultee: Woodland Trust		Date of Consultee Response:	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<p><b>Deterioration of Ancient Woodland</b> The Trust holds concerns regarding this proposal on the grounds of potential deterioration and detrimental impact to Freeholt Wood (grid ref: SP4604494086), an Ancient Semi Natural Woodland designated on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI). Our main concerns relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragmentation of the ancient woodland from adjacent semi-natural habitats.</li> <li>• Noise, light and dust pollution.</li> <li>• Adverse hydrological impacts.</li> <li>• Cumulative effect of the above impacts resulting in long-term deterioration.</li> </ul>	<p>RESPONSE: The Environmental Statement (ES) includes the additional information with regards to protection of the ancient woodlands and the SSSI. The landscape strategy is being designed to provide buffer habitat to the areas of ancient woodland and the SSSI. These areas will be planted sympathetically to enhance the edge structure of the ancient woodlands with areas of wetland habitat, woodland planting areas of ecotone (woodland edge transition) habitat and trees to provide greater connectivity to natural habitats.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Further details are included within the CEMP, that forms part of the ES submission. It sets out the</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>

<p>When land use is significantly intensified such as in this situation, woodland plant and animal populations are exposed to environmental impacts from the outside of a woodland.</p> <p>Natural England and Forestry Commission have identified impacts of development on ancient woodland within their standing advice. This guidance should be considered Government's position with regards to development impacting ancient woodland, although Natural England and Forestry Commission should still be consulted for specific comment on this proposal.</p> <p><b>Air Quality Impacts</b></p> <p>Furthermore, the Trust has concerns regarding potential nitrogen deposition on ancient woodlands surrounding the proposed scheme. Chapter 9 (Air Quality) of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report outlines a likely greater than 1% increase towards the critical load of Martinshaw Wood AW and Ashton Firs SSSI (9.120).</p> <p>We are of the opinion that development must be able to demonstrate that any resulting increase in the levels of nitrogen will be insignificant (&lt;1% of the critical load) at all ancient woodland sites. The scheme may need to be amended to include</p>	<p>mitigation measures put in place to ensure that noise, light and dust deposition during the construction phase will not adversely affect the areas of ancient woodland. The Noise Chapter 10 of the ES sets out the noise mitigation measures that will be implemented as part of the proposals for the operational phase and these are discussed further within the Ecology Chapter 12 of the ES with regards to the areas of ancient woodland and protected species. A Lighting Strategy has also been submitted as part of the ES process that will look at the operational impacts of lighting within the development as well as the potential construction lighting impacts.</p> <p>RESPONSE: There are no areas of the new road network that come within close proximity to the canopy edge of the areas of ancient woodland or other areas of the woodland adjacent to the site that could result in safety issues for the road network.</p> <p>RESPONSE: The Environmental Statement (ES) includes a full assessment of the hydrological impacts of the development within the ES Chapter 14. A detailed SuDS scheme is proposed that will ensure that the introduction harmful pollutants/ contaminants is mitigated and controlled.</p> <p>RESPONSE: An assessment of critical loads is provided within ES Chapter 9 Air Quality.</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 – Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 – Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 – Surface water and flood risk</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>further control measures or other proposals in order to attempt to reduce the process contribution to &lt;1%. Please see the Woodland Trust’s Technical Advice Note2 on ammonia impacts for further information.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>Mitigation is required to reduce edge effects. See Annex for full details:</p> <p><b>Buffer zones</b></p> <p>Buffering ancient woodland can be an ideal mitigation. Whilst we note that a buffer zone of 25 metres has been afforded to Freeholt Wood, given the scale of the proposals we are of the opinion that a larger buffer zone of at least 50 metres should be provided.</p> <p>The buffer should be part-planted before construction commences on site. HERAS fencing fitted with acoustic and dust screening measures should also be put in place during construction to ensure that the buffer zone does not suffer from encroachment of construction vehicles/stockpiles, and to limit the effects of other indirect impacts.</p> <p>This is backed up by Natural England and Forestry Commission’s standing advice which states that</p>	<p>RESPONSE: The proposals ensure that a buffer of at least 50m is provided for most of the areas of ancient woodland and woodland within the SSSI. There is one pinch point area to the north of Freeholt Wood, where there will be engineering works up to the 25m offset, but the distance to the hard surface of the road has been kept at the 35m offset. All works are well outside the root protection zone for the ancient woodland. In this location it is proposed that during construction protective fencing will be provided with dust and acoustic screening to limit impact from dust and noise and to ensure that there is no encroachment towards the woodland. It is also proposed to provide a soft edge to the woodland in this location to provide an ecotone from the woodland with trees and shrubs planted adjacent to the woodland boundary before the areas of meadow grassland that will provide further screening and protection. The engineered bank down to the road will also be with native shrubs to again add further screening and buffering from the road.</p> <p>RESPONSE: A full Arboricultural survey has been carried out of the site and the findings have informed the design process. The Environmental Statement (ES) includes a full Arboricultural impact assessment which details the findings of the survey and the impact assessment and</p>		<p>(Document 6.1.14)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 17.7)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils and Contamination (Document 6.1.16)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 – Cumulative</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>“the proposal should have a buffer zone of at least 15 metres from the boundary of the woodland to avoid root damage. Where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, the proposal is likely to need a larger buffer zone.</p> <p><b>Veteran Trees</b> It is important that an Arboricultural impact assessment is undertaken ahead of the Development Consent Order application process.</p> <p>It is essential that no ancient or veteran trees are lost as part of the proposals.</p> <p>Any ancient or veteran trees within influence of the scheme should be afforded a root protection area (RPA) in line with Natural England and Forestry Commission’s standing advice.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat, once lost it is gone forever. Any development resulting in loss or deterioration of ancient woodland must consider all possible measures to ensure avoidance of adverse impact.</p> <p>The Trust objects to this proposal on the basis of indirect impacts to ancient woodland. The applicant should seek to ensure appropriate</p>	<p>will provide a robust mitigation package to ensure that impacts are mitigated or compensated where required.</p>		<p>and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 – Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>
---	---	--	---



<p>buffer zones of at least 50 metres are implemented between the development and the adjacent ancient woodlands.</p> <p>Where appropriate mitigation is not achievable then the proposal should not be taken forward. This proposal contravenes national planning policy designed to protect ancient woodland and should be re-considered, unless the applicant is able to demonstrate that deterioration will be avoided.</p>			
<p>Attention drawn to Natural England's standing advice for Ancient Woodland.</p> <p><b>Ms</b></p>	<p>Natural England's standing advice has been followed in the parameters plan proposals, illustrative masterplan and illustrative landscape strategy.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Landscape (Document 6.1.11)</p>

Consultee: Blaby District Council		Date of Consultee Response: 08/04/2022	
Response	Regard to response	Scheme change	Relevant Document Reference
<b>Approach to Response</b>			
<p>The response has been prepared to respond on a chapter-by-chapter basis, with references to paragraphs, tables and figures provided where possible to offer clarity. Each section has been graded in terms of the level of impact in a positive and negative manner in accordance with the five-point scale system set out in the PINS Advice Note 1 where views need to be provided. This is outlined below:</p> <p>Five Point Scale: Strongly Negative, Negative, Neutral, Positive Strongly</p>	Noted	N	N/A
<p>These comments seek to collate and coordinate the range of technical internal consultation responses that the Council has received and identify the most substantial elements of those technical responses. However, the S42 Response must be read alongside those comments which are included at Appendix 1: Internal Consultation Responses, which form part of</p>	<p>As advised by BDC the responses below identify the substantial elements of the internal technical responses. The complete responses attached as Appendix 1 of BDC's response has been fully considered in terms of the responses set out below.</p>	N	N/A

our formal S42 consultation response, and should also be carefully considered by TS(H) Ltd.			
<b>Overall Summary</b>			
Blaby District Council have a number of negative and strongly negative concerns in respect of the proposal.	Noted		N/A
<b>Operation of the development</b>			
<p>The layout would not allow for many of the units to be rail connected or for this to take place in the future.</p> <p>The insufficient proposed rail connections results in conflict with Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project requirements (Section 26 of the Planning Act 2008).</p>	<p>The parameters plan allows for development in zones D, E and B3 to accommodate rail connected units. These 3 zones have the ability to accommodate up to 355,629sq m of warehouse space which is circa 55% of the total ground floor floorspace having the ability to be rail connected. The balance of floorspace can be 'rail served' i.e. containers could be moved to and from the Terminal using HGV or Tugmaster vehicles over the relatively short distances involved.</p> <p>The most recent DCO for a SRFI for West Midlands Interchange allowed for development in zones A1 and A2 to be rail connected which was 20% of the proposed floorspace, the balance of floorspace would be rail served. (WMI recommendation report 5.6.24)</p> <p><i>The Parameters Plan demonstrates that Zones D1, D2, E1, E2 and B3 have the ability to be 'rail connected', meaning a warehouse with its own dedicated rail siding or which is sufficiently close to the rail terminal to allow containers to be moved from the rail wagons</i></p>	N	

	<p><i>into the warehouse by overhead cranes or reach stackers without the need for them to be loaded onto a HGV or Tugmaster vehicle. (Examining Authority's Report on Findings and Conclusions West Midlands RFI. Paragraph 1.1.4)</i></p> <p>The Examining Authority for West Midlands Interchange commented on the benefit of the remainder of the scheme being 'rail served'</p> <p><i>'As explained by the Applicant in response to my questions at ISH5, the balance of the floorspace, in Zones A3 to A7, would be rail-served as containers could be moved to and from the Terminal using HGV or Tugmaster vehicles over the relatively short distances involved. This would involve additional loading and unloading operations, but this is standard practice at SRFIs and does not negate the cost benefits to warehouse occupiers of co-location with the Rail Terminal. The use of Tugmasters is a viable proposition as no more than 1km of the journey would be on public highway and the operator could, therefore, benefit from the cost savings that these could provide'.</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State agreed with the Examining Authority that the proposal at WMI <i>'meets the criteria for function, transport links, locational requirement, scale and design of an SRFI as set out in paragraphs 4.83 - 4.89 of the NPSNN.'</i> (DL paragraph 18). It is submitted that in the context of the NPSNN, Hinckley National similarly satisfies the criteria for functioning as an SRFI.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Quantum of development			
The proposal would result in the overdevelopment of the site leading to drainage, biodiversity, landscape, and public highway concerns.	Issues raised here are addressed in the sections below.	N	N/A
Incomplete Information			
The proposal is supported by insufficient supporting documentation with respect to highways modelling, impacts from increased Narborough level crossing barrier down time, archaeological significance, highway noise, gantry crane noise generation, technical energy assessment, ground water monitoring, inadequate tranquillity assessment, lighting assessment, health impact assessment and construction impact assessment.	These matters are addressed under the relevant chapter headings below.	N	N/A
Inaccurate Information			
	Transport impacts are-as established practice-	N	N/A

<p>There are several inconsistencies between application documentation. These inconsistencies raise concerns about conclusions drawn regarding impacts arising from the scheme. This includes incomplete highways modelling and mitigation proposals with significant potential knock-on effects mitigation measures and other technical areas such as air quality and noise.</p>	<p>calculated on floorspace rather than employee numbers and the transport modelling has been done on a worst-case scenario basis in terms of trip generation. Trip generation has been agreed with the Transport Working Group. The appropriate transport data has been used to inform the air quality and noise modelling.</p> <p>Other matters raised in this general comment are addressed under the relevant chapter headings below.</p>		
<p>Blaby District Council cannot currently support the proposal due to the highway modelling not being signed off.</p> <p>Further public and statutory consultation should be undertaken prior to submitting the application to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>The Further modelling approach has been agreed with the Transport Working Group and completed since the submission of the PEIR. The data used was required by other disciplines well in advance of the assessment, therefore the PEIR chapters were completed at that moment in time with the previous iteration of the model. On assessment of the new model flows, the outputs do not differ significantly from those presented as part of the PEIR. In addition, the consultation responses do not raise any matter that indicate a further public consultation should be carried out.</p>	Y	N/A
<p>The technical response on a chapter-by-chapter basis in terms of the proposals' impact is summarized below against the five point scale: Chapter Topic Area Development Impact</p>	Noted	N	N/A

<p>1 Introduction N/A  2 Site Description N/A  3 Project Description Negative  4 Selection and Evolution Negative  5 Policy and Need Negative  6 EIA Methodology Neutral  5 Policy and Need  7 Land Use and Social-Economic Strongly Negative  8 Transport Strongly Negative  9 Air Quality Strongly Negative  10 Noise and Vibration Strongly Negative  11 Landscape and Visual Effects Strongly Negative  12 Ecology Strongly Negative  13 Cultural Heritage Negative  14 Surface Water and Flood Risk Negative  15 Hydrogeology Neutral  16 Geology, Soils and Contamination Neutral  17 Materials and Waste Neutral  18 Energy and Climate Change Strongly Negative  19 Accidents and Disasters Neutral  20 Cumulative and In-Combination Effects Neutral  21 Conclusions Negative</p>			
<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction</b>			
Supportive of the parameters approach to the development to provide flexibility to market demands.	Noted, these are responded to in the relevant sections.	N	N/A

Chapter 2 – Site Description			
The 2020 Blaby District Landscape and Settlement Character Appraisal has superseded the 2008 Blaby District Character Assessment referred to within the ES.	Noted, this has been updated in chapter 2 of the ES	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 2 – Site Description (Document 6.1.2)
Chapter 3 – Project Description			
Evidence should be provided of the deliverability of the energy generating capacity of the development.	The deliverability of the energy generating capacity of the development is set out in ES appendix 18.1 Energy Strategy and is referenced at ES Chapter 3 Project Description and ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Project Description (Document 6.1.3)  Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (document reference (6.1.18))



			Appendix 18.1 Energy Strategy (document reference 6.2.18.1)
A gas-fired heat and power plant would not comply with government renewable energy policy direction.	The CHP plant will be capable of operating on decarbonised gas and will decarbonise at the same rate as the grid. It will only operate as a backup facility, anticipated to be approximately 10% of the time.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)
Unclear where the rail cargo for the facility would come from.  Capacity issues would result in a greater number of train movements during night-time hours. This needs to be reflected in the noise assessment.	The capacity study is based on 16 trains 32 movements per day, 10 trains 20 movements east to Felixstowe, London Gateway and East Coast Ports / ECML served terminals and 6 trains 12 movements west to Liverpool, Manchester and Scotland, Wales and SW terminals.  The capacity study has been undertaken by WSP and validated independently by Network Rail. At full capacity the train movements would be spread throughout the day, with a max of 2 trains per hour east through Narborough. There is no night-time skew. Fewer freight trains will run during the commuter peaks.	N	ES Appendix 3.1 - Rail Operations Report (Document 6.2.3.1)
<b>Para 3.36</b>			

<p>Adequate HGV parking should be provided</p> <p>Consideration should be given to meeting the regional need for overnight HGV parking not associated with the proposed development.</p>	<p>The scheme is being designed with adequate HGV parking within each development plot to cater for its needs. The lorry parking area would be for use of HGVs using the HNRFI site, it would not be open to non HNRFI vehicles.</p> <p>Noted, the lorry park will have a secure access and only accessible to HNRFI users and clearly identified as such.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 - Project description (Document 6.1.3)</p>
<p>The lorry park should be delivered prior to first use of the warehouse or the rail freight terminal.</p>	<p>It is worth noting the significant lorry parking capacity within each individual development plot to serve the needs of each occupier. Welfare facilities specifically for drivers will be provided at the buildings and on each side of cross docked buildings, this is industry standard.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Significant concern over lorry-hauling containers for collection and off- site delivery. This could be controlled via a legal agreement securing a cap.</p> <p>The radius for onward movements from the proposed facility would be too great and would not serve a local/regional need. A requirement or legal agreement on a lower maximum onward journey distance for off-site collection could be included.</p>	<p>This is to be a commercial regional facility for the benefit of the estate and the sub regional businesses. Restricting access to rail via a cap would be counterproductive and contrary to the NPSNN policy which supports modal shift from road to rail.</p> <p>The expectation is that the majority of onward movements would be within a 30-45km radius of the terminal. Some loads may be taken further but this is likely to be exceptional. Other terminals would be used for these loads. The market will drive the efficiency, businesses will seek to fulfil their logistics requirements in the most cost effective, time efficient</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	and increasingly green way, hence why the NPSNN supports a network of SRFIs to drive efficiency. A requirement controlling onward journey distance would be unnecessary, unenforceable, and unreasonable.		
<b>Chapter 4 – Selection and Evolution</b>			
Site options 1-3 do not comply with Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20 (March 2014) and Leicester and Leicestershire Authorities Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (April 2021) policies.	Possible sites within Leicestershire were considered and then tested against the required criteria appropriate for a SRFI, initially physically, including rail connectivity; and then in the context of the local plans such as the LLEP Strategic Economic Plan. The purpose of considering alternative sites is to see if there are better alternative locations. It is correct to say Options 1-3 are not better or indeed feasible alternatives under this assessment.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)
<b>Paras 4.32 - 4.41 Map 4.4</b>  Full options for access in relation to the Syston Fosse Way Junction Site were not considered.	This area referenced to the north of the A607 and west of the A46 was the very first site considered in Spring 2015, but insufficient land holdings could be secured to form a viable site for a scheme. The site would then have had to have been tested against alternatives site options and would not have accorded with the LEP plans referenced above. As such HNRFI would still be the better location. As this site was not capable of being taken forward a full study was	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)

	undertaken which identified HNRFI and the other assessed site options.		
Question whether all alternative sites have been explored.	The assessment of alternative sites is considered to be robust.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)
The ability to increase the number of rail-connected units through provision of a central rail port is not considered to have been fully considered. This could be addressed by alternative design.	<p>East Midlands Gateway is not designed with the terminal in the centre of the scheme and no buildings were or are ever capable of being directly rail connected. The provision of a rail port within the centre of HNRFI was considered in detail. The central location requires a semi-circular chord for rail access which provided additional constraints. This meant that individual buildings could not be directly rail served because the curves would be too tight. The site is not level, but level plateaux are being created.</p> <p>As set out above approximately 55% of the buildings can be rail connected with the balance being rail served.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (Document 6.1.4)
These paragraphs consider the potential Bypass Options A and B to the eastern villages. The proposal would have significant transport impacts upon the villages of Stoney Stanton and Sapcote.	The need for an eastern villages bypass has been reviewed in light of the modelling data, much of the new traffic is diverted from existing routes and local villages. The modelling demonstrates that the	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution

<p>The proposals should clearly explain the status of the Leicester and Leicestershire 2050: Our Vision for Growth (2018) and how it relates to the proposals.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the potential relationship of the rail freight to residential development proposals being promoted through the emerging Blaby District Local Plan.</p>	<p>volumes are not high enough to justify a full bypass.</p> <p>Midlands Connect published their Stage One A46 Corridor Study in November 2018. This set out to establish a set of specific transport objectives for the A46 including specifically for the Leicester Area. A Stage Two Study to include a clear strategy and investment plan for the Leicester area was due to be published in September 2019 but this was delayed until September 2020. The results determined that funding would not be sought for the A46 expressway due to cost and the fact that it would not relieve congestion as initially hoped.</p> <p>Instead, focus is now being placed on upgrading junctions at either end of the A46 Western bypass at the M1 and the Hobby Horse roundabout at Syston. The ES will clearly explain the status of the Leicester and Leicestershire 2050: Our Vision for Growth (2018) and how it relates to the proposals</p> <p>The nearby large scale housing sites (Land west of Stoney Stanton and Land North of the Railway, Elmesthorpe) proposed under the Blaby Local Plan Review Options document have been added to the cumulative effects assessment long-list. This process will be set out in the cumulative effects chapter of the ES.</p>		<p>(Document 6.1.4)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
---	--	--	---

Chapter 5 – Policy and Need			
<p>The impact of the proposals should be assessed against planning policy throughout the document.</p> <p>The proposal needs to clearly demonstrate how it relates to other nearby interchanges and does not oversaturate the market.</p>	<p>Noted - the intention is that each chapter will set out which policy is relevant, but the planning statement will undertake the policy analysis and balancing exercise.</p> <p>The HNRFI will serve its own market as described in the Market Needs Assessment. The market served by other SRFI's is also set out in the Market Needs Assessment. The NPS supports an expanded network of t of large SRFIs across the regions to accommodate the long-term growth in rail freight.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)</p> <p>Planning Statement (Document 7.1)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (Document Reference 16.1)</p>
<p>Insufficient assessment of the impacts upon footpaths, cycleways and bridleways connecting to Burbage Common.</p>	<p>Refer to the PRow Strategy and Transport Assessment for reference to connections beyond the SSSI.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2</p>

			Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)  Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)
<b>Para 5.79</b>  Concern over noise generation adversely impacting ecology at Burbage Common.	The chapter has been updated accordingly.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need (Document 6.1.5)
<b>Para 5.100</b>  NPPF section 8: Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities is excluded from the list and paragraph summaries.	The chapter has been updated accordingly.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - Policy and need

			(Document 6.1.5)
<b>Chapter 6 – EIA Methodology</b>			
No comment – approach appears to accord with legislation	Noted	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 6 – EIA Methodology (Document 6.1.6)
<b>Chapter 7 – Land use and Socio-Economic Effects</b>			
Further consideration should be given to addressing cumulative impacts from the proposal across a temporal range.	Temporal scope is considered in the cumulative effects. These are also reported separately for the construction and operation stage. Assessment of cumulative impacts is clearly set out in the ES.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)  Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document



			Reference 6.1.20)
<p>Aston Firs is not categorised as a community asset.</p> <p>Agriculture within the development site ('Development Land') and 'Businesses in the study area' should be disaggregated. The impact upon these two uses are fundamentally different and should not be conjoined.</p> <p>The impact upon walkers, cyclists and horse-riders will be greater than concluded due to routes across the site being removed.</p> <p>Disagree with the 'Medium' categorisation for the impact upon walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.</p>	<p>Noted that Aston Firs is not publicly accessible and its classification as community land will be removed.</p> <p>The Agricultural Land Holdings and Farm Shop are considered separately in Table 7.3 Receptor Sensitivity.</p> <p>'Medium' refers to the receptor sensitivity rather than the impact.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)
<p>Chapter constructed on a basis of pre-coronavirus baseline. Activity patterns and work life has changed since this time and this dated baseline information needs to be updated.</p>	<p>This statement and baseline information has been updated to better reflect the current baseline. The areas of the baseline that have been updated include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Size of the Labour Market (Annual Population Survey (APS), 2021). APS 2021 was released 12 April 2022.</li> <li>- Construction Employment (Census, 2021). (If available)</li> <li>- Logistics Sector Employment (Census, 2021). (If available)</li> <li>- Occupations in the Logistics Sector (APS,</li> </ul>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)

	<p>2021)  - Wages (Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2021)  - Health Profile (Public Health England, 2021)</p> <p>Homeworking is not considered within the assessment and data on homeworking will not be provided.</p>		
<p>The development must ensure the provision and implementation of a work and skills programme during the construction and operational phases of the development.</p>	<p>A Local Employment Skills &amp; Training Plan will be developed assuming grant of the DCO.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement  Chapter 7 -  Land use and socio-economic effects  (Document 6.1.7)</p>
<p>Error in information provided. The Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan has been formally adopted.</p>	<p>The paragraph has been updated.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement  Chapter 7 -  Land use and socio-economic effects  (Document 6.1.7)</p>
	<p>Midlands Connect published their Stage One</p>		<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>When referencing the Leicester and Leicestershire 2050: Our Vision for Growth, and the connectivity to the surrounding infrastructure networks, no reference is made to the proposed distributor road. This link road is important in terms of how it affects access to the site/area and thus potential draw of employees/companies and the benefits/harms to the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposals should clearly explain the status of the Leicester and Leicestershire 2050: Our Vision for Growth (2018) and how it relates to the proposals.</p>	<p>A46 Corridor Study in November 2018. This set out to establish a set of specific transport objectives for the A46 including specifically for the Leicester Area. A Stage Two Study to include a clear strategy and investment plan for the Leicester area was due to be published in September 2019 but this was delayed until September 2020. The results determined that funding would not be sought for the A46 expressway due to cost and the fact that it would not relieve congestion as initially hoped.</p> <p>The ES chapter clearly explains the status of the Leicester and Leicestershire 2050: Our Vision for Growth (2018) and how it relates to the proposals.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p>
<p>A plan of the study area should be included as part of the surrounding study area section.</p>	<p>Defined in Figure 7.4</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p>
<p>The health impact assessment has not appropriately considered all relevant factors.</p>	<p>The chapter follows the LA 112 Population and Human Health guidance to undertake the assessment of health impacts. Further clarity</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and</p>

	on the approach is provided in Chapter 7 of the ES.		socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)
The average turnover per construction employee in the East Midlands should be calculated over a longer period. Additionally, the area from which construction workers are likely to travel from to the site should be increased.	Noted - Approach to be updated in line with suggestion	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)
Post pandemic statistics need to be incorporated in terms of employment levels within the construction sector.	Baseline information has been updated to better reflect the current baseline.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)
	Transport impacts are calculated on floorspace rather than employee numbers and the transport modelling has been done on a worst-case scenario basis in terms of trip	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and

<p>Two density levels for employees are given which has implications for conclusions drawn in other technical documents.</p>	<p>generation. Trip generation has been agreed with the Transport Working Group. The appropriate transport data has been used to inform the air quality and noise modelling. In terms of job creation, the lower figure is referenced to avoid over promising on job creation.</p>		<p>socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p>
<p>The Business Rate information stated is incorrect.</p>	<p>Noted - Information and analysis has been updated accordingly.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p>
<p>No detailed lighting scheme has been undertaken.</p>	<p>The summaries set out for the transport, noise and air chapters were representative of the relevant chapters based on the modelling and survey work undertaken in support of the PEIR.</p> <p>The commentary in the table referring to the lighting scheme does not state that a detailed lighting scheme has been undertaken, but states that 'the detailed lighting strategy is anticipated to be ready for submission with the ES'. In the absence of a detailed lighting strategy, Table 7.13 instead refers to a</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy</p>

	<p>proposed lighting strategy which will comply with the relevant policy and guidance and sets out the main principles which would inform the lighting strategy, no site specific conclusions are set out in the table.</p> <p>A Lighting Strategy has been completed and submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>		(Document 6.2.3.2)
<p>The scheme does not increase the connectivity of the PRoW network It is noted that the development has the ‘potential’ to increase the connectivity of the Public Rights of Way (PRoW). However, the scheme does not show this at present. A number of traversing PRoWs and crossing points to the railway are being removed, and only a single new route provided. This reduces the connectivity, whilst the new route proposed is very much marginalised to the edge of the complex, offering an unattractive and indirect route for users. It is squeezed in adjacent to the M69, which has potential health issues from noise and air quality and make the routes less attractive to use which do not appear to have been considered. The acceptability of this route to horse riders also appears to have been ignored.</p> <p>The proposed new PRoW across the railway may not be suitable for horse riders due to noise and light sources along the route. .</p>	<p>This element was reviewed for both setting and additional connectivity throughout the park. A number of level crossings over the railway will be removed and diverted to bridges following consultation with Network Rail and a new route within a landscaped setting to the north of the railway line is proposed which maintains and links to the existing access points.</p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>

<p>The proposed PRoW route to the southern side of the site is not direct or particularly attractive for users.</p> <p>The PRoWs need further consideration to provide a truly functional and attractive route that is not marginalised.</p>			
<p>Impact upon the noise and air quality of the new PRoW does not appear to have been considered</p>	<p>We have not explicitly included the new PRoW through the site as a receptor as this is not relevant for the annual mean or short-term air quality objectives as presence on the PRoW is transient and not at any fixed location for any length of time. There are suitable proxy receptors such as Aston Firs which are next to the motorway. No significant impacts were identified here and pollutant concentrations are below the relevant air quality objectives so we can conclude that pollutant concentrations on the PRoW will be acceptable.</p> <p>We have placed a grid over the site for the ES to illustrate pollutant concentrations with the development in operation and this will cover the PRoW and also any staff amenity areas. This demonstrates that the site is below the relevant air quality objectives. A detailed analysis is provided in the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Noise and Vibration</p>

	Noise on the re-routed PRoWs has been considered within the Noise and Vibration ES Chapter.		
<p>Health outcomes only considered noise and air quality. It provides no assessment of the quality of the environment and the impact visual setting makes to health.</p> <p>The proposed new PRoW would not replicate the user experience of the current PRoW due to location between M69 and railway line. This route would not be suitable for horse riders.</p> <p>The proposal will have more than a minor adverse impact upon local residents.</p>	<p>The ES chapters on air quality, noise and vibration, flood risk, hydrogeology and contamination assess the potential impact of the construction and operational phases of the development on human health receptors. The Inspectorate stated in the Scoping Opinion December 2020 that they were satisfied with the proposed approach.</p> <p>The final DCO application includes a concise Health and Equality Briefing Note where the document draws together each of the overlapping technical disciplines (including air quality, noise and transport as highlighted in the comment as well as visual impact), and where appropriate, expands upon the conclusions to help put risk into a health context and respond to residual health concerns and opportunities.</p> <p>The routing of a new / realigned PRoW through the site has been considered in iterations of the masterplan. Given the layout of the scheme is not fixed, a single route</p>	Ysk	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils and Contamination (Document 6.1.16)</p>



	<p>through the park is difficult to define at this stage. Also due to the potential for a high number of vehicular crossings that could be encountered, it is considered that re-routing to the perimeter of the park was a better, safer solution, which allowed for a considered environment that wouldn't need to be adjusted as the park developed. PRoWs have been designed into the scheme to ensure minimal change to existing routes. Where this isn't possible, new routes have been designed considering the optimal safety of non-motorised users.</p> <p>The noise impact on PRoWs which form part of the proposals have been addressed in the final ES.</p>		
<p><b>Para 7.216</b></p> <p>The proposal would have only a moderate long-term impact regarding employment generation.</p> <p>Additional jobs would be within the logistics sector which generally only offers lower paid positions.</p>	<p>Trends on types of jobs are provided and factored in the assessment. We have clarified the justification of our assessment on this basis.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)</p>

Chapter 8 – Transport			
<p>The PEIR consultation has been undertaken prior to the completion of discussions/modelling of the highway work with Leicestershire County Council.</p>	<p>The Further modelling approach has been agreed and completed since the submission of the PEIR. The data used was required by other disciplines well in advance of the assessment, therefore the PEIR chapters were completed at that moment in time with the previous iteration of the model. On assessment of the new model flows, the outputs do not differ significantly from those presented as part of the PEIR.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) identified a need to consider the impact of freight trains on the Narborough level crossing. This remains unaddressed.</p> <p>Narborough level crossing will have the barriers down for a longer period when additional (and longer) trains are passing through for freight purposes associated with the HNRFI and other freight interchanges. This has not been assessed fully.</p> <p>Impacts associated with increased level crossing barrier downtimes should be considered. These include air quality, noise pollution, health, connectivity and character and appearance of the Narborough Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Network Rail has undertaken a comprehensive review of Narborough level crossing, the output of which has been provided to the Transport Working Group. The HNRFI movements at a max of 2 trains per hour outside the peak (and less or none within) add 5 mins downtime added to the existing down time is still well below the level NR would intervene in a town centre location. The review highlighted that the issues around Narborough relates to local highway issues which restricting rail movements would not change. This is outside the scope of HNRFI. Narborough crossing has been factored into the latest model run with the requisite barrier downtimes and delay, provided by Network</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

	Rail. It should be noted that the delay and congestion within Narborough is an existing problem. Additional train paths during the peak hours are limited to one additional in the PM peak only. HNRFI is therefore not impacting significantly above the baseline.		
<p>Errors in calculating the sensitivity of locations as facilities have been missed – for example:</p> <p>The inclusion of a primary school footpath connecting onto Stanton Lane/Hinckley Road, Stoney Stanton; and the presence of an open space/equipped playground with direct access, children’s nursery and substandard footpath widths on B4669 Hinckley Road, Sapcote (between Stanton Lane and Sharnford Road).</p> <p>This has under-valued the traffic flow sensitive receptors and thus the apparent harm to these road sections/the community.</p> <p>Renewed consideration should be given to the inclusion of a bypass due to traffic impacts upon Stoney Stanton and Sapcote.</p>	<p>Additional review of the sensitive receptor locations has been carried out for the ES. However, Primary schools were picked up within the PEIR.</p> <p>The bypass has been reviewed, much of the new traffic is diverted from existing routes and local villages. The volumes are not high enough to justify a full bypass. The presence of the A47 link on the western side of the M69 also helps to shift traffic away from the B581 and routes through Stoney Stanton.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
Insufficient information has been provided to allow consultees and the public to understand the impacts arising	The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CEMP) provides a detailed process of construction traffic management- this will		

<p>from construction traffic. It also means as a knock-on effect, no accurate assessment is provided for noise or air quality.</p>	<p>exclude sensitive routes as far as possible. The construction of the M69 slips and the A47 link road in the opening phases of construction will mean that latter phases will use the SRN or significant A roads to route to the site. Quantitative assessments of the effects on noise and air quality have been undertaken and show negligible effects.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p>
<p>Post-construction of the slip roads is noted in the PEIR as resulting in construction traffic being ‘focused’ on the strategic road network. This assertion will need to be adequately managed to ensure construction traffic does not affect the local community for 10 – 15 years.</p>	<p>Noted and as above, this will be managed through the CEMP.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p>
<p>It is questioned whether the accuracy of the baseline data for trip generation in the operational phase is accurate, particularly in relation to employee numbers.</p> <p>Assessment works based on it being a reliant car dependent scheme. The Council fully endorses this approach. Consideration should however be given to ensuring alternative transport access is incorporated into the proposal.</p>	<p>Trip rates have been fully agreed with the TWG, these are independent to projected employee numbers and are based on Gross Floor area and comparisons with similar schemes. A worst case for traffic has been used.</p>	<p>N</p>	

<p>It is believed that the highways information does not take account of the recent approval to extend the life of Croft quarry (2019/CM/0125/LCC) relating to the excavation of 6.3 million tonnes of aggregate over a 12 – 22-year period.</p>	<p>In terms of the PRTM forecasting process, all planning data as documented in the uncertainty log including Croft Quarry and the smaller sites are included in the forecasting process. NTEM trip rates are used in the PRTM forecasting process, and as set out in the proposal, unconstrained planning data are used (but in the event that the planning data lead to below NTEM/ TEMPro growth, the model reverts to NTEM/ TEMPro as minimum).</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>Electric car/lorry charging facilities could be secured via condition.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and</p>

			Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)
<p>The re-routing of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways would reduce the number of routes available across the site and would result in those that are retained becoming unattractive.</p> <p>Provision of a central PRoW should be considered.</p>	<p>The routing of a new / realigned PRoW through the site has been considered in iterations of the masterplan. Given the layout of the scheme is not fixed, a single route through the park is difficult to define at this stage. Also due to the potential for a high number of vehicular crossings that could be encountered, it was felt that rerouting to the perimeter of the park was a better, safer solution, which allowed for a considered environment that wouldn't need to be adjusted as the park developed. PRoW have been designed into the scheme to ensure minimal change to existing routes. Where this isn't possible, new routes have been designed considering the optimal safety of non-motorised users.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>
<p>Further transport modelling should be undertaken to assess impacts upon junctions 1 and 2 of the M69, as well as at both ends of the road.</p>	<p>Noted and this has been done with the revised model outputs, full micro-simulation models are being produced for Junction 1 and 2 of the M69 and appropriate impact analysis at J21 M1.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

Further consideration should be given to off-site highways improvements along the M69 to overcome any constraints on lorry movements.	No improvements along the M69 other than the access infrastructure comprising the new slip roads and signage are proposed, this is based on the highway modelling work which has not demonstrated a need for any further works on the M69.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
The amenity of non-motorised road users will be significantly eroded due to changes to landscape character.	These receptors have been considered in the ES.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)  Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Land use and socio-economic effects (Document 6.1.7)
The site is not an 'edge of town' location but a rural one.	The site sits at the edge of Hinckley urban area.	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 -

<p>Users of the proposed PRoW will not feel safe due to the characteristics of the surroundings.</p>	<p>The new bridleway/cycleway provides a wide and segregated route away from industrial roads and units.</p>		<p>Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>Different figures for HGV mileage savings have been provided across the documentation provided. No evidence as to the robustness of these figures has been provided.</p>	<p>Noted; this has been reviewed with other disciplines for the ES</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Appendix 8.2: Travel Plan</b></p> <p>Provision of bus routes to the site is important, but it should seek to serve the main population areas where employees are expected to be drawn from. In this respect, connection with Hinckley Railway Station and creation of an intermodal system needs thorough consideration. Private bus transfers could also be offered along with discounted train fares</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the provision of an additional passenger station to serve the development, existing surrounding settlements and proposed future developments in the broad area.</p> <p>Public transport to the site needs careful consideration given the 24/7 nature and shift working pattern of staff.</p>	<p>Noted on bus provision and cycle hire; this has been reviewed for the ES.</p> <p>Elmesthorpe station is too close to Hinckley to be operationally or economically viable for passenger rail services, regardless of the presence of HNRFI. Short distances between stations reduce line speed and thus overall capacity, particularly for faster through passenger services such as Coventry – Leicester.</p> <p>Discussions with public transport operators are taking place to deliver a public transport solution tailored to shift patterns. Arriva have set out a strategy for upgrading the X6 service and a commuted sum towards this will be</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p> <p>S.106 Planning Obligation Head of Terms (document reference 10.1)</p>



<p>The travel plan does not do enough to encourage non-car borne journeys.</p>	<p>secured through the Section 106 Agreement. A demand responsive transit solution is also being explored and would be secured by agreement between the operator and the applicant.</p>		
<b>Chapter 9 Air Quality</b>			
<p><b>Overall Summary</b></p> <p>The baseline transport movement figures need to be finalised, so all assessments within this report need to be updated once this has occurred.</p> <p>The document incorrectly assumes that train arrivals/departures are spread out across the whole day.</p> <p>Timetabling slots will result in clustering of trains which may affect the air quality outcomes.</p> <p>Additional assessment is needed to provide a robust Air Quality position, including consideration of the construction phase, energy plant centre and impact upon the re-routed PRowWs.</p>	<p>Updated air dispersion modelling has been undertaken and presented in the ES. This utilises the updated traffic data as agreed with the Transport Working Group. Train clustering cannot occur as there can be no more than three train movements on/off HNRFI in one hour. Of these no more than two can be in any one direction. This assumption reflects both timetabling and the logistics of terminal operations.</p> <p>The timetabling of trains will not alter the location of the rail interchange within the site nor the location of sensitive existing receptors relative to the interchange and therefore this will not alter the conclusions of the qualitative rail emissions assessment presented in the PEIR.</p> <p>The points relating to air quality are discussed in the ES chapter supporting the DCO application. Construction phase road traffic movements and emissions associated with any on site energy generating plant are considered in the ES chapter now that traffic</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>

	data and plant information has been provided.		
<p><b>Absence from chapter</b></p> <p>No consideration of the air quality on the HNRFI appears to have been undertaken.</p>	<p>The HNRFI does not propose any sensitive uses within the Order Limits in accordance with the current UK Air Quality Strategy air quality objectives. However, for completeness we have included consideration of pollutant concentrations across the Site and compare these to the relevant short term air quality objectives to advise with regard to the suitability of the Site for the proposed uses.</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p>
<p><b>Para 9.15 and 9.143</b></p> <p>Construction phase traffic emissions have not yet been assessed.</p>	<p>The construction phase road traffic emissions assessment was not undertaken in the PEIR as details with regard to the number of traffic movements associated with the construction phase, and routing of construction traffic was not available at the time of assessment. This assessment has been undertaken in the ES.</p>	N	N/A
<p><b>Para 9.32</b></p> <p>The assessment of energy plan emissions has not yet been undertaken.</p>	<p>Energy plant emissions information was not available at the time of writing of the PEIR. This element has been assessed in the ES where data are available for use in the assessment.</p>	N	N/A

<p><b>Para 9.78 – 9.80</b></p> <p>Air Quality Management Area 6: Mill Hill, Enderby appears to have been omitted from the consideration list.</p>	<p>Air Quality Management Area 6 Mill Hill Enderby was not identified as part of the affected road network as the change in road traffic movements in this area was below the criteria set out in IAQM and EPUK guidance. Monitoring undertaken within the AQMA recorded concentrations below the annual mean nitrogen dioxide objective in recent years, for which the AQMA was declared. Other AQMAs within the study area were assessed where the IAQM and EPUK guidance screening criteria were exceeded, and the proposed development was identified to have a negligible impact in these AQMAs.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Para 9.120; Table 9.30</b></p> <p>Identified significant increases expected to levels of NOx to Martinshaw Wood AW, Aston Firs SSSI and Narborough Bog SSSI.</p>	<p>The results of the assessment were passed to the Project Ecologist for review. The significance of any changes is not determined by the Project Air Quality Consultant. The Project Ecologist concluded that the impacts were not significant.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p>
<p><b>Paras 9.126 – 9.128 and 9.148; Table 9.26</b></p> <p>Train movements will not occur at one per hour and instead the clustering of train movements will occur. The baseline</p>	<p>Discussion with regard to rail movements has been provided within the ES in accordance</p>		<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>assumptions should be updated to reflect this, particularly in relation to assessing particulate concentrations.</p> <p>The uplift in rail movements as a result of the proposal should be properly assessed.</p> <p>The impact of increased rail movements and increased level crossing barrier downtime should be assessed in relation to relevant residential properties.</p>	<p>with Defra guidance, as agreed with BDC Environmental Health during consultation.</p> <p>Train clustering cannot occur as there can be no more than three train movements on/off HNRFI in one hour. Of these no more than two can be in any one direction. This assumption reflects both timetabling and the logistics of terminal operations.</p>		<p>Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.9)</p>
<p><b>Table 9.28</b></p> <p>No burning of waste material should occur.</p> <p>Mitigation requirements should be subject to monitoring, and this should form part of a legal agreement.</p>	<p>The wording provided in table 9.28 of the PEIR was taken directly from IAQM guidance. Mitigation measures specific to the site in terms of air quality management are being secured through a construction environmental management plan (CEMP).</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document reference 17.1)</p>
<p><b>Paras 9.142 and 9.144</b></p> <p>A financial contribution towards air quality monitoring equipment should be provided for the surrounding communities/sensitive locations.</p>	<p>Discussions with regard to monitoring are ongoing.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>s106</p>
<p><b>Additional comment</b></p>	<p>No sources of odour were identified within the development proposals and no existing</p>	<p>N</p>	

<p>An odour assessment is required.</p>	<p>sources of odour were identified in the vicinity of the site that may influence amenity for future users of the site. Odour was not raised by BDC Environmental Health during preparation for Stage 2 consultation nor throughout the consultation events or meetings subsequently held with BDC.</p>		
<b>Chapter 10 Noise</b>			
<p><b>Overall summary</b></p> <p>Insufficient noise attenuation is provided regarding residential properties near the site.</p> <p>The layout and design of the site may be able to be redesigned to better address these sensitive noise receptors.</p> <p>Concerns raised over the impact of the proposed road to the Aston Firs traveller site. Provision of a 6-metre-high acoustic fence may not be appropriate.</p> <p>Baseline assumptions are based on incorrect information on train timetabling and potential vehicular movements. As such noise and vibration impacts are likely to be greater than stated.</p> <p>Impacts from the on-site energy centre are not known.</p>	<p>Please see detailed responses below</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>

<p><b>Paras 10.47 – 10.54</b></p> <p>Visual impact should be considered within the Tranquillity Assessment.</p>	<p>This has been covered within the final ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
---	---	----------	---

<p><b>Table 10.14</b></p> <p>No consideration has been given to the noise levels of the new noise sensitive receptors being created through the rerouted PRoW. These noise levels are not likely to create an attractive environment for future users.</p> <p>Noise impacts should be assessed in relation to increased train movements beyond the site.</p> <p>Noise impacts from increase level crossing barrier downtime should also be assessed.</p>	<p>These points have been addressed where relevant within the final ES, which considers potential rail noise in detail.</p> <p>It is understood that the additional trains using the line are not dependant on the HNRFI being brought forward and the capacity and running of the trains is managed by third parties. Therefore, the noise and vibration impacts from additional trains and stationary traffic as a result of the barrier downtime at Narborough is not a consideration of this assessment. .</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>
<p><b>Paras 1085 – 10.97; Tables 10.22 – 10.23</b></p> <p>The noise impacts arising from the proposed construction plant should be considered. This should be based upon the plant that will be used on site.</p> <p>No impacts from the proposed earthworks should be considered, including attenuation measures where required.</p>	<p>This has been covered within the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration</p>

			(Document 6.1.10)
<p><b>Para 10.137</b></p> <p>Reconfiguration of the site layout should be considered in order to reduce high noise generating events arising from container placement.</p> <p>Careful consideration will need to be given to noise excesses at night due to proposed rail movements.</p>	<p>It is worth noting that the masterplan is illustrative at this outline stage and is an example of only one way the scheme could be delivered. In line with the requirements of EIA, the parameters have been assessed, and with the proposed mitigation in place, it is considered that noise associated with the proposed development is unlikely to result in unacceptable impacts at nearby receptors.</p> <p>A central location for container storage which utilises the proposed buildings as sound barriers would not be feasible as a central location for the railport was previously considered however a central location requires a semicircular chord for rail access which provided additional constraints. This would mean that individual buildings could not be directly rail served because the curves would be too tight. In addition, the railport will come forward in an early stage of the construction programme to meet the requirements of the national policy statement therefore it would potentially not have the benefit of being surrounded by buildings for several years hence the noise mitigation measures as proposed would offer the best mitigation from day one.</p>	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)



	In terms of night-time train movements, an assumption has been made within the assessment that movements will be spread evenly during the daytime and night-time periods.		
<p><b>Paras 10.170 – 10.181</b></p> <p>Unacceptable impact upon NSR14 identified, with high noise levels and a change in excess of 5 dB as a result of traffic noise. The text suggests that as the dwelling is not on the roundabout the impact will be less and therefore is acceptable. It would appear however that in order to reach this conclusion, more modelling/noise level collection is required.</p>	Additional baseline noise monitoring will be undertaken adjacent to the M69 in the vicinity of NSR14 and NSR15 to better characterise the existing noise environment. The results will be used to further inform the assessment. These are detailed within the final ES.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)
<p><b>Paras 10.185 – 10.189; Table 10.48</b></p> <p>This table identifies noise level exceedances at NSR 1, 15, 19, 20, 21 and 22 from the A47 link road. These would all have permanent moderate to major adverse impacts from this highway without mitigation. Further consultation is required.</p>	The results of the additional monitoring and updated assessment is presented in the final ES.	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)

<p><b>Paras 10.190 – 10.205; Table 10.49</b></p> <p>The Tranquillity Assessment should include hours beyond the daytime due to the nature of users.</p> <p>Noise impacts must be assessed based on the closest receptor in relation to Burbage Common, Freeholt Wood and Aston Firs.</p> <p>High noise levels may impact upon fauna which in turn will change the appearance and experience of those using the area.</p> <p>Concerns are raised that the proposal would have unacceptable noise impacts on Aston Firs and that the noise figures stated are an underrepresentation of the likely levels.</p> <p>The need for an acoustic barrier on the railway bridge between the site and Burbage Common/Freeholt Wood, highlights that there is a relationship issue. The elevated nature of much of the road section between the railway line and the B4668 to the west where it crosses the floodplain raises concern as to whether this acoustic fence needs to be significantly extended in order to provide an acceptable relationship.</p>	<p>The daytime period refers to the hours between 07:00 and 23:00 and therefore includes both the morning and evening periods. In accordance with BS8233:2014 and WHO guidelines, outdoor amenity is protected for this period, with set criterion to be achieved. However, no reference is made within these documents to the night-time period. The following was proposed during consultation with the Environmental Health Department at Blaby District Council at the outset of the project; ‘Although various approaches have been put forward in the past to determine the impact of a development on tranquillity, there is no industry standard approach. Therefore, we propose to develop a methodology drawing on multiple sources such as local open space policies, BS8233:2014, WHO Guidelines (1999), CPRE Tranquillity Map for England, and other web-based tranquillity tools. Areas such as open spaces, public footpaths, local reserves etc would be considered within any assessment.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Officer stated that they could see no issue with our proposals with regards to the tranquillity assessment. Therefore, the tranquillity assessment focused on the change in noise levels, with further baseline noise monitoring within the vicinity of the M69 feeding into this.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p>
---	---	----------	--

	<p>Where footpaths are proposed adjacent to the motorway, the assessment focused on the daytime period only, and adopted a criteria based on an absolute noise level for the whole period.</p> <p>The assessment location is a representative location within Burbage Common, Freeholt Wood and Aston Firs. The closest position is not necessarily representative of the noise levels across the site and only provides a limited picture. Notwithstanding this, noise contours will be produced showing the propagation of noise across these areas within the final ES. The potential noise impact on fauna will be covered within Chapter 12 of the ES. As discussed above, noise contours have been produced for the final ES, demonstrating the noise propagation across the site.</p> <p>Bunding has been proposed adjacent to the A47 link road where it passes NSR1, effectively placing the road within a cutting. This is shown on the earth work drawings and has been included within the noise model.</p>		
<p><b>Para 10.216</b></p> <p>Cranes could be relocated behind warehouses to reduce visual impact on the landscape.</p>	<p>As stated above a central location for the railport has been previously considered however a central location requires a semi circular chord for rail access</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 –</p>

<p>The visual impact of the proposed 6m high visual screens should be carefully considered.</p>	<p>which provided additional constraints. This would mean that individual buildings could not be directly rail served because the curves would be too tight. In addition the railport will come forward in an early stage of the construction programme to meet the requirements of the national policy statement therefore it would potentially not have the benefit of being surrounded by buildings for several years hence the noise mitigation measures as proposed would offer the best mitigation from day one.</p> <p>Noted.</p>		<p>Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>Paras 10.219 – 10.239;</b> <b>Tables 10.50 – 10.55;</b> <b>Figure 10.4</b></p> <p>Tables 10.50 – 10.53 show that there are exceedances at a number of NSR, especially at night-time. Such exceedances would worsen the existing situation. Even with mitigation some noise levels are exceeded- notably for NRS24.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation may not be appropriate, for example the proposed 6m high acoustic barrier adjacent to the traveller site.</p>	<p>We do not agree with this statement as the results of the assessment indicate that the increase in ambient noise levels as a result of the Proposed Development are marginal and are unlikely to be perceptible to the human ear. With mitigation in place, and taking into account the context in accordance with the relevant guidance, the residual effects are predicted to be permanent, minor adverse when considering noise from HGV movements, loading/unloading operations and service yard areas including SRFI operations, which in accordance with this EIA are considered not significant. As previously discussed, the masterplan is illustrative at this outline stage and is an example of</p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>

	only one way the scheme could be delivered. In line with the requirements of EIA, the parameters have been assessed, and with the proposed mitigation in place, it is considered that noise associated with the proposed development is unlikely to result in unacceptable impacts at nearby receptors.		
<p><b>Paras 10.225 – 10.239;</b> <b>Tables 10.50 – 10.55</b></p> <p>The use of electric vehicles on site only would reduce engine noise.</p>	The noise assessment has considered the use of diesel operated vehicles which presents a robust assessment. Should electric vehicles be used in the future, then this will present a betterment in terms of noise.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)
<p><b>Paras 10.240 – 10.242</b></p> <p>Evidence should be provided to support conclusions drawn regarding the effectiveness of mitigation measures to reduce gantry crane noise.</p>	Further details are provided in Appendix 10.4 submitted with the PEIR. Notwithstanding this, the scheme is at the outline stage and the exact plant types that will be installed are unknown at this time. However, the assessment has considered diesel powered cranes to provide a robust assessment, and any deviation from these will provide a betterment in terms of noise.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)

<p><b>Paras 10.243 – 10.244; Table 10.56</b></p> <p>Operational maximum noise levels are noted as being exceeded for 6 of the 26 NSR locations. The mitigation as currently proposed does not therefore appropriately offset harm as a result of noise.</p>	<p>The assessment has predicted the resultant <math>L_{AFmax}</math> level at the façade of nearby receptors assuming no screening is provided from any container stacks or other sources. The results of the assessment, with mitigation in place, indicate exceedances of up to 5dB at a worst-case receptor. This is as a result of the source operating in close proximity to the receptor. When the source is located further away, the level at the façade as a result of instantaneous noise is lower. Notwithstanding this, further detail is provided within the ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual Effects</b></p>			
<p><b>Overall comments</b></p> <p>The development would cause significant harm to the character of the area and associated views. This harm could be reduced by way of a revised layout as well as mitigation measures.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts should be considered within this chapter.</p> <p>No NSR locations are provided for the existing or</p>	<p>The layout has been revised to include additional land for strategic landscaping adjacent to the railway line. .</p> <p>Cumulative assessment forms form part of the ES.</p> <p>The ES noise chapter addresses NSR locations for PRoW.</p> <p>A lighting strategy has being developed for the</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2</p>

<p>proposed PRoWs within the site. NSR locations within the PRoW will need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>A lighting assessment needs to be undertaken.</p>	<p>proposed development. This will be secured through a requirement of the DCO.</p>		<p>Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>
<p><b>Figure 11.7</b></p> <p>The proposal will be most visible to the south-east as a result of the topography. Screening from this direction should be considered along with additional screening from other vistas.</p>	<p>Figure 11.7 illustrates the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (not Zone of Influence) based on bare earth landform only (does not take into account built -form or existing vegetation within the landscape).</p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and</p>

	<p>The landscape planting and bunding around the north-western edge of the site would assist in breaking up views of built form from Burbage Common and Elmesthorpe. The area south of the A47 Link which is to be converted from agricultural land to a naturalistic character, with wildflower meadow, woodland and scrub planting will also assist in limiting views from Burbage Common towards the proposed development. Additionally, planted woodland belts along the western edge of the main HNRFI and the area of POS would provide additional visual mitigation.</p>		<p>visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
<p><b>Para 11.105</b></p> <p>The construction phase should be considered a medium term impact due to the proposed length of this phase.</p>	<p>The construction phase is referred to within the ES as temporary, being phased throughout the development. However, as set out within the LVIA methodology, the duration of an effect is based on the following timescales: Long term (20 years+); Medium to long term (10 to 20 years); Medium term (5 to 10 years); Short term (1 year to 5 years). The duration of the construction phase has been addressed in the ES accordingly, with the duration of the effect defined in accordance with the LVIA methodology.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>



<p><b>Paras 11.118 – 11.119</b></p> <p>Concern as to residual effects at years 1 and 15 for landscape character areas Aston Flamville and Elmsthorpe Floodplain. Mitigation measures should therefore be reconsidered.</p>	<p>This statement is incorrect. Loss of a geographic area of an LCA is a loss to that geographic area of character. Year 1 and Year 15 effects are likely to be the same.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
<p><b>Table 11.11</b></p> <p><b>The proposal will result in indirect landscape impacts such as impact on views and perception of landscape character.</b></p> <p>Not enough information is provided within the PEIR or the LVIA (Appendix 11.1) to allow clarification on how the judgements on the impact to the LCAs have been determined.</p> <p>Impacts upon urban and settlement character areas within the study area have not been considered.</p>	<p>Indirect effects upon neighbouring LCAs have been assessed within the full ES, as has urban and settlement character areas within 2km of the site as requested.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
<p><b>Table 11.12</b> <b>Figures 11.8 – 11.12</b></p> <p>Viewpoints closest to the site will always be most affected (1, 4 – 9 and 37) across the duration of the</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The consultant team is reviewing the design of buildings, their heights and GI corridors</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>development. Insufficient regard has been paid to providing adequate vegetative screening to soften the visual impact of the development.</p> <p>The vegetation to the east along the M69 is largely relied upon to deliver screening from this direction. The current arrangement offers little opportunity to improve this.</p> <p>Additional planting should be included to screen the proposal to the north and in particular to screen views from Elmsthorpe.</p> <p>Additional tree planting should be proposed to screen views of the proposal from the west.</p> <p>Grassland planting would be insufficient to screen the proposal from the south. A more robust planting/landscaping plan should be proposed.</p> <p>Generally, an improved landscaping plan is required.</p> <p>Concerns raised that storage containers, as a result of their colour and height when stacked, would have a significant visual impact upon the landscape, particularly to the west and south-west.</p>	<p>around the site to address some of the concerns and assist in reducing the levels of effects experienced.</p> <p>Acknowledged and this has been addressed in the ES accordingly.</p>		<p>Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Design Code (Document 13.1)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p> <p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>A design code for the buildings should be secured.</p> <p>A lighting strategy is required.</p> <p>Green infrastructure opportunities should be utilised, particularly within the southern GI zone.</p> <p>Opportunities for increased areas of community planting, particularly to the north-west, should be taken.</p> <p>PRoWs should be widened</p> <p>The link road should be realigned so as not to dissect the public open space.</p> <p>An assessment of the impacts of the proposal on heritage assets needs to be undertaken.</p>			(Document 6.2.3.2)
<p><b>Appendix 11.4 Arboricultural Impact Assessment</b></p> <p>Construction works would not harm ancient woodland or other woodland if mitigation measures proposed are implemented.</p> <p>Further information is required in order to ensure that trees are not harmed by pollution.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted and includes a 15m buffer which has been applied to Ancient Woodland. All other mitigation and protection measures are set out within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)

			<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 – Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Appendix 11.4)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p>
<b>Chapter 12 Ecology and Biodiversity</b>			
<p><b>Overall comment</b></p> <p><b>The loss of farmland is acceptable.</b></p> <p><b>Ecologically valuable habitat will be retained.</b></p> <p>Additional buffering is required to the ancient woodland (Freeholt Wood).</p> <p>There is opportunity to create further connected habitats both on and off-site.</p>	<p>TSH welcome the acknowledgement that surveys and assessment have been undertaken as necessary and the loss of farmland in principle is acceptable.</p> <p>We will be providing access to the areas of open space for both workers of the proposed facilities and for the wider public to use. In relation to Freeholt Wood this is one area where there is a pinch point, all other areas have a far greater buffer than the standard requirement.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 - Ecology and biodiversity (Document 6.1.12)</p>

<p>A lighting assessment is required in order to assess the impact upon ecology.</p>	<p>An area of potential offsite mitigation land, in close proximity to the Order Limits and areas associated with the common and SSSI, is included within the Biodiversity Impact Assessment</p> <p>The impacts of lighting have been considered and further studies are being undertaken and these have been addressed in the Lighting Strategy is included within ES Appendix 3.2.</p>		
<p><b>Para 12.128</b></p> <p>The mitigation proposed is supported, however further enhancements could be provided.</p> <p>The health of planting designated areas to the south-west must be maintained.</p>	<p>The Mitigation measures have been developed further within the outline Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) and outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) which form part of the ES submission.</p>	Y	<p>Construction Method Statement (Document 17.2)</p> <p>Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Document 17.2)</p>
<p><b>Para 12.142</b></p> <p>The loss of 258 trees across the site is a significant negative effect at a District level.</p>	Noted	N	

<p><b>Para 12.145</b></p> <p>The loss of 74.1% of existing hedgerow on site is a significant negative effect at a District level.</p> <p>Retention of all the protected hedgerow is however welcomed.</p>	Noted	N	
<p><b>Paras 12.156 – 12.174</b></p> <p>The loss of habitats on site for birds, bats, otters, hares and toads are all recognised to have negative impacts upon existing fauna, largely at a local level.</p>	Noted	N	
<p><b>Para 12.175</b></p> <p>These four items are very important elements that could have a fundamental impact upon flora and fauna habitats.</p>	The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and the Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan set out mitigation measures to protect and manage fauna.	N	<p>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (document reference 17.2)</p> <p>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (document reference 17.5)</p>

<p><b>Para 12.176</b></p> <p>Further assessment required in relation to potential harm to Burbage Wood and Aston Firs SSSI.</p>	<p>The impacts from air pollution and hydrology have been assessed and mitigation has been provided to ensure that there are no significant adverse effects. This has been recognised by Natural England in their response. These areas are expanded on within the ES to show how there is no significant adverse effects on the designated sites.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Construction Method Statement (Document 17.2)</p>
<p><b>Paras 12.199 -12.201</b></p> <p>There is a lack of detail on the noise, vibration, light and air quality (including dust) impacts of the construction phase.</p>	<p>An outline ECMS has been produced to show how the effects of noise, light, vibration and air quality will be managed through the construction process.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Construction Method Statement (Document 17.2)</p>
<p><b>Paras 12.202 – 12.205</b></p> <p>Support the inclusion of protection measures within an Ecological Construction Method Statement.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Construction Method Statement (Document 17.2)</p>
<p><b>Para 12.219</b></p> <p>Additional woodland planting would provide ecological and landscape benefits.</p>	<p>The landscape strategy has been reviewed and the types of habitats provided within the mitigation areas have been looked at to ensure that biodiversity gain can be achieved as much as practically possible.</p>	<p>Y</p>	

<p><b>Para 12.230</b></p> <p>The proposals would not result in a positive effect overall at a site level.</p> <p>Additional planting, particularly to the north-west of the site would enhance ecology.</p>	<p>This statement was referring to when offsite contributions have been taken into consideration for an overall positive effect and these options have been reviewed and further information is provided within the ES. All options to increase the ecological value on site have been looked at.</p>	<p>Y</p>	
<b>Chapter 13 Cultural Heritage</b>			
<p><b>Overall summary</b></p> <p>No substantive harm would occur to heritage assets, subject to further trail trenches and further light, noise, vibration and odour assessments. This does not however mean there is an absence of harm and this must be assessed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF and Planning and Listed Building Act.</p> <p>One Listed Building appears to have been missed off the list – Hillfoot Farmhouse, Station Lane, Croft.</p>	<p>Acknowledged that adverse effects on heritage assets in EIA terms translates to harm in terms of the NPPF. This can be addressed and made clear in the conclusions of the ES, in terms of defining the level of harm to relevant heritage assets.</p> <p>Hillfoot Farmhouse is determined not to be a sensitive receptor, as set out within Appendix 13.2 of the ES. It is concluded that given the distance between the asset and the Order Limit, any visibility will not alter the contribution of setting to the Heritage Asset, nor the ability to appreciate its intrinsic significance.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Heritage Assessment (Appendix 13.2)</p>
<p><b>Para 13.8 -13.19</b></p>		<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>



<p>The methodology used to assess assets and relative impacts is agreeable.</p>	<p>Agreed, no action required.</p>		
<p><b>Para 13.42 Appendix 13.2</b></p> <p>One Listed Building appears to have been missed off the list – Hillfoot Farmhouse, Station Lane, Croft.</p>	<p>Acknowledged and this has been addressed in the ES accordingly.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p>
<p><b>Paras 13.46 – 13.101</b></p> <p>No in principle issue with conclusions provided in relation to the impact upon each asset.</p> <p>Further assessment in relation to light, noise, vibration and odour should be undertaken for heritage assets.</p>	<p>Addressed in the ES accordingly. Light will naturally fall within visual considerations, while the conclusions of the relevant ES sections and assessments and scoping reports in respect of noise and vibration have been incorporated into the assessment.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p>
<p><b>Paras 13.124 – 13.125</b></p> <p>Trial trenching must be completed before definitive conclusions are reached regarding archaeology.</p>	<p>The results of the completed archaeological investigations have been incorporated into the ES</p>	<p>N</p>	
<p><b>Paras 13.156 – 13.159</b></p>			<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>The suggested additional landscape mitigation would offer additional mitigation protection to the heritage assets.</p> <p>The proposal would harm the setting of three Listed Buildings. Whilst this harm is not significant it cannot be conflated with 'no harm'. The impacts will therefore need to be assessed in accordance with the NPS, NPPF and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p>	<p>Agreed, it is not considered that any landscape mitigation could meaningfully mitigate or remove the effects arising in respect of designated heritage assets. The ES/PEIR does not conflate non-significant effects with 'no harm' in terms of the NPPF. This is made clear in the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage (Document 6.1.13)</p>
<b>Chapter 14 Surface Water and Flood Risk</b>			
<p><b>Overall summary</b></p> <p>The baseline situation needs to be fully established to ensure drainage solutions are appropriate.</p> <p>Concerns that the background information is not sufficiently robust and therefore the proposed drainage system is not sufficiently robust.</p> <p>Greater surface water storage should be proposed for amenity and ecological reasons.</p> <p>If the Environment Agency's consultation response does not include sufficient depth of local knowledge, the Council is prepared to engage</p>	<p>The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority have been consulted at various stages in the project to ensure that all available data and local knowledge was used when assessing the baseline conditions. Blaby and Hinckley were also consulted but were unable to provide any local information on flooding.</p> <p>Due to the small size of the watercourses in and around the site, neither the EA or LLFA held much data. This led to the development of a site specific hydraulic model to help identify the floodplain extents. The hydraulic model was developed in consultation with</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)</p>

<p>further with TS(H) Ltd in this respect and lend our own local knowledge and expertise to aid the drainage assessment of the proposals.</p>	<p>the EA and LLFA, and it was approved by the EA on the 24th March 2022.</p>		
<p><b>Paras 14.85 – 14.86</b></p> <p>The Flood Map for Planning may not be accurate for the site, due to it being within a catchment area of less than 3 km for the Thurlaston Brook Tributary. Local resident evidence suggests that flooding of the site either from river flooding or surface water pooling is more expansive than the plans and information suggests. Additional work to establish fully the baseline is therefore required.</p>	<p>A site specific hydraulic flood model was prepared to help identify probable floodplain extents in the absence of available data from the EA and LLFA. The hydraulic model was developed in consultation with the EA and LLFA, and it followed best practice guidelines published by the EA. The model was approved as fit for purpose by the EA on the 24th March.</p> <p>While the hydraulic model includes all of the contributing runoff from the site and wider catchment, it only illustrates the floodplain that emanates from the watercourse channel - it does not illustrate the overland flow routes which storm water runoff may take before reaching the watercourses.</p> <p>However, crucially, the hydraulic modelling has shown that the flood risk within the site, upstream of the railway line, is primarily a product of the surface water runoff from within the site itself. Therefore, addressing the storm water runoff from the site as part of the development will help address the flood risk. Storm water falling on the development will be intercepted</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)</p>

	<p>and stored by new drainage infrastructure, which will relocate much of the water currently pooling in the site to within purpose built ponds, swales, basins and underground tanks. Hydraulic modelling has shown that this would address the flood risk to the development, while also offering some downstream betterment.</p>		
<p><b>Para 14.99</b></p> <p>It is unclear what survey period length has been used to conclude that there is low risk of groundwater flooding.</p> <p>If surface water capacity is not deliverable underground as anticipated, then the quantum of development would need to be reconsidered.</p>	<p>Groundwater monitoring was undertaken between October and December 2018 which identified groundwater at over 3m below ground level, typically perched on the top of the Mercia Mudstone bedrock, which is itself unlikely to contain a continuous aquifer. The shallow cohesive geology underlying the site, is also unlikely to transmit large volumes of groundwater. This cohesive geology layer impedes infiltration from shallower depths, and results in some localised shallow groundwater being present on the site. Where the shallow groundwater is encountered during construction, it can be safely addressed through localised dewatering.</p> <p>Both the drift deposits and deeper bedrock are of low permeability underlying the site means that there is not a significant groundwater reservoir or flow pathway that could be negatively impacted by the development. While it is not expected to be a</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)</p>

	constraint, the below ground tanks can be sealed so that they are unaffected by potential groundwater.		
<p><b>Para 14.111</b></p> <p>The effects upon the SSSI designations should be robustly presented and considered even if the level of impact is not 'significant'</p>	<p>As stated in the PEIR, Burbage Wood and Ashton Firs (SSSI), is located to the south-west of the Main HNRFI Site. The topography of the area is such that land in the main development falls away from the SSSI and the watercourses in site flow away from the SSSI. As the development is located downstream of the SSSI, it will not affect the surface water and flood risk aspects of the SSSI.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)</p>
<p><b>Para 14.122</b></p> <p>Potential harm to construction workers needs to be considered as the site is within flood zones 2 and 3.</p>	<p>The PEIR acknowledges that prior to mitigation at the construction stage flood risk to construction workers in of a major adverse significance. The PEIR sets out measures to address this risk, which include: following the latest guidelines and best practice when working near to watercourses, monitoring weather warnings, and locating the site compound, welfare facilities, and materials outside of the floodplain.</p>	N	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk</p>

			(Document 6.1.14)
<b>Paras 14.136 – 138</b>			Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Surface water and flood risk (Document 6.1.14)
The operation of the areas of the site within flood zones 2 and 3, particularly in relation to whether trains can run and the carrying out of maintenance works, must be fully considered.	Flood Zone 2 and 3 do not reflect the elevated railway line. Detailed site specific modelling has shown that the existing railway line is in reality raised above the floodplain. Once complete, the rail port and new connections to the rail line will also be above the floodplain. Therefore, the operation of the rail port and northern rail line would be unaffected in a flood event.	N	
<b>Chapter 15 Hydrogeology</b>			
<b>Para 15.30</b>			Environmental Statement Chapter 15 – Hydrogeology (Document 6.1.15)
Further deeper strata borehole assessment of the main HNRFI site and the need for all work to the A47 link road land (areas 2 and 3) should be undertaken. It is however acknowledged that they are unlikely to cause any issue in respect of the proposed development.	The deeper boreholes have been completed as part of detailed ground condition site investigation to support design of earthworks.	N	
<b>Chapter 16 Geology, Soils and Contamination</b>			
<b>General comment</b>			Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils
	Further information on mitigation of operational impacts are provided in the final ES.	Y	

<p>The approach to considering contamination and the proposed remediation of the site in general is accepted.</p> <p>Appropriate measures to control the proposed use can be put in place to offer greater protection against contamination and any leaching into water courses from these sources.</p>			<p>and Contamination (Document 6.1.16)</p>
<p><b>Para 16.90</b></p> <p>There are several potential contamination sources on the site. If contamination is found during construction the LPA should be immediately notified and suitable remediation measures put in place.</p>	<p>Noted, contingency measures for unforeseen contamination form part of the remediation strategy and earthworks proposals for the site.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Geology, Soils and Contamination (Document 6.1.16)</p>
<b>Chapter 17 Materials and Waste</b>			
<p><b>Paras 17.72 – 17.76</b></p> <p>Measures to reuse material from existing buildings on site is welcomed. Off-site removal to landfill should be minimised, apart from any contaminants (e.g. asbestos).</p>	<p>This has been included in the SWMMP.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (Document 17.4)</p>

<p><b>Paras 17.78 – 81</b></p> <p>Cut and fill to minimise the off-site removal of earthworks is agreeable.</p> <p>Limits on the quantity of material that can be removed should be put in place.</p>	<p>This has been addressed in the SWMMP.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (Document 17.4)</p>
<p><b>Para 17.94</b></p> <p>Locally sourced materials should be used where appropriate/possible.</p>	<p>Noted and has been addressed in the SWMMP.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (Document 17.4)</p>
<p><b>Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change</b></p>			
<p><b>Para 18.58</b></p> <p>Further information is required in relation to the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions from employees commuting to the site.</p>	<p>Assessments have now been completed. Quantifiable assessments include, but are not limited to, the effects of GHG emissions on the road network and energy. Where not feasible, a qualitative assessment has been completed instead in line with best practice methodologies.</p> <p>Chapter 18 of the ES considers commuter impact on GHG emissions and the Framework Travel Plan (ES Appendix 8.2) sets out how resultant emissions could be kept low.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>



<p><b>Para 18.65</b></p> <p>A specific journey length calculation for train journeys/ GHG should be provided to make any analysis site specific as locations are largely known.</p>	<p>The Applicant appreciates and considers valid concerns with respect to climatic change (both vulnerabilities to change and impact upon change) but wishes to remind the local authority that the PEIR is 'preliminary' in nature. Assessments have now been completed. Quantifiable assessments include, but are not limited to, the effects of GHG emissions on the road network and energy. Where not feasible, a qualitative assessment has been completed instead in line with best practice methodologies. Such assessments will be completed for submission of the application and included in the Environmental Statement (ES).</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p><b>Para 18.94</b></p> <p>The climate change impacts for the construction period have not yet been assessed.</p>	<p>Best practice dictates that an effective scoping exercise ensures that a balance is struck between the amount of GHG emissions emitted or saved by the project and the effort committed to the actual GHG assessment. For example, if most impacts occur during a project's operational phase, then the GHG assessment can reflect this. A high-level or qualitative GHG assessment for certain project elements or activities can be carried</p>	N	

	<p>out as long as it is justified and agreed during the scoping stage with stakeholders. The commitment to net-zero construction and to meeting best design guidance supports current policy and both UK and International ambitions to meet net zero by 2050. A strategy to achieve this accompanies the final ES.</p> <p>The inclusion of quantified GHG emissions data for scope 2 (indirect assessments / embodied carbon) is more likely where relevant quantified information is already available for the project (e.g. material quantities or vehicle movements) that can be used to determine corresponding GHG emissions. In the absence of such data, a quantifiable assessment has been offered as is preferred as a lack of data also means that there are no meaningful benchmarks against which to judge significance.</p>		
<p><b>Para 18.164</b></p> <p>If a CHP/on-site heat network is proposed then this must be included within GHG/energy requirement calculations.</p> <p>The reliance on fossil fuels as the main energy source is disappointing.</p> <p>On site charging for HGVs should be included to future proof the development.</p>	<p>Noted. An Energy Strategy, outlining the proposals for generating and meeting demand accompanies the final ES at Document 6.2.18.1. This includes calculations for all means of energy provision.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18).</p>

All on-site vehicles should be electric.			
<p>Paras 18.194 -197</p> <p>A fabric first approach to reducing the impact of buildings is supported. Further innovative measures to reduce energy consumption should be considered, along with additional renewable energy generation on site.</p> <p>Compliance with relevant building standards is supported and can be secured by legal agreement.</p>	<p>Noted. A Sustainability Strategy, including energy, outlines all proposals to mitigate the effects of the operational development once finalised and accompanies the final ES</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<b>Chapter 19 Accidents and Disasters</b>			
	No comments	N	
<b>Chapter 20 Cumulative and In-combination effects</b>			
<p><b>Appendix 20.1</b></p> <p>The impact of the latest consent for Croft Quarry (2019/CM/0125/LCC) has not been considered.</p>	<p>The dataset has been reviewed and shows the latest record was marked as an EIA screening request under 2018/EIASCO/0161/LCC. The cumulative developments long-list has now been updated to include the Croft Quarry Extension. The cumulative effects assessment is reported in chapter 20 of the ES.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

Chapter 21 Conclusions			
<p><b>Overall Comment</b></p> <p>Specific concerns in respect of the scheme are set out within each chapter above. Some significant issues are highlighted that may amend the conclusions reached within the summary sections of Table 21.1 as a result.</p>	<p>Noted, this chapter has been updated in light of the final design applied for and the assessments undertaken, the final outcomes of the EIA process is reported in chapter 21 of the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	
Glossary			
<p><b>Page 0 -13</b></p> <p>Concerns over whether the 5 km distance buffer from the boundaries of the Main Order Limits are accurate (see Figure 20.1). It is not clear what the furthestmost eastern extent of the Main Order Limit is on the drawings, and therefore what the 5 km buffer should be. This could affect the integrity of the whole Preliminary Environmental Report on topics such as: nature conservation (distance to SSSIs, SACs, LWS), cultural heritage (distance to Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings), where distances have been measured to different sources from the extents of the Main Order Limits. This point needs to be clarified on the associated plans.</p>	<p>Noted, the accuracy of all buffers against the boundary of the Main Order Limits has been checked as part of the final ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	

<b>Consultee: Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</b>		<b>Date of Consultee Response: 08/04/2022</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Regard to response</b>	<b>Scheme change</b>	<b>Relevant Document Reference</b>
<b>Context and Overview</b>			
Beyond the administrative boundaries of HBBC, there is a recognition of the regional significance of the Project. Consequently, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council will support and provide leadership, if required, to a Joint Authority Response in which the each of the authorities will provide a co-ordinated response to TSH during subsequent phases of the submission of the DCO application. However, given the short timescales for the current statutory consultation of 12 weeks from Wednesday 12th January until Friday 8th April it has been necessary to submit responses separately by Authority.	The consultation period was initially undertaken for a period of 8 weeks from the 12th of January until the 9th of March. The consultation period was then extended until 8 April 2022 giving an overall consultation period of 12 weeks and 2 days. The statutory minimum consultation period is 28 days. TSH considered the duration of the consultation period to be appropriate and the original time period of 8 weeks was reviewed by Blaby District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council as part of the Statement of Community Consultation process.	N	Consultation Report (document reference 5.1)
<b>Terms of Reference</b>			
<b>Conclusion</b>		N	Environmental Statement Chapter 20 -

<p>HBBC do not support the development proposals as presented by TSH as they have considerable concerns on the range of adverse individual and cumulative impacts which have not yet been identified by the promoter.</p> <p>The principal concern of the Council is that without careful consideration of the zone of Influence that any Cumulative Environmental Assessment will distort the overall assessment of impacts.</p>	<p>Noted. A detailed response to each point is provided below.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts are assessed at ES Chapter 20.</p>		<p>Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
<b>Introduction</b>			
<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <p>The development should not describe itself as the 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange' but instead as a 'Strategic Rail Freight Interchange at Hinckley'.</p> <p>The reliance of "national" status implies in this context a singular facility rather than potentially part of a strategic network.</p>	<p>Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange is simply a project title for ease of identification. Such a name alone does not seek to claim compliance with the NPS.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p><b>Criteria for qualification as an NSIP</b></p> <p>Any proposal for a SRFI must satisfy the criteria of the Planning Act set out at paragraph 1.20.</p>	<p>Noted and this has been addressed in the Planning Statement</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Planning Statement</p>

			(document reference 7.1)
<p><b>Parameters of Development</b></p> <p>The significance of the flexibility in the design should be more prominent within this section of the PEIR. There are expected to be significant pressures being placed on some key parameters that may well lead to material amendments to the project. This will obviously reflect a risk to development and should be highlighted early in the Report.</p>	<p>We note the comments and make clear in the project description, the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and the parameters plan the flexibility sought in the DCO and the basis upon which the EIA has been undertaken. A Rochdale envelope approach has been followed, whereby the EIA undertakes a worst case assessment such that any further refinement of the scheme will lead to impacts of equal or lesser significance. For the more significant effects, mitigation is set out, together with an assessment of the residual effects, to indicate what the mitigation would achieve.</p>	Y	<p>Application Form (Document Reference 1.2)</p> <p>Parameters Plan (Document Reference: 2.12)</p>
<b>Site description and surroundings</b>			
<p>The Order Limits are currently shown in draft. Should any changes take place to The Order Limits it would be beneficial to understand how this will be communicated to relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>The LPAs have been notified of the changes to the Order Limits following the Stage 2 consultation. Appropriate further engagement has been carried out in response to the Order Limit changes.</p>	Y	<p>Order Limits Plan (document reference 2.27)</p>
<p>Relevant stakeholders should be kept informed with regard to changes to specific areas of the proposal, such as ecology, drainage etc.</p>	<p>We propose to notify the relevant stakeholders of any proposed substantive changes to land inside the main Order Limits prior to submitting the application. We</p>		<p>Design and Access Statement (Document 8.1)</p>

<p>Consideration should be given as to the materiality of any amendments proposed during the course of the project in relation to the need to reconsult.</p>	<p>will keep the RPAs informed of any such changes as part of our regular ongoing dialogue.</p> <p>The Consultation Report documents this dialogue up to the point that the application is finalised. The Design and Access Statement explains the evolution of the scheme and the EIA addresses the main alternatives considered by the applicant. The Planning Statement sets out any balancing considerations and the ES provides a non-technical summary of the environmental effects of the project, incorporating mitigation.</p>	<p>Y</p>	
<b>Details of the proposal</b>			
<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>The key parameters relevant in the illustrative masterplan, parameters plan and off-site highways and junction improvement plans should be aligned any variations –should be highlighted.</p>	<p>These plans align.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Illustrative Masterplan (document reference:2.8)</p> <p>Parameters Plan (document reference: 2.12)</p> <p>Highways Plans (document reference 2.2)</p>
<p>The Planning Act 2008 provides that development consent may be granted for both a NSIP, referred</p>	<p>It is correct that the Planning Act separately defines the terms 'Principal Development' and Associated</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>



<p>to as the 'Principal Development' in this document, and for 'Associated Development', which is development associated with the Principal Development. This distinction is made in the description of the authorised development in the draft DCO that accompanies this PEIR for consultation purposes. However, the distinction is not included in an assessment of the Proposed Development's environmental effects.</p>	<p>Development' for the purposes of the consent. However the EIA is undertaken in accordance with, The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. In accordance with these Regulations, the likely significant effects of the project as a whole are required to be assessed and therefore it is correct not to separate out sections of the proposed development as the comment suggests.</p>		<p>Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
<p>The six main development zones proposed within the parameters plan should be more clearly identified within the relevant documentation.</p> <p>The quantum of impact during the construction and operation phases is under assessed.</p> <p>Figure 2.3 is unclear with regard to interdependencies between phases for Development Zones A-F.</p>	<p>The project description including of the development zones identified on the parameters Plan is set out in ES Chapter 3: Project Description</p> <p>The completed Environmental Statement assesses the likely significant environmental effects of these 'Rochdale Envelope' parameters.</p> <p>Phasing is clearly set out in Chapter 3 of the ES and in phasing plans.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Project Description (Document Reference 6.1.3)</p> <p>Phasing Plans (Document reference 2.18.1 – 2.18.6)</p>
<p>Clarification is required with regard to which buildings will be rail connected/accessible and when this connectivity will take place.</p>	<p>The parameters plan allows for development in zones D, E and B to accommodate rail connected units. These 3 zones have the ability to accommodate up to 355,629sq m of warehouse space which is circa 55% of the ground floorspace which has the ability to be rail connected. The balance of floorspace can be 'rail served' i.e. containers could be moved to and from the Terminal using HGV or Tugmaster vehicles over the</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Parameters Plan (Document reference 2.12)</p>

	<p>relatively short distances involved.</p> <p>The most recent DCO for a SRFI for West Midlands Interchange allowed for development in zones A1 and A2 to be rail connected which was 20% of the proposed floorspace, the balance of floorspace would be rail served. (WMI recommendation report 5.6.24)</p> <p><i>The Parameters Plan demonstrates that Zones D1, D2, E1, E2 and B3 have the ability to be 'rail connected', meaning a warehouse with its own dedicated rail siding or which is sufficiently close to the rail terminal to allow containers to be moved from the rail wagons into the warehouse by overhead cranes or reach stackers without the need for them to be loaded onto a HGV or Tugmaster vehicle. (Examining Authority's Report on Findings and Conclusions West Midlands RFI. Paragraph 1.1.4)</i></p> <p>The Examining Authority for West Midlands Interchange commented on the benefit of the remainder of the scheme being 'rail served'</p> <p><i>'As explained by the Applicant in response to my questions at ISH5, the balance of the floorspace, in Zones A3 to A7, would be rail-served as containers could be moved to and from the Terminal using HGV or Tugmaster vehicles over the relatively short distances involved. This would involve additional loading and unloading operations, but this is standard practice at SRFIs and does not negate the cost benefits to warehouse occupiers of co-location with the Rail</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p><i>Terminal. The use of Tugmasters is a viable proposition as no more than 1km of the journey would be on public highway and the operator could, therefore, benefit from the cost savings that these could provide'.</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State agreed with the Examining Authority that the proposal at WMI '<i>meets the criteria for function transport links locational requirement, scale and design of an SRFI as set out in paragraphs 4.83 - 4.89 of the NPSNN.</i>' (DL paragraph 18). It is submitted that in the context of the NPSNN, Hinckley National similarly satisfies the criteria for function as an SRFI.</p>		
<p>Clarification is required as to whether junction 2 of the M69 requires signalisation. Additionally, clarification should be provided as to whether this underpinned the model used within the PIER</p>	<p>Yes it does and it was included in the modelling for PEIR and the ES.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Transport and traffic (Document reference 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Development programme and phasing</b></p> <p>Further detail should be provided as to the assumptions that the assessment of the development period is based upon, along with how this will impact the development zones highlighted as part of the parameter plans.</p>	<p>The development period is based on market assumptions. Of note EMG has completed earlier than anticipated with 100% of units using rail.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 3 Transport and traffic (Document reference 6.1.3)</p>

Further information, such as an indicative construction programme, is required in order to understand any risks to the programme arising from the required improvements to the road network.			
It is unclear how any phasing plan will interact with any triggers secured within the DCO by legal or statutory means with regard to off-site highway works or construction of elements of the railport.	Phasing of off-site highway works and the railport is addressed within ES Chapter 3 and the draft DCO.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 3 Transport and traffic (Document reference 6.1.3)  Draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1)
Clarification should be sought as to how 16 train visits a day are defined, along with whether this represents the minimum or maximum number of trains.	16 trains per day represents 32 movements (in and out).  16 trains per day is the maximum assumed.	N	N/a
Further information regarding how the site management company (following operation of the development) will operate, as well as how effective and close consultation will take place with stakeholders.	These details will come forward through detailed design.	Y	Management Company terms

<p>Effective mechanisms for enforcement of environmental standards should be secured either via procurement or contractual terms.</p>			
<b>Site Selection and Project Evaluation</b>			
<p>The technical review documents lack detail on the assessment of impacts, in particular the PEIR.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration has been given to alternative locations.</p> <p>The site selection and project evaluation should be closely guided by consultation feedback and the EIA process before concluding that the design, size, and scale of the development is able to align itself with National Policy.</p>	<p>The NPS refers (paragraph 4.26) to the requirement for Applicants ‘to include an outline of the main alternatives studied by the applicant and an indication of the main reasons for the Applicant’s choice taking into account the environmental effects (emphasis added). The Directive does not require an applicant to undertake a full environmental assessment of each alternative site considered by the applicant. TSL reached the conclusion that the site for HNRFI was the preferred choice for clear reasoning when compared to the high-level constraints identified for the alternative sites that were considered in undertaking a site search for a suitable SRFI site.</p> <p>The assessment of alternatives is set out in ES Chapter 4: Site Selection and Evolution</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4: Site Selection and Evolution (Document reference)</p>
<p>There is a lack of information and assessment of alternative sites.</p> <p>Concerns as to whether the cumulative impact of development across the region has been given</p>	<p>Technical reasons for discounting alternatives have been set out. There is no benefit in master planning a site which does not pass the basic requirements for developing an SRFI. Maturing of rail freight traffic is accelerating and will continue to do so with the pressures on HGV logistics within the UK market. Take</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects</p>

<p>sufficient consideration within the assessments undertaken.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration has been given within the documentation to the possible need to expand the site in the future.</p>	<p>up will be quicker than historically experienced, as is being demonstrated at EMG.</p>		<p>(Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
<p>Of the five priority Growth Areas identified by the LLEP-SEP the Promoter differentiated between the seven site options against a general principal that a SRFI on the F2N strategic rail freight route ideally within GA5, Southwest Leicestershire Growth Area, with good access to the M69 and M1 motorways and the A5 corridor, represents an optimal multi-modal connectivity and a nodal point for the expressed need for future growth. The option appraisal further sifts the preferred location against 5 key criteria of Rail, Road, Amenity and Environment, Commercial and Economic.</p> <p>The underlying data on which the site selection is based upon is not sufficiently robust, particularly in relation to the traffic modelling.</p> <p>Insufficient evidence that a SRFI at Hinckley is the optimal location for a SRFI in the area.</p>	<p>Other sites were considered and tested and as per BDC's review, HNRFI complies with the LLEP Plans and Studies. When other sites clearly fail basic requirements, a 'more robust' assessment in terms of more data or masterplanning is not going to change the fundamental flaws. ES Chapter 4: Site Selection and Evolution and the Market Needs Case further addresses the comparative justification for HNRFI.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 – Site Selection and Evolution (Document Reference 6.1.4)</p>

<p>The options appraisal is not sufficiently detailed and insufficient consideration has been given to alternative sites.</p> <p>The criteria for assessing alternative sites should comprise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extent of area of open level land.</li> <li>b) Comparative volumes of at-grade rail frontage for rail connections to the main line, and the ability to accommodate trains up to 775m in length.</li> <li>c) Comparative potential for direct road access to the strategic highway network,</li> <li>d) Relative impacts and distances from existing residential settlements sufficient to avoid significant adverse effects on noise and visual amenity after mitigation.</li> <li>e) A comparatively low level of environmental constraint, with no designated features of landscape, ecological or cultural heritage interest inside the site.</li> <li>f) The values that are assigned to a LLEP's designated South-West Leicestershire Growth Area.</li> </ul>	<p>This has substantially been covered in ES Chapter 4: Site Selection and Evolution</p> <p>The NPS states paragraph 2.56:</p> <p>'Given locational requirements and the need for effective connections for both rail and road, the number of locations suitable for SRFIs will be limited which will restrict the scope for developers to identify viable alternative sites (emphasis added)'.</p> <p>It is for the developer to select sites for SRFIs using its expertise, and the expertise of the project team in the context of the policy guidance set out in the NPS. This judgement can be formed without necessarily undertaking extensive and detailed assessment of alternative sites.</p> <p>National Planning Policy does not require a developer to seek development consent for the 'optimal site'. The issue for consideration is whether the proposal satisfied the policy guidance of the NPS which does not require a detailed comparative assessment to be made against potential alternative sites that may have been considered in the initial site search.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 – Site Selection and Evolution (Document Reference 6.1.4)</p>
<p>Evidence should be presented with regards to how alternative sites would connect to the road network.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 4: Site Selection and Evolution access to the mainline and ability to serve 775m as the starting point to identify any site that might be considered for a SRFI, then connections to the strategic road network were</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 – Site Selection and</p>

<p>Other alternative sites may provide similar rail characteristics/capacity as identified as possible at Hinckley.</p> <p>Additional information should be provided as to how the SRFI would relate to those in the rest of the country.</p> <p>Further depth of comparative analysis of Hinckley against other possible sites should be undertaken with regard to future demands/expansion. Unclear whether engineering and timetable assessment work undertaken with Network Rail through its in-house "GRIP" development programme has confirmed the ability to achieve the main line connections on which to commence operations, along with capacity within the timetable to accommodate the rail freight services associated with those operations.</p> <p>Comparisons between Hinckley and alternative sites should be undertaken with regard to train network capacity.</p>	<p>considered. Therefore all the sites have been tested against this base line.</p> <p>The Market Needs Case addresses the geographical inter-relationship between SRFI's in the region.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed through engineering studies with a range of options considered in detail, with the resulting master plan providing the optimal arrangement, including stabling, design for OLE power and rail access to a number of individual buildings.</p> <p>NR have confirmed the ability to connect and serve 16 trains per day within the existing capacity of the network. This takes into account existing reserved paths protected by Train Operating Companies' for anticipated expansion into other facilities. For operational reasons within the terminal and signalling, a max of 2 trains per hr from the east can be serviced, allowing considerable capacity for other freight and passenger services to run.</p>		<p>Evolution (Document Reference 6.1.4)</p> <p>Market Needs Assessment (Document Reference 16.1)</p>
--	--	--	--



National Policy and Drivers of Need			
<p>The primary policy for the determination of the proposals is the NPS however weight can be given to national and local policy.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 – Relevant legislation and Policy (Document Reference 6.1.5)</p>
<p><b>The drivers of need for SRFIs</b></p> <p>Environmental, safety, social and economic benefits, and adverse impacts, should be considered at national, regional, and local levels.</p> <p>Further clarity should be provided in relation to how the above principles were considered when undertaking site selection.</p> <p>Concern that the site selection process insufficiently considered the need to deliver environmental and social benefits as part of schemes.</p>	<p>The National Policy Statement (NPS) on National Networks states ‘The Government has concluded there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFIs’ (paragraph 2.56). The proposals demonstrate compliance with the NPS and these specific social, economic and environmental matters have been addressed in the ES and the Planning Statement.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 5 – Relevant legislation and Policy (Document Reference 6.1.5)</p>

<p>The “judgement of viability” made within the market framework must be a factor in defining the needs case for the project. It is not clear whether there has been any engagement with the Government on how it expects to account any interventions. We have concerns that no consideration or examination of the likely social value of the project or indeed the mechanisms through which these interventions are included as part of the business case aligns. More detail is required to form the development consent including clear enforceable commitments.</p>	<p>The project will be entirely funded by private sector investment.</p> <p>In terms of social value a skills and training scheme will be secured by a DCO requirement. It is not a material planning consideration but the applicant proposed to provide a Community Benefit Fund.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (Document Reference: 6.1.7)</p>
<p><b>Scale &amp; Design</b></p> <p>Unclear as to what is implied by the terms ‘rail connected’ and ‘rail accessible’.</p> <p>A more detailed analysis should be provided on the concept of connectivity and accessibility beyond standard Design and Access Statements.</p>	<p>For clarity the same definitions have been used for the relationship between the railway and individual buildings as set out in the Examining Authority’s Report for the West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange:</p> <p><i>“Rail-connected”</i> - a warehouse or other building either with its own dedicated rail siding or which is sufficiently close to the rail terminal to allow containers to be moved from the rail wagons into the warehouse by overhead cranes or reach stackers without the need for them to be loaded onto a HGV or Tugmaster vehicle;</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Design and Access Statement (Document 8.1)</p>

	<p><i>“Rail-served”</i>- a warehouse forming part of the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange development, but which would require containers to be moved from or to the rail terminal by means of an HGV or Tugmaster vehicle.</p> <p><i>“Rail-accessible”</i> - having the potential either for a direct rail connection (rail-connected) or to be rail-served.</p> <p>All of the buildings on the development will be Rail Served, having the capability to use HGVs or Tugmasters with skeleton trailers to move containers and swap bodies between the warehouse loading bays and the intermodal terminal.</p>		
<p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>Unconvinced that the planning provisions within the NPS are consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Unconvinced that the drivers of need are adequately considered in relation to site selection.</p> <p>The material weight of local development plan policy in relation to the environment will need to be considered.</p> <p>Insufficient weight has been given to the requirements of Core Strategy Policy 5: Transport Infrastructure in the Sub- regional Centre in which</p>	<p>The NPPF makes clear (paragraph 5) that National Policy Statements form part of the overall framework of national planning policy. Policies development plans are relevant planning considerations.</p> <p>The Secretary of State will use the NPSNN as the primary basis for making a decision on the development consent application for HNRFI. The NPS identifies assessment principles and generic impacts of ‘nationally significant infrastructure projects’. These policy considerations typically overlap with policy considerations in development plans.</p> <p>A cumulative assessment is provided at ES Chapter 20.</p>	N	<p>Planning Statement (document reference 7.1)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

<p>the draft Plan refers to the HNRFI (paragraphs 8.38 – 8.39).</p> <p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the wider borough in relation to the natural environment and transport infrastructure. Further clarity should be provided in relation to the Zone of Influence and a Cumulative Environmental Assessment provided.</p>			
<b>Land Use and Socio Economics</b>			
<p><b>Page 21</b></p> <p>“The baseline research shows that the unemployment rate in the study area is the same as the England average.” As at Oct 2020-Sep 2021 the Hinckley And Bosworth unemployment rates was 4% compared an England average of 4.9%.</p>	<p>Up to date employment rates are provided in the ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>
<p><b>7.35</b></p> <p>The data should be updated as it is based on pre-covid circumstances.</p>	<p>This statement and baseline information has been updated for the ES to reflect the current baseline. The areas of the baseline that have been updated include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Size of the Labour Market (Annual Population Survey (APS), 2021). APS 2021 was released 12 April 2022.</li> <li>- Construction Employment (Census, 2021). (If available)</li> </ul>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Logistics Sector Employment (Census, 2021). (If available)</li> <li>- Occupations in the Logistics Sector (APS, 2021)</li> <li>- Wages (Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2021)</li> <li>- Health Profile (Public Health England, 2021)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>7.47</b></p> <p>HBBC does not have an available workforce so it is unclear how the developer will ensure that local people's skills are enhanced.</p>	<p>The reference is to the full study area and discussions on a Local Employment &amp; Skills Strategy are in progress.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>
<p><b>7.57</b></p> <p>Unclear what the benefits of development are to the A5.</p>	<p>Coal Pit Lane is the main intervention. However, the improvements to the M69 by creating the new slips will reduce pressure on the A5. This is due to traffic redistributing to the faster and more direct access the M69 provides.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>
<p><b>Page 29</b></p> <p>No mention of HBBC planning policy or local plan</p>	<p>Appropriate policy has been referenced within the ES under the policy section.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>

<b>7.95</b> Data beyond the Blaby wage data should be used.	A study area average has been set out in the ES.	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)
<b>7.100</b> The TSH should consider the wider HEDNA and not just figures specific to Blaby.	Wider reference to HEDNA figures have been included in the ES	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)
<b>7.115</b> Mitigation, improvement schemes and/or financial contributions require further consideration and investigation.	A Local Skills and Training plan will be secured by DCO requirement. .	Y	draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1)
<b>Potential Socio-Economic Effects</b>			
<b>7.141</b> There is also a significant labour market (58,300 jobs estimated by the Annual Population Survey,	A Local Skills and Training plan will be secured by DCO requirement.	Y	draft Development Consent Order

<p>2020) to accommodate an extra 335 on-site positions.</p> <p>The scheme will displace construction workers from other projects. Consideration should be given to ensuring that additional people are attracted to the construction sector.</p>			<p>(document reference 3.1)</p>
<p><b>7.145</b></p> <p>Construction is estimated to have a low positive impact on the medium sensitivity construction employment in the relevant study area (where there is, in total, 58,000 residents in construction employment), resulting in a minor beneficial effect over the short and medium term.” Why is this only a minor beneficial effect, how can this be bolstered to be a moderate to major benefit effect?</p>	<p>Effect significance is informed by Table 7.5 and takes into consideration the full study area, across the full study area this is a minor beneficial effect.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>
<p><b>7.161</b></p> <p>HNRFI would generate 4,400 – 5,400 additional FTE jobs for the national economy”. This statement seems low due to the displacement, but what happens to those employment areas that the businesses relocate from?</p>	<p>The rate of displacement has been adjusted to 25%. Older employment areas would generally be redeveloped.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>

<p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the impact upon employment areas that businesses relocate from.</p>			
<p><b>7.162</b></p> <p>The additional jobs, 2,500 – 3,100 would be new on-site jobs for the residents of the study area.”</p> <p>Unclear what study area this statistic is based on.</p>	<p>Study area defined under 7.7 of ES Chapter 7.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>
<p><b>7.163</b></p> <p>‘The effect of operational jobs from the Proposed Development is predicted to be moderate beneficial over the long term.”</p> <p>Due to the size of the site and the impacts locally, HBBC would expect to see more positive impacts on the local employment.</p>	<p>The assessment considers the full study area and not HBBC only.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>
<p>Community land and assets (including Access to Burbage Woods and Common)- would be neutral effect over the long term.</p>	<p>The assessment has been reviewed and updated accordingly to report a minor adverse effect in the long term.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics</p>



HBBC does not agree with the effect the proposal will have on Burbage Woods and Common.			(Document Reference 6.1.7)
<p><b>Proposed Mitigation</b></p> <p>TSH only mention financial gain of landowners</p>	Mitigation measures have been reviewed and updated considering recent discussions with local authorities – Local Employment & Training Strategy.	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)
<p><b>Climate Change</b></p> <p>Weak mention in this section</p>	The section on climate change has been reviewed and updated. More detail is presented in ES Chapter 18.	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document Reference 6.1.7)</p>
7.126		N	

<p>The land use and socio-economic effects chapter concludes that the Proposed Development will have a significant beneficial effect by generating net additional jobs and by providing additional floorspace to the businesses of the logistics sector.</p> <p>How does the proposed development provide significant beneficial effect when impact on the local labour force was only minor for construction and moderate beneficial for occupation.</p> <p>A good Local Employment &amp; Training Strategy is needed for the development to actually benefit the local workforce, see EP06 Education and Skills for a Strong Local Workforce in the draft HBBC local plan.</p>	<p>Local Employment &amp; Training Strategy has been developed and has informed the assessment.</p> <p>Effects that are moderate or major are considered to be significant in EIA terms, and therefore the Proposed Development is expected to generate a significant beneficial effect in terms of employment.</p>		
<p><b>Public Rights of Way</b></p> <p>Insufficient detail as to how the PRoW strategy will provide improved cycle and pedestrian routes to the centre of Hinckley and Burbage.</p> <p>A strategy for the management of the PRoW's during construction is required.</p>	<p>Given the location of the site opportunities to walk to the site are limited. It is widely considered that cycling has the potential to substitute for short car trips, particularly those under 5km, and form part of a longer multi modal journey by public transport. Cycling is therefore an important journey to work mode that has the potential to substitute for short car journeys. The cycling catchment area demonstrates that employees from Hinckley could cycle to the site. Connecting</p>	N	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Appendix 8.1 Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan</p>

<p>Clarification is needed as to who will manage and maintain the PRoWs after construction to the development area.</p> <p>A plan should be provided showing the interconnection of PRoW that are to be altered as part of the project with the existing PRoW network.</p> <p>Arrangements around a direct vehicular link / access from the end of Burbage Common Rd on the new relief road, in addition to the proposed footpath and path/cycleway should be considered</p> <p>The existing footpath through Elmesthorpe Plantation comes to a stop at the end of our boundary, so requires a link to the proposed bridleway.</p> <p>The new area of play and open space between Burbage Common and the new relief road, are any PRoW's effect in anyway with these proposals?</p>	<p>existing cycle routes to proposed new cycle lanes on the link road could support cycling to the site from Hinckley. Pedestrian and cycle access to the site is detailed further in the sustainable transport strategy and plan which will be secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>The exact PRoW that will be affected and the measures employed to ensure they can be used safely, or diverted/closed if not practicable, will be detailed in the phase specific CEMPs which are to be secured by DCO requirement.</p> <p>Management of the PRoWs will be a combination of LCC and the applicant and will be agreed with LCC.</p> <p>A plan showing the interconnection of PRoW that are to be altered as part of the project with the existing PRoW network has been produced.</p> <p>This will be closed as a through route to vehicles, with bridleway/pedestrian/cycle through access only.</p>		<p>(document reference 6.2.8.1 (part 15 of 16))</p>
---	---	--	---

	<p>This is an error on the plan. It is intended to retain the connection through Elmesthrope Plantation to the proposed bridleway.</p> <p>No PRoW passes through this proposed area of POS.</p>		
<b>Traffic and Transport</b>			
<p><b>General</b></p> <p>Concerns are raised with the model used to present information within the PEIR and Interim Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>Further modelling has been completed now and fully communicated with the TWG.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p>It would be helpful to highlight in the final environmental analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the expected proportion of the total freight handled via the rail terminal compared to that using road.</li> </ul>	<p>For highway modelling purposes the total HGV movements on and off the public road network on a worst-case scenario is assumed to be c.9,000 total movements per day, of which 1,361 are to and from the rail terminal (this assumes 30% of rail movements stay within the scheme). The percentage of containers</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The total additional traffic expected to be generated by the proposed development.</li> </ul>	<p>assumed by TS to be moved to surrounding areas, off site, via the highway network is 70%; whilst other consented SRFI developments have utilised a lesser figure of 60%, demonstrating our modelling is robust in its assumptions comparatively. A technical note on the Railport Generation of HGV movements can be found at Chapter 8 of the PEIR report within appendix 8.1 (1.3) Appendix D: Baker Rose Technical Note 1; Railport Generation of HGV Movements to and from the Public Highway. This has been agreed with LCC Highways.</p> <p>Trip generation has been agreed with LCC Highways.</p>		
<p>More detail on how sustainable travel can be maximised to urban areas should be provided.</p> <p>The draft Sustainable Travel Strategy did not appear to have been included in the material attached.</p>	<p>Sustainable Transport Strategy document has been included as part of the TA appendices in the final submission</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>8.31</b></p> <p>The Planning and Infrastructure uncertainly log had not been finally agreed with LCC at the time the PEIR was submitted.</p>	<p>This has since been agreed with the TWG which includes LCC for the latest model run.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p><b>Table 8.2</b></p> <p>It is unclear how the receptor sensitivities and type have been derived.</p> <p>Locations where there is existing or future traffic congestion should be included.</p> <p>There are several key local areas of concern highlighted in the HBBC response to the SoCC, including the Watling Street bridge on the A5, the A47 between the A5 and Desford crossroads; A47 link to Leicester Road; the impacts on the Hinckley Burbage, Barwell and Earl Shilton core local road network; and the impacts on the A5, particularly between Longshoot to Smokington Hollow, and the traffic volumes including HGV flows in the rural areas surrounding Hinckley including Higham on the Hill, Stoke Golding and Wykin. We appreciate some of these may be included in the analysis, but the level of detail provided in the PEIR is insufficient to assess the impact and we would expect a final assessment to include these locations in more detail.</p>	<p>These areas are covered in the latest model run, the final ES refines the sensitive receptors considered</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Figure 8.1</b></p>	<p>The areas are covered in the latest model run, the final ES refines the sensitive receptors considered to an appropriate level.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 -</p>

<p>Further information should be provided in relation to the scale of analysis for receptors in HBBC.</p>			<p>Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Table 8.3</b></p> <p>HBBC considers that important local issues of concern should be added to Table 8.3 – these are all considered by residents/members to impact on the local environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HGV movements along the local road network; in the urban areas and minor roads in the area</li> <li>• HGV parking.</li> <li>• The resilience of the local network due to increased traffic flows.</li> <li>• Impact on over height vehicles issue at the Watling Street bridge on the A5 including the ability of the network to cope with the resulting issues.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. This has been further considered in the Final ES.</p> <p>A full HGV routing strategy has been produced to support the ES. This includes enforceable measures to prevent HGVs using locally sensitive routes. Parking off-site will be monitored and controlled by site travel plan coordinator. They will be the point of contact for all residents wishing to report HGV drivers parking on local roads.</p> <p>The height restriction on the A5 will be communicated to all drivers. The A47 link road also provides an alternative route for the circa 5% nationally of HGVs that are high-sided.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>8.6.2</b></p> <p>It is noted that ‘As with any large-scale traffic model, limitations exist in the ability to reproduce future year flows.’</p>	<p>Additional sensitivity has been carried out on alternative link road layouts. The PRTM has been reviewed and refined in detail in conjunction with the TWG.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p>Further information should be provided to explain how sensitivity testing can be used to reduce such uncertainties.</p>			
<p><b>8.133</b></p> <p>The proposal will exacerbate issues over high vehicles in relation to The Watling Street Railway Bridge.</p>	<p>There has been ongoing discussion surrounding the bridge strikes with the TWG.</p> <p>The significance has been reviewed further against sensitive receptor criteria.</p> <p>The height restriction on the A5 will be communicated to all drivers. The A47 link road also provides an alternative route for the circa 5% nationally of HGVs that are high-sided.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>8.147</b></p> <p>The A47 should be considered as moderate significance due to the important role within the local highway network.</p>	<p>Noted. This has been further considered in the Final ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>8.178</b></p>			



<p>HBBC consider that an LTN1/20 analysis should be undertaken as part of the scheme assessment to show how cycling connections to the adjacent HBBC urban areas (Hinckley, Burbage, Earl Shilton and Barwell) are currently achieved and how they can be improved.</p> <p>Figure 6 of appendix 8.1 shows that these areas are well within easy cycling range of the site.</p>	<p>Checked against LTN1/20 standards. A combined cycle/footway is included on the entire length of the A47 link road. This connects to established routes on the A47 and Barwell Lane connecting to the surrounding settlements.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>8.206</b></p> <p>Length, nature and user experience of PRoW network should be fully assessed considering the proposed changes.</p>	<p>Noted. Considered in more detail for the Final ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>
<p><b>Table 8.5</b></p> <p>It is not clear how this table and the accompanying figures relates to the earlier consideration of magnitude and significance (Table 8.3) for each impact criteria, and it is assumed this will be analysed in full in the final analysis.</p>	<p>Considered in more detail for the Final ES. Additional tables for each of the assessment criteria have been included in the Final ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>8.221</b></p>			

<p>More detail on capacity issues in the HBBC network should be provided.</p> <p>We note that there are existing and future capacity issues expected at J3 of the M69 (J21 of the M1). This should form part of the analysis.</p>	<p>Noted revised modelling has further detailed information on impacts and is contained in the ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Table 8.8</b></p> <p>Alternative mitigation options may exist, and this should form part of discussions with the highway authority.</p>	<p>LCC forms part of the TWG and have been party to all data throughout the process and will continue to be part of mitigation discussions.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>8.266</b></p> <p>Unclear as to whether the HGV strategy will be enforceable or deliverable.</p> <p>It is not yet clear what measures the applicant proposes to reduce the environmental impact of HGV trips for example we are aware of current trials of low emission HGV's.</p>	<p>The HGV route management plan and strategy has been developed further to account for enforcement and legal agreements that will be needed.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy document reference 17.4)</p>
<p><b>8.287</b></p>			

<p>Further consideration beyond the impact of traffic levels should be given to the amenity of non-motorised traffic users.</p>	<p>This has been considered in further detail in the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan as well as the Public Rights of Way Strategy.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Sustainable Transport Strategy (document reference 8.2.8.1 (part 15 of 16))</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (document reference 6.2.11.2)</p>
<p><b>Appendix 8.2 - Draft Travel Plan</b></p> <p>Further information on the implementation of the travel plan should be provided regarding how the modal shift will be achieved.</p> <p>The 15% target for reduction in single driver trips is welcomed.</p>	<p>The Travel plan contains further information on mechanisms.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Appendix 8.2 Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (document reference 6.2.8.2)</p>

<p><b>Public exhibition material, page 11</b></p> <p>This states that 'Each freight train can remove up to 76 HGVs from our roads, removing 1.6 billion HGV kilometres annually'</p> <p>Further detail should be provided in relation to this statement.</p> <p>Elsewhere in the material there is reference to each train removing up to 50 HGV movements and it would be useful to clarify which is appropriate.</p> <p>It would be helpful to highlight in future the expected proportion of the total freight handled via the rail terminal compared to that using road.</p>	<p>This statement is from Network Rail assuming a higher number of single TEU/20' containers.</p> <p>The core numbers are as per the assessment used (50 HGV movements) and settled with the Transport Working Group.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
--	---	----------	---

<b>Appendix 8.1: Interim Transport Assessment</b>			
<p><b>Figure 13</b></p> <p>It is noted that the A47 and associated junctions show as collision hotspots on the plan. Further consideration should be given to changes in traffic flows/mix.</p>	<p>COBALT analysis for collision has been carried out for the submission.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Table 6</b></p> <p>Further information relating to cycling improvements adjacent to HBBC urban areas should be provided.</p> <p>Figure 7 appears to indicate gaps in cycling infrastructure to these areas.</p>	<p>Further detail of connection to existing routes is provided in the final ES - there is a route which runs parallel to the B4668.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>Figure 17</b></p> <p>The new A47 link road (west of the railway line) should also be an undesirable route for HGV movement.</p>	<p>This is required to avoid the low bridge for certain vehicles. The vast majority of HGVs will use Junction 2 of the M69 for access, but we cannot rule out the use of the A47 as an alternative for high-sided vehicles and local HGV traffic.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

<p><b>Table 15 &amp; 18</b></p> <p>It is noted that approx. 15% of all external HGV movements are from the railport terminal; can it be confirmed that this is the approximate maximum proportion of freight activity that will be related to rail?</p>	<p>We have agreed Trip rates with the TWG ahead of the model run. The railport figures were reviewed in detail and were considered robust.</p> <p>For highway modelling purposes the total HGV movements on and off the public road network on a worst-case scenario is assumed to be c.9,000 total movements per day, of which 1,361 are to and from the rail terminal (this assumes 30% of rail movements stay within the scheme). The percentage of containers assumed by TS to be moved to surrounding areas, off site, via the highway network is 70%; whilst other consented SRFI developments have utilised a lesser figure of 60%, demonstrating our modelling is robust in its assumptions comparatively. A technical note on the Railport Generation of HGV movements can be found at Chapter 8 of the PEIR report within appendix 8.1 (1.3) Appendix D: Baker Rose Technical Note 1; Railport Generation of HGV Movements to and from the Public Highway. This has been agreed with LCC Highways.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>

It would be useful to also be provided with the additional HGV volumes on the relevant links.	Zoomable plots are provided with the new model run. This contains flow change information. Supplied to the TWG.	Y	Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)
<b>Air Quality</b>			
Air Quality impact from the construction phase could be adequately managed through condition.	This will be managed through the CEMP which will be secured by a DCO requirement.	N	Draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1)
An updated air dispersion model should be provided following updates to the transport figures.	This has been provided in the ES.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.3)
An air quality assessment should be provided in relation to the proposed heat and power system.	This has been provided in the ES.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.3)

<p><b>Absence from chapter</b></p> <p>No consideration of the air quality on the HNRFI appears to have been undertaken.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the use of electric vehicles on site.</p>	<p>The HNRFI does not propose any sensitive uses within the Order Limits in accordance with the current UK Air Quality Strategy air quality objectives. However, for completeness we can include consideration of pollutant concentrations across the Site and compare these to the relevant short term air quality objectives to advise with regard to the suitability of the Site for the proposed uses.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Air Quality (Document 6.1.3)</p>
<p><b>Noise &amp; Vibration</b></p>			
<p><b>Noise Impact Assessment</b></p>			
<p>Table 6</p> <p>“Approximately the height of two stacked containers”. Is this the height limit of stacked containers?</p>	<p>Table 6 is detailed within Appendix 10.3. Appendix 10.3 has been provided as it is referenced within the noise and vibration chapter as a source of some of the operational assumptions/sources. However, the data detailed within Table 6 of Appendix 10.3 has not been utilised within the noise and vibration chapter for Hinckley NRFI, and therefore, the reference to the height of the stacked containers is not relevant to the noise and vibration chapter for Hinckley NRFI.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Project Description (Document 6.1.3)</p>



	Project information is provided in ES Chapter 3: Project description.		
Chilled wagons have not been assessed  The air quality assessment will need to be revised should the transport assessment change.	Refrigerated containers and chilled wagons have been accounted for in the noise assessment. Noted	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)
<b>Construction Phase</b>			
<b>10.15</b>  Use the appropriate assessment guidance where construction activities would take place for longer than 6 months.	Given the size of the development site, it is considered unlikely that earthworks would take place close to any one receptor for a period longer than 6 months, where noise from this source would dominate.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)
<b>10.20</b>  Where will the initial site access be?	The site access, off the junction 2 roundabout, will be the first element to be built.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)

<p><b>10.22</b></p> <p>Construction Phase traffic assessments will need to be phased to cater for the access from the north once the A47 link is operational.</p>	<p>Worst case assessments for the site access have been covered within the final ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Transport and traffic (Document 6.1.8)</p>
<p><b>10.92</b></p> <p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC) recommended hours of operation for construction works are : Monday – Friday 07:30 – 18:00, Saturday 08:00 – 13:00, No working on Sundays and Bank Holidays. This is addressed in paragraph 10.208 which provides acceptable proposed hours of operation.</p>	<p>In consultation with contractors, it is proposed to extend these hours to allow contractors to make good use of daylight during longer days to compensate for shorter daylight hours in the autumn and winter. Longer working hours also allow for time to be made up to compensate for time lost to bad weather. The construction hours proposed are Monday to Saturday 7 -7 with no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays, these would be secured by a DCO requirement.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1)</p>
<p><b>10.87/Table 10.23</b></p> <p>The dwelling to the South-west of the junction link on Leicester Road should be included within the assessment.</p>	<p>It is assumed this relates to Houston Lodge, which is included within the final ES. It is also noted that there is a new traveller camp located just off Leicester Road. This has also been considered as a receptor within the final ES. At this stage, it has been assumed that</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>

It is unclear whether the construction of the A47 link road is included within the figures presented in table 10.23.	construction of the A47 link road would be covered within elements 1 – 4, detailed within Table 10.22 Assumed construction plant details, which includes site preparation, foundation works, building erection and road surfacing. This assessment has been updated for the ES, once further information is available.		
<b>Construction Vibration</b>			
Plant should be sensitively selected (i.e. rotary bored in preference to driven piles) and monitoring provided for.	This will be considered as part of detailed design.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)
<b>Completed Development</b>			
No consideration has been given to noise generated from the lorry park/ driver welfare area.	This is included within the final ES.	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)
<b>10.109</b>	Appendix 10.3 references some of the assumptions used for the operational activities.	N	Environmental Statement

<p>Unknown whether there is a proposed speed limit for the site. Appendix 10.3 states that “The speed used for all vehicles is 20 km/h”.</p>	<p>This does not include the speed of HGVs moving around the site, and therefore this sentence is not relevant to the noise and vibration chapter for Hinckley NRFI.</p>		<p>Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>Table 10.33</b></p> <p>The use of electric onsite vehicles and plant should be explored to reduce noise.</p>	<p>The noise assessment has considered the use of diesel operated vehicles which presents a robust assessment. Should electric vehicles be used in the future, then this will present a betterment in terms of noise.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>10.112</b></p> <p>If transport figures are revised, then the number of HGV passbys may need revising.</p>	<p>This has been updated as more information has become available.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>10.127</b> <b>Table 10.34 Onward</b></p> <p>NSR’s 21, 22 and 23 have not been included in the tables and they should be.</p>	<p>As discussed in the meeting held on 16th March 2022, due to the distance from the proposed</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>

	<p>HNRFI, long-term background noise monitoring has not been undertaken at these receptors. Further assessment work has been undertaken for these receptors and presented to Giles Rawdon dated March 2022. The receptors have also been included within the ES Chapter</p>		<p>Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>10.38</b></p> <p>Unclear how the results for NSR’s 21,22 and 23 have been arrived at. The ambient noise levels used should be justified.</p> <p><b>Table 10.50 Onward</b></p> <p>All receptors should be included to demonstrate predicted noise levels at all NSR’s.</p> <p>Insufficient detail has been provided for the appropriateness of the mitigation proposed to be assessed.</p>	<p>The background noise levels have been derived following statistical analysis of the measured 15-minute LA90 values for the daytime and night-time periods. This includes review of the min, max, mean, mode and median values, and the analysis has been undertaken for both the weekday and weekend periods. The ambient noise levels have been derived using the logarithmic average of the measured LAeq,15m levels for the daytime and night-time periods. The lowest level for the weekday and weekend periods has been used within the assessment.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>

	<p>Notwithstanding the above, an updated baseline noise survey was undertaken by BWB Consulting in April 2021 and therefore the assessment has been updated to reflect the results of the baseline noise survey. As discussed, given the distance between the proposed NRFI and these receptors, it is considered that the main source of noise affecting these receptors will be noise from the proposed A47 link road. To determine the impact from this source, it is proposed to undertake a measurement in accordance with the shortened procedure detailed within Calculation of Road Traffic Noise, which is detailed, together with the assessment, in the final ES chapter. Notwithstanding this, the resultant levels associated with the proposed operational noise of the NRFI are detailed above.</p>		
<p><b>10.242</b></p> <p>The use of electric plant equipment should be explored for air quality and noise reasons.</p>	<p>This will be considered at detailed design.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>Appendix 10.3</b></p>			

<p>“It is understood that the proposed gantry cranes used at the intermodal freight terminal will be electrically powered and fitted with broadband noise movement alarms”</p>	<p>Appendix 10.3 has been provided as some of the data was used within the PEIR document. However, it was not specifically produced for the HNRFI and therefore the statement is not relevant to Hinckley NRFI. Notwithstanding this, it is understood that consideration will be given to plant selection at the appropriate time.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>Noise from fixed plant, equipment and break-out noise</b></p>			
<p><b>10.28</b></p> <p>The cumulative effect of all external plant and activities needs to be considered. The potential exists for earlier development to “use up” limits leaving little room for future areas- particularly if full details are not known. It may be useful to zone limits to areas.</p>	<p>This has been addressed in the final ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>Noise from off-site rail movements</b></p>			
<p><b>10.158, 10.160</b></p> <p>Have these figures been accepted as accurate?</p>	<p>Baseline figures have been revised for the ES, however it is unlikely that the impact would change significantly.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>

<p><b>Vibration from off-site rail movements</b></p> <p>A detailed vibration assessment is to follow.</p>	<p>It was stated that further vibration monitoring and detailed vibration assessment would be included within the ES . However, the additional trains are not dependant on the Proposed Development being brought forward and the running of these trains will be managed by third parties. Therefore, the vibration impacts from the additional trains are outside the scope of this assessment. Notwithstanding this, the results of the vibration monitoring indicate that the existing vibration levels are low. Given that the existing line will be located between the HRNFI and the nearest receptors, and that the nearest dwelling to the Proposed Development is located approximately 90m from the proposed sidings, rail vibration is currently at levels considered to be low, to the extent whereby the additional vibration generated by the Proposed Development is unlikely to result in a significant impact.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Noise (Document 6.1.10)</p>
<p><b>Off-site road traffic noise impacts</b></p> <p>Dwellings are located adjacent the roundabout of the A47/Leicester Road (4668). Noise impact from</p>	<p>As discussed previously, short-term monitoring has been undertaken in the vicinity of Leicester</p>	<p>N</p>	



the increased traffic volume and changes to the road should be assessed for these properties.	Road, and an assessment at these receptors has been included within the final ES.		
<b>A47 Link Road</b>			
<p><b>Table 10.48</b></p> <p>A high and medium impact from the A47 link is predicted at NSR's 21 and 22 which are in the HBBC area. Further work is required to understand and determine the noise impact and include other nearby dwellings (dwellings South West of the junction to the link on Leicester Road).</p>	Short-term monitoring has been undertaken in the vicinity of Leicester Road, and an assessment at these receptors has been included within the final ES.	N	
<b>Landscape and Visual Effects</b>			
<p><b>Consultation</b></p> <p>In addition to consultation as part of the scoping process, the Applicant has undertaken further consultation with BDC, HBBC LCC as summarised in Table 11.4 and paragraphs 11.32-34. The summary demonstrates that the photo viewpoint locations have been agreed with key consultees.</p>	Agreed	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Landscape (Document Reference)
<p><b>Guidance</b></p> <p>The methodology used is appropriate.</p>	Agreed	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and

			visual effects (Document 6.1.11)
<p><b>Thresholds for significance</b></p> <p>A matrix based approach is used to identify significance.</p>	Agreed	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)
<p><b>Study Area</b></p> <p>The study area is small for a development of this size.</p> <p>Some landscape/townscape receptors within the 2km study area have not been assessed. (Considered further below).</p>	<p>The rationale for the study area was set out in para 1.17 of Appendix 11.1 and paras 11.22 to 11.25 of PEIR Chapter 11. Note that the 2km distance is for the 'detailed study area' whilst 5km is the 'broad study area' in which landscape and visual amenity has still been considered.</p> <p>LUC responded in consultation on 04/04/22 - "We agree that 2km is sufficient providing indirect effects on landscape / townscape character within 2km are assessed as you state below. We note that there are viewpoints up to around 4.5km away."</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)

	Additional receptors identified by LUC have been included in the ES.		
<p><b>Landscape &amp; Visual Receptors</b></p> <p>The Applicant has not considered effects on townscape receptors / settlements.</p>	Indirect effects upon Urban Character Areas (UCAs) and Settlement Character Areas (SCAs) has been undertaken as part of the full ES.	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)
<p><b>2.17</b></p> <p>Further assessment should be included to consider the impact upon Urban Character Areas (UCAs) in HBBC or 'Settlement Character Areas' in BDC. Where urban areas are excluded from this assessment this should be justified.</p> <p>The Applicant should consider the potential for indirect effects on the character of these areas relating to intervisibility with neighbouring LCAs within the site.</p> <p>The Applicant has only considered the sensitivity of the LCA to the component of the project located within it and does not consider the sensitivity to</p>	<p>Assessment of UCAs and SCA's is included in the Landscape and Visual ES Chapter. including indirect effects upon on the character of these areas.</p> <p>A breakdown of value and susceptibility for landscape and visual receptors is provided within the ES.</p> <p>The ES assessment tables include references where sensitivity is considered different to the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment produced by LUC (Blaby Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment)</p>	N	Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)

<p>development in neighbouring LCAs. It is considered that this has the potential to ‘underplay’ the sensitivity of the receptor.</p> <p>There is no explanation provided for the ‘medium’ sensitivity to transport infrastructure identified for the Burbage Common Rolling Farmland LCA or the ‘very low’ sensitivity to transport infrastructure identified for the Hinckley UCA.</p> <p>No reference is made to the ‘key sensitivities and values’ set out in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Landscape Character Assessment (2017).</p> <p>The Applicant should also consider the sensitivity of LCAs to the project to consider the potential for indirect effects on landscape character (visual character and perceptual character).</p> <p>There are no judgements on susceptibility and value for any of the assessed LCAs. Overall, there is not enough information to understand how judgements have been reached.</p>			
<p><b>Visual Baseline</b></p> <p>The viewpoints related to visual receptors were agreed with LCC and HBBC as set out in Table 11.2 of Chapter 11.</p>	<p>There are a number of views from PRoW within the site, which include Photoviewpoints 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 37.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>

<p>Viewpoints within the PRoW and realigned PRoW should be included, along with an assessment of the effect on the experience of users of these rights of way should be considered.</p> <p>There is no map showing which groups of dwellings have been assessed so it is difficult to say if any key settlements have been missed.</p> <p>Nine of the viewpoints are representative of night-time views in addition to day-time views, as agreed with LCC and HBBC. No description of baseline night-time views is provided in the LVIA.</p> <p>Wireline photomontages have been prepared from 10 of the photoviewpoints, as agreed with LCC and HBBC.</p>	<p>A plan of residential receptors is included in the ES</p> <p>The night-time assessment has been undertaken in accordance with our LVIA methodology contained within Appendix 11.1. An appraisal of baseline views and an assessment has been provided within the ES. Note that reference to nine should be ten (Photoviewpoints 9, 12, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 32, 38 and 41 as illustrated on Figure 11.11 and 11.12).</p> <p>Night-time visualisations are included within the ES.</p>		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
<p><b>Assessment of effects during construction, including objectivity</b></p> <p>Landscape and visual effects during construction are identified as being adverse.</p> <p>Construction effects are also identified as being temporary and short-term, although it is noted in Chapter 3 of the PEIR that the phased construction works will take up to 10 years to implement. In our opinion 10 years is medium term.</p>	<p>Indirect effects upon non-host LCAs are included within the full ES.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Project Description (Document 6.1.3)</p>

<p>The Applicant has not considered the potential for indirect effects on landscape character, for example the potential for the large-scale warehousing to affect the key characteristics in a neighbouring LCA.</p>			
<p><b>Application of the method</b></p> <p>The Applicant has not identified the size/scale of effects or magnitude of change in the PEIR and should confirm that these judgements will be provided in the ES.</p>	<p>These are provided in the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Landscape and visual effects (Document 6.1.11)</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Effects</b></p> <p>There is no assessment of cumulative effects in Chapter 11 of the PEIR. Potential cumulative schemes are shown on Figure 20.1 in Chapter 20: Cumulative and In-combination Effects.</p>	<p>Cumulative assessment forms part of the ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

<p><b>Effects of Lighting</b></p> <p>There is no methodology for the assessment of lighting. No baseline descriptions of lighting are provided in relation to landscape character or views.</p> <p>In the assessment of landscape and visual effects the Applicant should describe baseline levels of lighting and an assessment of lighting on landscape and visual receptors, including mitigation.</p>	<p>As stated, a narrative is provided for in the ES with regard to potential lighting impacts. This is based on a Lighting Strategy for the Proposed Development which will be secured as a requirement of the DCO.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Lighting Strategy (Document 6.2.3.2)</p>
<p>Interrelationship of the LVIA with other chapters of the ES</p> <p>There is a brief reference to the Ecology chapter in paragraph 11.170 in relation to hedgerow losses and gains. It is stated that 12.67km of hedgerows in moderate condition would be lost and 1.32km in poor condition would be lost. 13.76km of new hedgerow would be created on site, whilst 9.19ha of woodland vegetation would be planted.</p> <p>There is also a brief reference to the Heritage chapter (paragraph 11.80) in relation to the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A cumulative impact assessment is provided as part of the final ES.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

<p>character of the site. In Table 11.2 it is stated that there is a “close working relationship between landscape and heritage disciplines” and “Cross-referencing between chapters will be provided in the forthcoming ES”, in response to comments from Historic England.</p>			
<p><b>Photography and visualisation</b></p> <p>No methodology is provided to produce visualisations. They show the ‘maximum development parameters’ which we agree is the worst case scenario for the LVIA, and do not include mitigation.</p> <p>It is noted that separate ‘wirelines’ illustrating the scheme layout are included as part of the consultation documents, but it is not clear if these have informed the LVIA.</p> <p>Most of the baseline photography has been taken in winter, which is appropriate as it shows the ‘worst case’ visibility of the site. It would be useful if direction of photograph was shown on a figure as difficult to orientate</p> <p>Baseline photography has been provided for some of the agreed night- time viewpoints but no visualisations.</p>	<p>The visualisation methodology is in accordance with LI Guidance. A full methodology is included in the ES Chapter. Directions of view have been included in updated Photo viewpoint mapping figures.</p>	<p>Y</p>	



<p><b>LVIA clarifications</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a justification for the 2km study area – given the potential wide visibility of the scheme</li> <li>• Provide reasoning and justification why an assessment of effects on townscape receptors / settlements within 2km of the site (UCAs in HBBC and ‘Settlement Character Areas’ in BDC), has not been undertaken, as agreed.</li> <li>• Provide reasoning and justification why indirect effect on LCAs within 2km of the site has not been undertaken (indirect effects on the perceptual aspects of landscape character (including views)).</li> <li>• Clarify that the sensitivity of LCAs has been identified with reference to judgements on susceptibility and value as set out in the LVIA methodology in Appendix 11.1. Show how judgements on susceptibility and value have been derived for the landscape and visual receptors and applied in practice. For landscape refer to sensitivity and values set out in the relevant LCA and provide clear links back to evidence to underpin professional judgements. Provide information to show how the judgements have been reached.</li> </ul>	<p>As above</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>
---	-----------------	----------	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a map showing which groups of dwellings have been assessed in relation to visual amenity and explain why any have been scoped out.</li>   <li>• Provide a methodology for the assessment of night-time lighting effects. Include a description of existing (baseline) views at night- time from the nine representative night-time photo viewpoints, with reference to the night-time baseline photography provided in the PEIR. Include an assessment of effects of lighting in accordance with the agreed methodology, with reference to night- time visualisations from agreed viewpoints.</li>   <li>• Clarify that judgements for magnitude of change will be provided in the ES, with reference to the “size and scale of the change, its duration and reversibility” as set out in the methodology in Appendix 11.1, paragraph A1.11.</li>   <li>• Clarify the methodology used to produce visualisations which accompany the ES and the separate package of ‘wirelines’ which illustrate the development proposals and are included in the consultation material. Include clarification of the heights of vegetation modelled in the Year 15 ‘wirelines’. Include map showing direction of view on the photos to help the users orientate.</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide justification why an additional viewpoint representing the users of rights of way that cross the site is not included in the LVIA.</li> <li>• Provide a clear reference for when effects are short term and clarify what short term means in terms of number of years.</li> <li>• Clarify how cumulative effects are/will be dealt with in the LVIA.</li> <li>• Clarify that the maximum/optimum measures have been put in place to mitigate significant adverse landscape and visual effects of the scheme.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Opinion and recommendations</b></p> <p>The proposed rail freight infrastructure is a major development (height and scale) with significant landscape and visual effects that are far reaching.</p> <p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) map indicates theoretical visibility from parts of all of these settlements and surrounding landscapes.</p>	Noted	N	

<p><b>Landscape effects</b></p> <p>There are potential views to the site from the following character areas Burbage Common Rolling Farmland and a small part of Stoke Golding Rolling Farmland in Hinckley and Bosworth, and Elmesthorpe Floodplain, Aston Flamville Wooded Farmland, Stoney Stanton Rolling Farmland and Soar Meadows in Blaby.</p> <p>The settlements of Burbage, Hinckley, Barwell and Earl Shilton are all within 2km of the site in the HBBC area. Aston Flamville, Blaby, Sharnford, Sapcote and Elmesthorpe are all within 2km of the site in the BDC area.</p> <p>The development would be imposed within this rural setting. The size and scale of the development means it is far more dominant in many views from surrounding landscapes and settlements than the existing linear infrastructure.</p> <p>The LVIA records significant residual effects at year 1 and year 15 for two landscape character areas (LCA 1: Aston Flamville and LCA 6 Elmesthorpe Floodplain), indicating that mitigation proposals are not effective in reducing significant effects.</p>	<p>Further justification and narrative on judgements is provided within the ES Chapter and supporting appendices.</p>	<p>Y</p>	
--	---	----------	--

<p>The impact on the landscape has been under assessed as indirect impacts are not taken into consideration.</p> <p>The overall positive beneficial effects recorded for Burbage Common Rolling Farmland are questioned.</p> <p>The LVIA does not currently consider effects on the urban and settlement character areas within the 2km study area as requested in the scoping consultation.</p>			
<p><b>Visual Effects</b></p> <p>The LVIA records a significant beneficial effect in relation to open access land and the new area of public open space adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park, from the western end of Burbage Common Road. This is an unlikely conclusion given the scale of changes expected here.</p>	<p>Further justification and narrative on judgements is provided within the ES Chapter and supporting appendices.</p>	<p>N</p>	
<p><b>Summary of landscape and visual effects</b></p> <p>As a result of the HNRFI permanent, significant residual adverse effects will be experienced for many landscape and visual receptors. The LVIA shows that for most receptors these cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>Further justification and narrative on judgements is provided for within the ES Chapter and supporting appendices.</p>	<p>N</p>	

<p>While the full assessment of night- time/lighting impacts is yet to be undertaken as part of the LVIA it can be assumed that these permanent adverse effects will be experienced at day and night.</p>			
<p><b>Mitigation and enhancement</b></p> <p>One of the clarifications on the LVIA is the growth rates assumed for tree and woodland planting in the visualisations/wirelines. These look to be quite ambitious in terms of the height and degree of screening expected to be provided at year 15.</p> <p>In our opinion, mitigation of the landscape and visual effects of a scheme of this scale is very difficult/impossible.</p> <p>There are also concerns related to the proposed mitigation including the realignment of the network of rights of way to a corridor along the M69 – resulting in a very different experience for users, and the segregation of the proposed new areas of open space ‘common land’ (Burbage Common) west by the new link road – limiting its use and appeal</p> <p>Although unlikely to mitigate significant effects, it is considered that the design of the current layout</p>	<p>Estimated growth rates are set out in Table 1.10 of Appendix 11.1 of the ES. (6.2.11.1) and are considered to be a conservative estimate as described.</p> <p>The realignment of rights of way across the site will indeed result in a different experience to the current one. However, every effort has been made to create a strong sense of separation between the recreational users of those rights of way and the operational activities of the site, with broad green corridors being provided to accommodate equestrian, cycle and pedestrian users.</p> <p>The new areas of open space are located on the south side of the A47 Link Road directly adjacent to the Burbage Common and Woods Country Park; there will be no separation by a road.</p> <p>The design has been amended as follows:</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>could be improved by considering the objectives as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The siting and form of buildings and use of materials and colours should be given careful consideration;</li> <li>• Mitigation of the potential effects associated with lighting;</li> <li>• Refer to measures in HBBC updated Green Infrastructure Strategy (May 2020) - range of interventions and opportunities for GI provision within the Southern GI Zone which could contribute towards enhancement and mitigation opportunities including enhancing the Southern Green Wedge, delivering a more resilient Burbage Common and Woods Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and increased woodland planting;</li> </ul> <p>A more ambitious landscape enhancement scheme could be provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maximum height parameter has been reduced by 2-5m in response to consultation.</li> <li>• The landscape strategy has evolved since the consultation to include additional land north of the railway line.</li> </ul>		
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>			
<p><b>13.42</b></p> <p>The three designated heritage assets within the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council administrative area (the grade I listed building</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Church of St Mary, Barwell; the grade II* listed building Church of St Simon and St Jude, Earl Shilton; and the grade II* listed building Church of St Catherine, Burbage) are considered to be sensitive receptors, due to the potential for development within the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of these churches from the wider landscape and erode their historical wider agricultural setting in views from the churchyard.</p>			
<p><b>13.135</b></p> <p>The significance of each of the three churches will be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within their wider setting. In regard to the Church of St Mary and the Church of St Catherine the predicted visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site will adversely affect the ability to appreciate these two churches in context with their historical agricultural setting. For all three churches the appreciation of their significance will also be affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised views towards the church tower and/or spires from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site.</p> <p>Whilst HBBC agree that there will be adverse effects resulting from the Proposed Development within</p>	<p>The ES/PEIR does not conflate non-significant effects with 'no harm' in terms of the NPPF. This is made clear in the ES, where in the conclusion to the ES the level of harm in terms of the NPPF is articulated for each relevant asset.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.1.13)</p>



<p>the Main HNRFI Site that cannot be mitigated, and agree with the resulting level of impact identified, care should be taken to not conflate a 'not significant' impact as concluded within the PEIR (in EIA terms) with no harm. The Proposed Development within the Main HNRFI Site will result in harm to three designated heritage assets in terms of national and local planning policy. This level of level of harm would be less than substantial.</p>			
<b>Energy and Climate Change</b>			
<p><b>General</b></p> <p>The proposal should be assessed in accordance with national and international climate change policy and agreements.</p> <p>There is limited analysis without access to the evidence base and data submission particularly where carbon emissions in the local area are relevant to assessment of impacts.</p> <p>The traffic modelling has not necessarily been run through or tested thoroughly leaving gaps in the understanding on the number of lorries using the local roads as well as major highway interchanges. Therefore, it is unknown what the emissions will be in the local area- it is likely it will increase due to the increase in vehicles</p>	<p>Climate change impacts have been assessed in Chapter 18 of the ES, with the significance of effects considered within the context of the UK's net zero commitments. The legislative policy context is discussed further in Chapter 18. A breakdown of greenhouse gas emissions is provided in the chapter, with further details of the evidence base in its appendices.</p> <p>Up to date traffic modelling data has been provided for ES Chapter 18.</p> <p>With regard to the point about greenhouse gas emissions in the local area, the cumulative effects of are a global issue but are based on the traffic modelling of changes in vehicles on the local road network.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

<p>This means carbon/climate impacts on Hinckley have not been fully considered. There is no carbon emission breakdown.</p>			
<p><b>18.35</b> HBBC climate change strategy is live on the website.</p>	Noted	N	N/a
<p><b>18.38</b> The Promoter has correctly taken a position on the adoption of a precautionary approach to the assessment with recommendations expected to be made to reduce unmitigated emissions and incorporate mitigation measures (such as renewable energy sources and low carbon materials) into the Proposed Developments design. However, despite this assurance they are clear that a qualitative assessment is not feasible, and that further assessment is conditioned at an appropriate stage to ensure minimum target reductions are achieved.</p>	Further assessment is provided in Chapter 18 and its appendices, which set out the committed measures to mitigate GHG emissions.	Y	Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)
<p><b>18.43</b></p>		N	Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change

<p>We would have thought that given the significance of GHG in relation to modal shift the headline implications of GHG assessment could be provided.</p>	<p>Assessment of GHG emissions is provided in Chapter 18 and its appendices, which set out the committed measures to mitigate GHG emissions.</p>		<p>(Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p><b>18.53</b></p> <p>Full carbon emissions are not known as sources have been excluded.</p>	<p>The inclusion of quantified GHG emissions data for scope 2 (indirect assessments / embodied carbon) is more likely where relevant quantified information is already available for the project (e.g. material quantities or vehicle movements) that can be used to determine corresponding GHG emissions. In the absence of such data, a quantifiable assessment has been offered as is preferred as a lack of data also means that there are no meaningful benchmarks against which to judge significance. Assessment of GHG emissions is provided in Chapter 18 and its appendices. Tables 18.4 and 18.8 set out the exclusions and limitations to the assessment, how these have been addressed (within the scope of a proportionate ES chapter) through qualitative assessment where required.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p><b>18.58</b></p> <p>No quantification of GHG emissions from worker commuting can be undertaken at this stage as</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 – Site Selection and Evolution (Document Reference 6.1.4)</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and</p>

<p>estimates of worker numbers are not yet available. HGV movements are expected to be 15% of the operational flows and are therefore not considered significant when compared with the worst-case scenario. We would have expected that some of the parameter plans might conceivably be used in providing some depth of understand on emissions.</p>	<p>In keeping with advice form the Planning Inspectorate (Advice Note 9), the Rochdale Envelope uses a number of parameters to define the project description. A parameter is a fixed part of the proposed scheme and to which subsequent reserved matters submissions will adhere to.</p>		<p>Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p><b>18.60</b></p> <p>As construction details are indicative, it is difficult to offer any meaningful insights on impacts at this stage without a better understanding of the baseline on which this assessment is being made.</p> <p>Concerns that the operational assessment assumptions are not robust as they are based on the scenarios modelled with the appropriate Pan Regional Transport Model (PRTM). Further assessment should be undertaken.</p>	<p>Chapter 18 provides quantitative assessments of vehicular GHG emissions and embodied carbon. The CEMP and CTMP set out measures to reduce GHG emissions associated with these sources and are included in the submission documents. The transport modelling is set out in the Transport Assessment and the impacts assessed in Chapter 18 are based on this.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 17.6)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>

<p><b>18.140</b></p> <p>We have strong underlying concerns at the lack of information on carbon footprint of construction plant at this stage.</p>	<p>The justification for exclusion of construction plant emissions from the assessment is set out in Chapter 18. – this in keeping with the Scoping Opinion taken from the PINS. The exclusion of construction plant emissions from a quantitative assessment has been set out in the chapter as follows: "<i>At the time of writing, there is insufficient information available to quantify direct GHG emissions associated with construction plant. However, this source of emissions is not expected to significantly affect the overall GHG emissions during the Construction Stage as according to a report from the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (2010), direct and indirect GHG emissions due to on-site operations generally contributes less than 1% of total emissions for projects. Nevertheless, mitigation measures have been recommended within the 'Proposed Mitigation' section of this Chapter to reduce GHG emissions from construction plant</i>", It is therefore proposed in the ES that the lifecycle of the detailed design and subsequent applications is determined when the information to complete a meaningful assessment is available.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p><b>18.142</b></p>	<p>Chapter 18 and Appendix 18.2 (Embodied Carbon Report) set out the development's mitigation</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement</p>

<p>All materials used should be sourced in the UK where possible to reduce the embodied carbon.</p>	<p>commitment to achieve zero carbon in construction. This would be achieved through a range of measures, to be explored and quantified through further lifecycle analysis during detailed design. Local sourcing of materials will be one factor considered, and this is also set out as a good management measure in the CEMP to reduce transport impacts.</p>		<p>Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document 17.6)</p>
<p><b>18.150</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that GHG emissions from the operation of the Proposed Development are likely to have an adverse impact.</p> <p>The assumption that despite the lack of information on the detail of the technologies and designs, the magnitude of change in GHG emissions is still considered to result in a permanent minor adverse effect lacks justification.</p>	<p>The impact assessment with description of the criteria used to determine the magnitude of impact and significance of effect is set out in Chapter 18 and its appendices. These also set out the embedded and committed mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

<p><b>18.153</b></p> <p>The GHG emissions resultant from rail operations associated with the Proposed Development are likely to have an adverse impact.</p> <p>We are concerned that not enough justification or explanation is offered on the magnitude of change in GHG emissions.</p>	<p>The impact assessment with description of the criteria used to determine the magnitude of impact and significance of effect is set out in Chapter 18 and its appendices.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p>
<p><b>18.160</b></p> <p>The time scales for the assessment of energy use for heating cooling and lighting are unclear.</p> <p>Renewable energy sources should be considered.</p> <p>A breakdown of the energy sources and the associated emissions should be provided.</p> <p>Emissions which, during operation, are expected to be reported as they contribute to the total emissions</p>	<p>The impact of operational energy use is detailed in Chapter 18 and Appendix 18.1 (Energy Strategy). This includes a breakdown of expected operational energy demand and proposed use of renewables, taking into consideration demands such as EV charging.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document 6.1.18)</p> <p>Appendix 6.1.18.1 Energy Strategy (Document Reference)</p>

<p><b>18.161</b></p> <p>An energy monitoring system should be installed.</p> <p>It is expected that carbon emissions will be monitored and reported, therefore, usage needs to be tracked and known from the start.</p>	<p>All electricity demands will be metered locally and with sufficient resolution for benchmarking and management actions to be taken. All switchgear will include smart-building interfaces and support smart controls. This will allow the optimum mix of PV, storage and grid to be managed throughout the life of the site.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p><b>18.162</b></p> <p>Electric vehicle charging points have been poorly explored.</p> <p>18.165 states EV charging points could increase electricity requirements, but if this were to be renewably sourced, there is the potential for electricity demand to be produced on site.</p>	<p>Chapter 18, Appendix 18.1 (Energy Strategy) and Appendix 18.2 (Embodied Carbon Report) set out the development’s mitigation commitment to achieve zero carbon in construction and to incorporate renewable energy generation in operation. This would be achieved through a range of measures, to be explored and quantified through further lifecycle analysis during detailed design.</p> <p>A requirement secures 20% EV charging points for parking spaces and 80% spaces with passive provision.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (Document Reference 6.1.18)</p>



<p><b>Table 18.19</b></p> <p>There needs to be more detail on the meaning of significance and why it has been given a rating of not significant. It could be argued that all climate/carbon variables are significant.</p>	<p>The methodology section of Chapter 18 sets out the approach to assessment of significance, in accordance with the applicable IEMA guidance for this topic. It describes five levels of significance which are not solely based on whether a project emits GHG emissions alone, but how the project makes a relative contribution towards achieving a science-based 1.5°C aligned transition towards net zero.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change (Document Reference 6.1.18)</p>
<p><b>18.164</b></p> <p>Further measures to reduce GHG's should be considered.</p>	<p>Chapter 18, Appendix 18.1 (Energy Strategy) and Appendix 18.2 (Embodied Carbon Report) set out the development's mitigation commitment to achieve zero carbon in construction and to incorporate renewable energy generation in operation. This would be achieved through a range of measures, to be explored and quantified through further lifecycle analysis during detailed design.</p> <p>An explanation is provided within the ES. Tritax is establishing an energy services company (ESCo) to manage and adapt the infrastructure through the life of the site - including ongoing investments - as technologies become deployable.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change (Document Reference 6.1.18)</p> <p>Appendix 6.1.18.1 Energy Strategy (Document Reference)</p> <p>Appendix 6.1.18.2</p>

			Embodies Carbon Report
<p><b>18.172</b></p> <p>This statement does not fully assess the significance of the impact. This should be a cumulative assessment and consider the development as this is where significant emissions will be seen.</p> <p>(With the mitigation measures described in Appendix 18.4, it is considered that climate change would have no significant impacts on the Proposed Development)</p>	<p>This statement is a summary. Evidence supporting this conclusion is provided in ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change in which it sets out the broad criteria for the consequence and likelihood of effect which determines the significance. The definition for each respective criteria can be found in the methodological section of the chapter. This is a standard, good practice approach to defining the vulnerability of design proposals to the effects of climatic change.</p> <p>The atmospheric concentration of GHGs and resulting effect on climate change is affected by all sources and sinks globally, anthropogenic and otherwise. As GHG emission impacts and resulting effects are global, the approach to cumulative effects assessment for GHGs differs from that for many EIA topics where only projects within a geographically bounded study area would be included.</p> <p>All global cumulative GHG sources are relevant to the effect on climate change, and this should be taken into account in defining the receptor (the atmospheric concentration of GHGs) as being of 'high' sensitivity to further emissions. Effects of GHG emissions from specific cumulative projects therefore in general should not be individually assessed, as there is no basis</p>	N	<p>ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change (Document Reference 6.1.18)</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

	for selecting any particular (or more than one) cumulative project that has GHG emissions for assessment over any other.		
<p><b>18.187</b></p> <p>When will the end user be defined? This is an important factor when considering climate change and carbon.</p> <p>It is expected that the end user will report emissions annually.</p>	<p>Specific details afforded to the final layout and build is dependent on the market and consumer demands (the ‘end-user’) and will be confirmed later, if consent is achieved. The end-user will therefore determine the size, type, operational hours and function of the final built development.</p> <p>It is important to consider that “the present form of infrastructure operation consists of supply systems provisioning unconstrained demand of end-use products, with larger consumption volumes corresponding to higher economic revenue. An important priority for sustainable infrastructure operation is therefore to analyse the infrastructure end-use service demands, and the variety of end-users’ wants and behaviours” (Knoeri, et al. 2016).</p> <p>Since 1 October 2013 the Companies Act 2006 (Strategic Report and Directors’ Report) Regulations 2013 has required all UK quoted companies to report on their greenhouse gas emissions as part of their annual Directors’ Report. From 1 April 2019, quoted companies must report on their global energy use and large businesses must disclose their UK annual energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. This is required by</p>	N	N/A

	the Companies (Directors' Report) and Limited Liability Partnerships (Energy and Carbon Report) Regulations 2018. The government encourages all other companies to report similarly, although this remains voluntary. It is therefore expected that all end-users will report on their impacts once operational.		
<b>18.188/18.189</b>  Renewable heat sources such as heat pumps, biomass, solar thermal, and waste heat recovery should be implemented at design and construction stage.	PV is being deployed at a substantial scale. Any core heating and cooling will be by heat pump in the base build. Provision for any occupier demand - including the active ESCo are being provided to ensure the site will remain an exemplar for low carbon operations.	N	ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change (Document Reference 6.1.18)  Site Waste and Materials Management Plan (Document 17.4)
<b>18.200</b>  Offsetting should be a last resort. Carbon reduction should be the focus. This should be considered for construction and operation.	The Applicant acknowledges the principles of the mitigation hierarchy for development. It may not be feasible, achievable or practical to achieve true net-zero for a development of this size, scale and nature without procuring means to offset residual effects (as	Y	ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change (Document

	<p>discussed; “TSH intends to offset any outstanding output of carbon following the mitigation measures embedded into the design of the Proposed Development”).</p> <p>A net-zero target is met when residual emissions are offset by CO2 removals. Where a building cannot generate all its own energy and draws energy from the gas or electrical grids, then some form of carbon offsetting would be required to allow the building to be verified as net zero carbon. Likewise achieving a net zero carbon construction would currently require carbon offsetting to negate the embodied carbon emissions (associated with constructing the building) for a project to be verified as net zero carbon in construction. In their Net Zero UK report the Commission on Climate Change (CCC) set out a recommended strategy for the UK to become net zero carbon by 2050. In this report they state: “Most sectors (including buildings and power stations) will need to reduce emissions close to zero without offsetting; the target cannot be met by simply adding mass removal of CO<sub>2</sub> onto existing plans”. They do include a small amount of offsetting in their strategy for the whole UK and point out that this needs to be reserved for the hard-to-treat sectors of aviation, shipping and freight.</p> <p>The Applicant currently measures the carbon in construction of all new buildings, both during the design stage and at practical completion, and to ensure</p>		Reference 6.1.18)
--	--	--	----------------------

	<p>they achieve net zero for construction using UKGBC's net zero framework. The Applicant will apply best practice principles during construction; as set out in the mitigation, construction will aim to reduce its energy and material consumption as far as possible and install heating equipment which does not burn hydrocarbon fuels (gas, oil, biomass etc). The Applicant will also set out management plans to dictate best practice procurement and operation of machinery and plant to best reduce both direct and indirect emissions. Where residual emissions cannot be mitigated, offsetting is utilised using best practice and certified means.</p>		
<p><b>18.202/18.203</b></p> <p>How will the vulnerabilities to climate change be mitigated?</p>	<p>The potential climate vulnerabilities are assessed in Chapter 18, with details of the mitigation measures employed set out in Appendix 18.8 (Embedded Mitigation Measures to Improve Resilience).</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change (Document Reference 6.1.18)</p>

Major Accidents and Disasters			
<p><b>19.5</b></p> <p>We would expect to be advised on and scrutinise all “information about how TSH would respond to accidents with potential off-site emissions. Assessment of accidents should: identify all potential hazards in relation to construction, operation, and decommissioning; include an assessment of the risks posed; and identify risk management measures and contingency actions that will be employed in the event of an accident to mitigate off-site effects.</p> <p>We expect to be part of an iterative design process to be able to provide direct input on measures to manage or avoid the risks identified by PHE during the construction of the SRFI at Hinckley.</p>	<p>Noted, this is reported in the major accidents and disasters chapter in the ES.</p> <p>The Construction Environmental Management Plan which seeks to avoid and mitigate against environmental harm from construction has been shared with the Local Authorities prior to submission of the application. Future phased CEMPs will be a DCO requirement.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 19 - Accidents and disasters (Document 6.1.19)</p> <p>Construction Environment Management Plan (Document 17.1)</p>
<p><b>19.7</b></p> <p>Insufficient information on the ‘expected significant adverse effects of the development on the environment deriving from the vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters which are relevant to the project concerned’ (EIA Regulations 2017, Schedule 4, Paragraph 8).</p>	<p>Further information is provided in the major accidents and disasters chapter of the ES.</p>	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 19 - Accidents and disasters (Document</p>

			reference 6.1.19)
<p><b>19.13</b></p> <p>We understand that during the consultation / pre-application stages, TSH have continued to consult with local police, fire, ambulance and health services and Network Rail. We are not entirely clear as to what extent and on what basis this consultation has taken place. Concerns of whether the design for HNRFI will take into account all these considerations including access for the emergency and security services.</p>	<p>As prescribed consultees the police, fire and rescue and health services have been consulted. Work has been ongoing with Network Rail for several years to go through the GRIP process and Network Rail are also a statutory consultee. The design of the HNRFI takes into account all of these responses. Access for emergency services is also covered by the relevant Building Regulations.</p>	Y	<p>Parameters Plan (Document reference 5.12)</p> <p>Rail Operations Report (Document reference 6.2.3.1)</p>
<b>Cumulative Effects Assessment</b>			
<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>Concern over the lack of robustness in the structure of a CEA.</p>	<p>The process for CEA follows the structure set out by PINS in their advice note on cumulative effects. It is considered an industry standard robust approach to assessing cumulative effects. The process to date has identified potential sites to be considered through a range of sources including the Transport Working Group and LPA and PINS searches for live applications. In addition, the consultation on the PEIR requested that the planning authorities identified additional sites, that may not have been identified through the long list process to ensure a comprehensive coverage of</p>	Y	<p>ES Chapter 20 Cumulative and in Combination Effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>



	<p>cumulative sites. The assessment presented in the PEIR is a preliminary assessment based on the technical assessment work that had been completed to date, this has been updated as part of the ES. As part of this, mitigation measures identified for the individual topic assessments are considered alongside the necessity for further mitigation measures to address any significant effects identified.</p>		
<p><b>The Current Consultation</b></p> <p>We would expect to have proactive engagement with the Promoter on the parameters of the Zol as well as supporting the any assessment of in-combination and cumulative impact in accordance with Table 2 in Advice Note 17.</p>	<p>The Zol have been identified in consultation with technical specialists and are in line with the guidance provided in advice note 17 and industry standard best practice and technical guidance. As part of the consultation on the PEIR respondents were requested to identify additional sites that may not have been picked up through the Zol review. We will undertake further reviews in line with the Zol prior to submission to ensure a comprehensive approach to the CEA process.</p>	Y	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 20 - Cumulative and in-combination effects (Document Reference 6.1.20)</p>

<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>This chapter specifically covers Health and Wellbeing.</p>	<p>There is no standalone health and well-being chapter. There is however a Health and Equality Briefing Note).</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Appendix 7.1 (Health and Equality Briefing Note 6.2.7.1)</p>
<p><b>Baseline &amp; PEIR Review</b></p> <p>Nitrogen dioxide is recognised as a no threshold pollutant i.e. there is no ‘safe’ level of exposure and so any increase in this will have a detrimental effect on residents’ health.</p> <p>Thus, based on the WHO standard which better reflects the no threshold health impacts of nitrogen dioxide, there are some quite significant increases in nitrogen dioxide pollution, both relative to the standard and the existing pollution levels. We cannot see reference to this.</p>	<p>The air quality assessment has been undertaken in the ES, utilising the current relevant UK Air Quality Strategy objectives as these are the only air quality objectives currently in law in the UK.</p> <p>The WHO limit values are lower than the UK air quality objectives and background pollutant concentrations across large areas of the UK, especially in cities such as London and Birmingham, are already exceeding the WHO limit values, without consideration of any emissions associated with road traffic or other sources.</p> <p>With that in mind, the pollutant concentrations predicted at all receptor locations in both the opening and completion years were below the current UK air quality objectives by some headroom and a number of receptors were also compliant with the WHO limit values. The significance of the impact of the</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>ES Chapter 9 (Document Reference 6.1.9)</p>

	<p>development on local air quality is based on reviewing the percentage change in pollutant concentration relative to the percentage of the relevant air quality objective. It is therefore considered that, as the proposed development has a less than 0.5% change in pollutant concentrations at the majority of receptor locations, the impact of the development would remain negligible and not significant overall when compared to the WHO limit values. It should be noted that the proposed development represents a reduction in pollutant concentrations at a number of receptors within the HBBC area and therefore, the scheme represents a benefit to air quality in these locations through the rerouting of existing traffic onto roads away from densely populated areas.</p> <p>There is currently no requirement for the WHO values to be assessed for development applications hence this was not undertaken in the air quality assessment in the PEIR and was not requested by HBBC at the time of consultation, nor in further communications with the Environmental Health Officer following their review of the air quality assessment presented in the PEIR.</p>		
<p>It is unclear how new footpaths and cycleway link to existing or planned infrastructure beyond the site.</p> <p>Cycle infrastructure should be supported by secure cycle storage.</p>	<p>Refer to the PROW strategy and the Sustainable Transport Strategy to understand how footpaths and cycleways link beyond the site.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference)</p>

	<p>Cycle storage would be provided on site and changing / shower facilities are part of standard spec for the proposed buildings.</p>		<p>6.2.11.2)</p> <p>Appendix 14 to Transport Assessment (Document reference 8.1)</p>
<p>The update of circular routes within the site will depend on the detailed design to ensure there's appeal and that people on the site would want (and enjoy) to use them on a regular basis.</p>	<p>Noted – footpath connections have been enhanced Additional land has been included in the redline on the north western side of the railway line to provide more strategic landscaping adjacent to the rail line to improve amenity for the relocated PRowS and provide better screening of the development from north of the railway.</p> <p>Improved connectivity between the onsite footpath / cycleway network and the proposed public footpath / bridleway network via an additional link between units 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Illustrative Masterplan (Document Reference 2.3)</p> <p>Appendix 11.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.2)</p>

Conclusions			
<p><b>Summary of Work to date</b></p> <p>The process of detailed technical review of the project will be critical to the robustness of the assessment.</p> <p>As it currently stands, we have considerable misgivings on the indicative weighting of the magnitude of the effects of the Proposed Development at this stage, given the concerns raised above on the methodology of the assessments and the lack of information and detail in the documentation.</p>	<p>Methodologies, where feasible, have been agreed with local authorities and statutory undertakers and the highway modelling work has been undertaken using Leicestershire County Council’s Pan Regional Transport Model. The information and technical reports provided for statutory consultation were very detailed documents which had been informed by significant survey and technical work following on from the two rounds of informal consultation held in 2018 and 2019.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1)</p>
<p><b>21.3 / Table 21.1</b></p> <p>We expect to be able to review and sign off a Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (“REAC”).</p> <p>Based upon the work undertaken to date an emerging REAC is not a schedule that the joint working groups have had an opportunity to digest in detail given the outline nature of the PEIR. There are concerns on some of the principal justifications and securing mechanisms where we believe gaps exist in</p>	<p>The REAC forms an integral part of the DCO and is presented in the Environmental Statement that accompanies the DCO application.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 21 - Conclusions (Document Reference (6.1.21))</p>

<p>the data, incomplete design and baseline data resulting in the commitments provided in table 21.1.</p> <p>We would support direct intervention and assessment of the content of the application for the DCO. An updated REAC an integral part of the DCO.</p>			
<b>Conclusions</b>			
<p><b>Planning Statement (Draft)</b></p> <p>Conclusions of the draft Planning Statement are presumptive.</p> <p>We do not believe that the information contained in the PEIR establishes that the benefits of SRFI at the Hinckley site will substantially outweigh the adverse residual impacts that have been identified.</p> <p>We strongly agree that the statutory consultation on SRFI at Hinckley will be the first step in establishing the case for the Proposed Development and that TSH will expect to consider all responses if it is to establish the presumption. We expect that there will require to be revisions to the proposals in line with the consideration of the council and that a Planning Balance be re- considered for the Proposed Development as to be submitted to the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>The Planning Statement in its conclusion specifically refers to the consideration of the information contained in the PEIR (paragraph 4.8).</p> <p>The Planning Statement has undertaken the planning balance of the submitted scheme, having considered and responded to the comments made to the statutory consultation.</p>	Y	<p>Planning Statement (Document Reference 7.1)</p>

Appendix 9.9

4 January 2022



SENT BY POST AND E-MAIL

Liam Fedden Esq  
Case Manager  
National Infrastructure Planning  
Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

Karl Cradick  
E: k[REDACTED]@savills.com  
DL: +44 (0) 1202 856908

Wessex House  
Wimborne BH21 1PB  
T: +44 (0) 1202 856 800  
F: +44 (0) 1202 856 801  
savills.com

Dear Mr Fedden,

**CASE REFERENCE TR050007**

**DB SYMMETRY (HINCKLEY) LIMITED: PROPOSED HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE, BLABY DISTRICT, LEICESTERSHIRE**

**PLANNING ACT 2008: SECTION 46 - DUTY TO NOTIFY THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF A PROPOSED APPLICATION**

Further to our recent correspondence, please accept this letter as notification pursuant to section 46 of the Planning Act 2008 ('the Act') that Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited ('the Applicant') intends to carry out its statutory consultation pursuant to section 42 of the Act, commencing on 12 January 2022 and expiring on 9 March 2022.

I enclose:

- A copy of the letters being sent to all parties to be consulted pursuant to sections 42, 43 and 44 of the Act;
- A copy of the section 48 press notice.

As you are aware, the Applicant prepared an updated Statement of Community Consultation ('SoCC') and engaged with the following local authorities in respect of the proposed consultation strategy:

- Blaby District Council
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Harborough District Council
- Rugby Borough Council

Offices and associates throughout the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa and the Middle East..

Savills (UK) Limited. Chartered Surveyors. Regulated by RICS. A subsidiary of Savills plc. Registered in England No. 2605138.  
Registered office: 33 Margaret Street, London, W1G 0JD





- North Warwickshire Borough Council
- Tamworth Borough Council
- Coventry City Council
- Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council
- Leicester City Council
- Warwickshire County Council
- Staffordshire County Council

The above list includes additional local authorities beyond those required to be consulted under section 47 of the Act.

The Applicant published a notice in the Hinckley Times and in the Leicester Mercury on 8 December 2021, pursuant to section 47(6) of the Act, advising that the SoCC could be inspected at various locations. I have enclosed a copy of that notice for your information.

We trust the enclosed information is sufficient. However, should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

**Karl Cradick**  
Director

Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA

+44 (1604) 330 630  
tritaxsymmetry.com

7 January 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

**Notice pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.**

The purpose of this letter is to consult you on the proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI), including warehousing, on the land to the north-west of Junction 2 of the M69 motorway and associated highway works.

The proposals have previously been through two stages of non-statutory consultation in 2018 and 2019, and we are now inviting you to take part in the current stage of statutory consultation. The current statutory consultation is being undertaken pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). Notification of the proposed application has been publicised under the requirements of Section 48 of the Act.

You are being consulted on the proposals because we are obliged to consult any party who has, or may have, an interest in land which is the subject of the current proposals. However, for your information, we understand that your interest is confined to ownership of land, or interests in land, beneath the public highway which is known as a subsoil interest.

In order to deliver on the proposals, Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd will apply for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Secretary of State. If accepted, the application will be examined by the Planning Inspectorate and a recommendation will be made to the Secretary of State for Transport who then decides whether to approve the DCO.

## **The Proposals**

The main features of the proposal are:

- New rail infrastructure providing access to the series of parallel sidings
- Intermodal freight terminal ('railport') capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day of up to 775m in length
- Hard surface areas for container storage
- Up to 850,000m<sup>2</sup> GIA of warehousing and ancillary buildings with a total footprint of 650,000m<sup>2</sup> and up to 200,000m<sup>2</sup> of mezzanine floorspace
- Lorry park with HGV fuel filling station
- Energy services area incorporating an electricity sub-station connected to the local distribution network and a gas-fired heat and power plant (10MW generation capacity fed from solar PV including standby capacity (20MW) and battery (20MW)
- Terrain remodelling, hard and soft landscape works, amenity water features and planting
- Noise attenuation measures – acoustic barriers up to 6m in height

- Pedestrian, equestrian and cycle access routes and infrastructure
- A new link road from M69 junction 2 to the B4668 / A47 Leicester Road including:
  - New access road connecting to an internal road network serving
  - New rail bridge within the SRFI site
  - New junction at B4668 / A74 Leicester Road
- Works to the M69 motorway at Junction 2 comprising:
  - Reconfiguration of existing roundabout and approach lanes
  - Additional southern slip roads

## Consultation

The purpose of the current stage of statutory consultation is to receive feedback on the proposals from the relevant people. Responses will be considered in the formation of the final proposals and the impact of consultation on the final proposal will be detailed in a Consultation Report which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

The project website ([www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk](http://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk)) contains the following documentation for viewing and download and upon which we are seeking your views as part of the consultation:

- Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
- Draft Development Consent Order;
- DCO Explanation Document;
- Location Plan;
- Draft Works Plans;
- Draft Parameters Plan;
- Draft Illustrative Masterplan;
- Community Explanation Document
- Draft Highway Plans;
- Draft Rail Plans;
- Draft Rail Report
- Draft Planning Statement
- Draft Design and Access Statement.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on our social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyRail; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

If you are unable to view or download any of the above documentation, please get in touch using one of the methods listed below and we will be happy to provide copies of the documents you would like to see either on a USB stick. If you would like a hard copy of the documents the following small charges will apply:

- PEIR: £35.00 plus VAT
- SoCC: £20.00 plus VAT
- Community Explanation Document: £5.00 plus VAT
- Full set of all consultation materials comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plan: £125.00 plus VAT

Subject to government guidelines regarding public gatherings in relation to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, and to any restrictions which may be in place at the particular venue, we are planning to hold public exhibitions at several locations as follows:

- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Wed 19<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- Stoney Stanton Village Hall: Fri 21<sup>st</sup> Jan, 12.30pm-6.30pm

- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Sat 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Burbage Millennium Hall: Mon 24<sup>th</sup> Jan, 3pm-8pm
- Sapcote Methodist Church: Wed 26<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- The George Ward Centre: Fri 28<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- St Francis Community Centre: Sat 29<sup>th</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Ashby Road Sports Club: Mon 31<sup>st</sup> Jan. 2pm-8pm
- Narborough Parish Council Hall: Tues 1<sup>st</sup> Feb, 1pm-9pm

We are also hosting two webinars, which require booking via the website [REDACTED] or by calling the Community Information Line (0844 556 3002). The two webinars will be held at the following times:

- Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-4pm
- Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> Feb, 6pm-8pm

We are aware of the potential for changes in guidance relating to public spaces due to the Covid-19 pandemic and we take public health and safety arrangements very seriously. At the time of writing this letter, those potential changes cannot be known. We are therefore currently planning to proceed with the events as outlined above. We will, however, keep this under review and in the event that any changes are needed in relation to those arrangements, such as restrictions on numbers, booking slots to attend the events or possibly even the need to hold more virtual events in place of those face-to-face exhibitions, we will publicise updates to explain any necessary changes, through our project website, the social media platforms listed above and through local press where possible.

### Consultation responses

We invite you to comment on the proposals during the consultation period, which officially runs from 12<sup>th</sup> January until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation however we have opted to allow more than the statutory minimum 28-day period. The deadline for receipt of responses is 9<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

Please respond using one of the following methods:

- The comments section on [REDACTED]
- Email: [REDACTED]
- Call the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)
- Write to: C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT
- Complete a feedback form online on the project website or post a feedback form to C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT

### Further Information

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the Section 48 press notification which was published in the Leicester Mercury and Hinckley Times on 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 and in the London Gazette and the Daily Telegraph on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021.

We thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director

Address 1  
Address 2  
Address 3  
Address 4  
Address 5

Grange Park Court  
Roman Way  
Northampton  
NN4 5EA  
+44 (1604) 330 630  
[tritaxsymmetry.com](http://tritaxsymmetry.com)

7 January 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange - including warehousing - on the land south of Elmesthorpe, between the Leicester to Hinckley railway and the M69 motorway (known as Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, (HNRFI)) and associated highway works.**

**Notice pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.**

The purpose of this letter is to consult you on the proposals for a strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI), including warehousing, on the land to the north-west of Junction 2 of the M69 motorway and associated highway works.

The proposals have previously been through two stages of non-statutory consultation in 2018 and 2019, and we are now inviting you to take part in the current stage of statutory consultation. The current statutory consultation is being undertaken pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act). Notification of the proposed application has been publicised under the requirements of Section 48 of the Act.

This letter is being sent to all parties required to be consulted under Section 42 of the Act. Accordingly, you are being consulted on the proposals because;

1. You are a statutory consultee, being a prescribed body set out in the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 or a local authority under section 43 of the Act;
2. You have an interest in land that is the subject of the current proposals; or
3. You are another person or body to whom we think this proposal might be of interest.

Item 2 above refers to *an interest in land* - interests in land include the following:

- You are an owner, lessee, tenant or occupier of land which is in our proposed application boundary;
- You have an interest in the land or have the power to sell or convey some of the land which is in our proposed application boundary; or
- Your property or land may, in due course, be affected by the carrying out of or the use of the development which may entitle you to bring a claim for compensation in the future.

In order to deliver on the proposals, Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd will apply for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Secretary of State. If accepted, the application will be examined by the

Planning Inspectorate and a recommendation will be made to the Secretary of State for Transport who then decides whether to approve the DCO.

## The Proposals

The main features of the proposal are:

- New rail infrastructure providing access to the series of parallel sidings
- Intermodal freight terminal ('railport') capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day of up to 775m in length
- Hard surface areas for container storage
- Up to 850,000m<sup>2</sup> GIA of warehousing and ancillary buildings with a total footprint of 650,000m<sup>2</sup> and up to 200,000m<sup>2</sup> of mezzanine floorspace
- Lorry park with HGV fuel filling station
- Energy services area incorporating an electricity sub-station connected to the local distribution network and a gas-fired heat and power plant (10MW generation capacity fed from solar PV including standby capacity (20MW) and battery (20MW))
- Terrain remodelling, hard and soft landscape works, amenity water features and planting
- Noise attenuation measures – acoustic barriers up to 6m in height
- Pedestrian, equestrian and cycle access routes and infrastructure
- A new link road from M69 junction 2 to the B4668 / A47 Leicester Road including:
  - New access road connecting to an internal road network serving the SRFI
  - New rail bridge within the SRFI site
  - New junction at B4668 / A74 Leicester Road
- Works to the M69 motorway at Junction 2 comprising:
  - Reconfiguration of existing roundabout and approach lanes
  - Additional southern slip roads

## Consultation

The purpose of the current stage of statutory consultation is to receive feedback on the proposals from the relevant people. Responses will be considered in the formation of the final proposals and the impact of consultation on the final proposal will be detailed in a Consultation Report which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

The project website ([www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk](http://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk)) contains the following documentation for viewing and download and upon which we are seeking your views as part of the consultation:

- Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)
- Draft Development Consent Order;
- DCO Explanation Document;
- Location Plan;
- Draft Works Plans;
- Draft Parameters Plan;
- Draft Illustrative Masterplan;
- Community Explanation Document
- Draft Highway Plans;
- Draft Rail Plans;
- Draft Rail Report
- Draft Planning Statement
- Draft Design and Access Statement.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on our social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyRail; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

If you are unable to view or download any of the above documentation, please get in touch using one of the methods listed below and we will be happy to provide copies of the documents you would like to see either on a USB stick. If you would like a hard copy of the documents the following small charges will apply:

- PEIR: £35.00 plus VAT
- SoCC: £20.00 plus VAT
- Community Explanation Document: £5.00 plus VAT
- Full set of all consultation materials comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plan: £125.00 plus VAT

Subject to government guidelines regarding public gatherings in relation to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, and to any restrictions which may be in place at the particular venue, we are planning to hold public exhibitions at several locations as follows:

- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Wed 19<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- Stoney Stanton Village Hall: Fri 21<sup>st</sup> Jan, 12.30pm-6.30pm
- Elmesthorpe Village Hall: Sat 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Burbage Millennium Hall: Mon 24<sup>th</sup> Jan, 3pm-8pm
- Sapcote Methodist Church: Wed 26<sup>h</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- The George Ward Centre: Fri 28<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2pm-8pm
- St Francis Community Centre: Sat 29<sup>th</sup> Jan, 10am-1pm
- Ashby Road Sports Club: Mon 31<sup>st</sup> Jan. 2pm-8pm
- Narborough Parish Council Hall: Tues 1<sup>st</sup> Feb, 1pm-9pm

We are also hosting two webinars, which require booking via the website [REDACTED] or by calling the Community Information Line (0844 556 3002). The two webinars will be held at the following times:

- Tuesday 25<sup>h</sup> Jan, 2pm-4pm
- Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> Feb, 6pm-8pm

We are aware of the potential for changes in guidance relating to public spaces due to the Covid-19 pandemic and we take public health and safety arrangements very seriously. At the time of writing this letter, those potential changes cannot be known. We are therefore currently planning to proceed with the events as outlined above. We will, however, keep this under review and in the event that any changes are needed in relation to those arrangements, such as restrictions on numbers, booking slots to attend the events or possibly even the need to hold more virtual events in place of those face-to-face exhibitions, we will publicise updates to explain any necessary changes, through our project website, the social media platforms listed above and through local press where possible.

### **Consultation responses**

We invite you to comment on the proposals during the consultation period, which officially runs from 12<sup>th</sup> January until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The Act requires a 28-day period for this consultation however

we have opted to allow more than the statutory minimum 28-day period. The deadline for receipt of responses is 9<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

Please respond using one of the following methods:

- The comments section on [REDACTED]
- Email: [REDACTED]
- Call the Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)
- Write to: C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT
- Complete a feedback form online on the project website or post a feedback form to C/O Lexington Communications, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT

### Further Information

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the Section 48 press notification which was published in the Leicester Mercury and Hinckley Times on 15<sup>h</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 and in the London Gazette and the Daily Telegraph on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021.

We thank you in advance for your valuable feedback and we look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Yours faithfully,



Sinead Turnbull  
Planning Director



**Section 47 Planning Act 2008**

**Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Order 202X**

**NOTICE PUBLICISING A STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited of Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton NN4 5EA (“the Applicant”) is proposing to apply to the Secretary of State (through the Planning Inspectorate) for a development consent order to authorise the construction, operation, use and maintenance of a rail freight interchange, alterations to M69 Junction 2 to provide south-facing slip roads and a new highway linking M69 J2 with the B4468 Leicester Road and off-site highway works (‘the Application’).

The Application is EIA development meaning the Applicant will submit an Environmental Statement with the Application.

As part of the proposals, the Applicant has a duty to consult the local community pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant has produced a Statement of Community Consultation (“SOCC”) for this purpose. The SOCC sets out how the Applicant will consult with the local communities likely to be affected by their proposed development. The SOCC has been prepared in consultation with local authorities including Blaby District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council.

The SOCC is now published on the Hinckley National Website (<https://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk/>) under the Consultation Materials tab and will be available to view free of charge until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

The following Councils have agreed to display the Statement of Community Consultation on the individual Council’s website.

Blaby District Council  
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council  
Harborough District Council  
North Warwickshire Borough Council

The following public libraries have agreed to make available the Statement of Community Consultation to visiting members of the public, Blaby, Hinckley, Burbage, Enderby, Kirby Muxloe, Market Bosworth, Newbold Verdon, Sapcote, Desford.

Information regarding the availability of the SoCC for inspection may also be obtained via the **Community Information Line (0844 556 3002)** including any request for the provision of a hard copy for which there is a charge of £20.00 + VAT.

**Issued by: Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited, Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton, NN4 5EA**

**Hinckley National Website <https://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk/>  
Community Information Line 0844 556 3002**

**Section 48 Planning Act 2008**

**Regulation 4 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended)**

**Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Order 202X**

**NOTICE PUBLICISING A PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR A DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER ('DCO')**

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (TSH) of Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton NN4 5EA ("the Applicant") is proposing to apply to the Secretary of State (through the Planning Inspectorate) for a development consent order to authorise the construction, operation, use and maintenance of a rail freight interchange, alterations to Junction 2 of the M69 Motorway to provide south-facing slip roads and a new highway linking Junction 2 of the M69 Motorway with the B4468 Leicester Road ('the Application').

The proposed development would be located on land to the north-east of Hinckley, south of Elmesthorpe, east of the Leicester to Hinckley railway and west of the M69 Motorway. The main features of the proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI) are:

- a) New rail infrastructure off the Leicester to Hinckley railway;
- b) An intermodal freight terminal aka railport, capable of accommodating up to 16 trains per day;
- c) Up to 850,000 m<sup>2</sup> of buildings for logistics use (comprising 650,000 square metres at ground floor level and a further 200,000 square metres of mezzanine floorspace) – a use within Class B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended (warehouse and storage);
- d) Lorry Park with welfare facilities and HGV fuelling facilities;
- e) Highway works including:
  - i. Provision of south facing slips onto Junction 2 of the M69;
  - ii. A new highway link between Junction 2 and B4668/A47 Leicester Road;
  - iii. Improvements to existing highway junctions in the vicinity of the site

The project is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development meaning the Applicant will submit an Environmental Statement with the Application.

A copy of details of the proposals, plans, maps, and other draft documents showing the nature and location of the proposed development may be inspected free of charge on the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website <https://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk/> under 'Consultation Materials' tab on a page called 'Formal Consultation' from 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

In the event of queries in respect of the project documents on the website the following telephone number can be used:

**Community Information Line: 0844 556 3002**

To request hardcopies of the following documents please contact TSH either through any of the 'Contact Us' details referenced on the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website, or by telephoning the Community Information Line number above. Please note hardcopies are subject to the following reasonable printing and postal costs:

- Statement of Community Consultation £20.00 + VAT
- Preliminary Environmental Information Report £35.00 +VAT

- Community Explanation Document £5.00 + VAT
- Full set of all consultation material comprising all documents being made available for public consultation including appendices and plans £125.00 + VAT

**The statutory consultation stage on Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange will run from 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 to 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The deadline for responses to the consultation is the 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022.**

During this period responses to the consultation may be made using any of the following methods:

- Online at the project website by completing a questionnaire (A hard copy of the questionnaire may be requested free of charge via the Community Information Line).
- Through attendance at public exhibitions and virtual events.
- Via written response to C/O Lexington Communications, 3rd Floor, Queens House, Queen Street, Manchester, M2 5HT, or via email [REDACTED]
- Through the Community Information Line 0844 556 3002 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5.30pm)

The details of the public exhibitions and virtual events are to be published on the project website; public notices in the press; social media; displayed on Site Notices in the vicinity of the proposed development, and provided to Blaby District Council; Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council; Leicestershire County Council; Harborough District Council; Rugby Borough Council and all Parish Councils within 10km of Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange.

A link to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange website will also be available on the project's social media platforms:

- Facebook - 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – HNRFI';
- Twitter @HinckleyRail; and
- Instagram - 'hinckleynationalrailfreight'

and details of the public exhibitions and virtual events will also be published on these platforms.

**Issued by: Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (The Applicant), Grange Park Court, Roman Way, Northampton, NN4 5EA**

**15<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

**Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Website <https://www.hinckleynrfi.co.uk/>**

**Community Information Line 0844 556 3002**

Appendix 9.10



National Infrastructure Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer 0303 444 5000  
Services: HinckleySRFI@planninginspectorate.gov.uk  
e-mail:

---

By email only

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR050007

Date: 7 January 2022

---

Dear Mr Cradick

## **Planning Act 2008 (as amended) – Section 46**

### **Proposed application by Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange**

#### **Acknowledgement of receipt of information concerning proposed application**

Thank you for your letter of 4 January 2022 and the following documentation:

- Copies of the letters sent to section(s) 42 parties;
- a copy of the s48 Notices; and
- a copy of the s47 notice.

I acknowledge that you have notified the Planning Inspectorate of the proposed application for an order granting development consent for the purposes of section 46 of the PA2008 and supplied the information for consultation under section 42. The following reference number has been given to the proposed application, which I would be grateful if you would use in subsequent communications:

TR050007

I will be your point of contact for this application.

The role of the Planning Inspectorate in the application process is to provide independent and impartial advice about the procedures involved and to have open discussions with potential applicants, statutory bodies and others about the processes and requirements of the new regime. It is important that you keep us accurately informed of your timetable and any changes that occur.

We will publish advice we give to you or other interested parties on our website and, if relevant, direct parties to you as the applicant. We are happy to meet at key milestones and/or provide advice as the case progresses through the pre-application stage.

Once you have prepared draft documents we are able to provide technical advice, in particular on the draft development consent order, explanatory memorandum, the consultation report and any draft HRA. You may therefore wish to build this into your timetables.

In the meantime, you may wish to have regard to the guidance and legislation material provided on our website including the Infrastructure Planning (Fees) Regulations 2010 (as amended) and associated guidance, which you will need to observe closely in establishing the correct fee to be submitted at the successive stages of the application process.

When seeking to meet your pre-application obligations you should also be aware of your obligation under the current data protection legislation to process personal data fairly and lawfully.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

*Liam Fedden*

**Liam Fedden**  
**Case Manager**

This decision was made by officials on behalf of the Secretary of State under delegated powers.

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.