

My major concerns are as follows:

- The immediate and overbearing proximity to both Elmesthorpe residents and the bordering SSSI, would suggest that the site chosen is not suitable for such a proposal considering its surroundings.
- The omission of Elmesthorpe in most location descriptions/maps/documents is disingenuous. It appears the applicant understands that the extreme proximity to a residential settlement is problematic.
- Site lighting: effects on villagers and surrounding wildlife. Constantly changing lighting schemes are harder to adjust to and disturb sleep much more than a constant scheme. High level and bright constant schemes are also inappropriate for residents and wildlife.
- Noise: there will be noise from large quantities of extra traffic, extra trains and general operational noise. We have to also consider the 10-year construction phase. Are noise attenuation barriers enough mitigation?
- Given the extreme proximity to residential areas; serious consideration should be given to preventing this site operating at night. This would greatly alleviate major concerns surrounding light and noise levels. Night noise and light disturbance will have direct effects on well-being, quality of life, people's job performance, children's education and generally affect lives from all aspects.
- Flooding: the modelling and assessments on the flood risk are not an accurate reflection of what happens in the proposed HNRFI site and the surrounding area. The water table is very high and flooding is a common occurrence. The drainage systems in this old village are very fragile, archaic in design and already struggle to cope.
- Grading of the colour schemes of buildings is an important aspect that was promised during consultation and no longer appears to be the case.
- Air pollution: there has been an 'advertised' 'commitment' to ensure the construction is carbon neutral which I have been unable to find evidence as to how this is proposed to be achieved. There will be a marked difference in air quality.
- The green travel plan for site staff walking and cycling to work is not realistic. The overwhelming majority of workers will not be local and therefore unable to employ these methods of transport.
- Elmesthorpe is not included in the traffic mitigation plans despite undeniable traffic increases throughout Elmesthorpe as a result of new motorway slip roads and a RFI.
- The current traffic mitigation plans are not adequate in their entirety.

- An enforced weight limit along Station Road B581 in Elmesthorpe is required. In addition to this, signage for 'no access to HNRFI' (or similar) to be placed on the approach from both Stoney Stanton and A47 Clickers Way improving road safety issues for pedestrians, cyclists and high frequency of equine users.
- Staff parking in Elmesthorpe's residential side roads, local businesses and Station Road B581 in order to access the site by foot via Burbage Common Road avoiding traffic bottlenecks during shift changeovers. Having raised this concern at the consultations; the applicant advised it was a very relevant and realistic possibility. Despite raising this in my consultation response, it has not been covered in the consultation report.
- Parking provision for lorries does not seem adequate. It is unclear whether the services provided for HGVs will extend past overnight parking and toilet facilities. Hygiene, food and beverage facilities are essential to prevent disruption in nearby villages. These facilities (with the exemption of hygiene, food and drink) must be free of charge to prevent them seeking free alternatives in the surrounding villages.
- If the lorry park is full, what mechanisms will be in place to prevent overspill HGVs using the local roads and amenities?
- There appears to be no provision of on site food and beverage facilities for staff.
- Increased crime levels.
- Construction traffic, site workers and site waste being removed should not use the roads through Elmesthorpe.
- When the M69 was originally completed, the Ministry of Transport set conditions that slip roads were not built on the west side of the junction because the local road infrastructure could not manage the increased traffic. Since then, the local road infrastructure has not improved but traffic on the M69 has grown exponentially. The original reasoning still stands, exacerbated by 9000 HGV movements and circa 17000 staff movements per day associated with the proposed HNRFI. Building the 'A47 link road' that exits onto B4668, a relatively small road which then funnels through small villages or towns, is not appropriate mitigation.
- Power plant emissions.
- Effects the proposed site will have on the water supply (namely quality and pressure) to my home.
- I am genuinely concerned about the effect that this proposed development will have on my mental health. The link between green space and mental health has been officially and widely recognized for quite some time; I moved to this area of historic Land Settlement to aid my mental health recovery.

- The PROW(s) that currently link Elmesthorpe to Burbage Common SSSI (including Elmesthorpe Plantation) have been replaced by much more industrial routes. A place that was once on our doorstep now feels to have been cut off from us.
- There is a significant cluster of existing RFIs in the area, most of which are considered under utilised. It does not appear to have been researched or stress-tested that fully utilising these areas may be a more appropriate option.
- When comparing the amount of freight trains allegedly designed to use the RFI to the numbers of HGVs movements, it is very clear that this is a HGV transport hub, with rail being a secondary function (if at all). This is a warehousing application disguised as an NSIP.

I would like to voice my OBJECTION to this proposal. I assert that the negative impacts of this proposal far outweigh any benefits this proposal purports to provide.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca Roper