

### Section 1: Land Interests

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<b><u>The Leigh Family</u></b>	
<b>RR-0216</b>	<p><b><u>Christine Margaret Leigh</u></b></p> <p>I am totally opposed to the HNRFI scheme as a joint owner of Water Meadows Farm which boundary ends at the proposed rail line we will be strongly affected. Our sole intention at our time of purchase was to restore the farm to its former glory as a beautiful nature and conservation reserve. Our animals graze on the land next to the train line and we would be impacted for a considerable distance by the planned infrastructure. We are so close to the proposed infrastructure that we would be gravely affected in EVERY WAY. The scale of the scheme would have a catastrophic impact on the environment and landscape. Decimating valuable farm and woodland forever, thus destroying the natural habitat for a huge number of wildlife and different rare species. The land in question also has significance to archaeologist, this part of England was the hearty of the Civil Ward in the 17th century. There are so many reasons why this proposal should not go ahead-Increased pollution. Increased traffic. Increased noise.24 hour train movement. Increased lighting. Loss of wildlife. Loss of trees. Loss of village life. Adverse visual impact. Parking. Road infrastructure. Road safety. No plans to make the site carbon neutral. No plans for increasing facilities of schools,</p>	<p>The representations made by the Leigh family include matters which are common to many of the representations submitted and the Applicant's responses set out in section 6 Residents / Businesses covers these, including points in respect of traffic and transport, air quality, noise, lighting, ecological effects, landscape and visual impact, archaeology and loss of farmland.</p> <p>Some of the Leigh family representations also refer to the impact of the scheme on their property.</p> <p>The Order limits include a parcel of land (parcel 36 shown on sheets 1 and 2 of the Land Plans (Documents 2.20A and 2.20B (PINS Ref APP-058 and APP-059)) owned by the Leigh family as noted in the Book of Reference (document reference: 4.3, APP-090). As explained in the Statement of Reasons (document reference: 4.1, APP-088)), this land is required for earthworks and landscape works immediately north of</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>doctors, dentists, vets etc. Within driving distance in the surrounding areas we have many rail freight terminals such as Freight line BIRFLI). ABP Rail Freight Coleshill. Rail Freight terminal Castle Donnington. Rail Freight Infrastructure DIRFT Northampton. Rail Freight Infrastructure Telford. Rail Freight Infrastructure Daventry. All of these developments are under utilised. Whilst we all agree with people having job opportunities, unemployment in this area is very low and there are plenty of jobs already available for both skilled and unskilled workers.</p>	<p>the railway. The proposed works to be carried out on the relevant land are contained in Work No. 1 and Work No. 19 as shown on the Works Plans (documents references: 2.2A and 2.2B, APP-008 and APP-009) and described in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO (document reference: 3.1, APP-085).</p>
<p><b>RR-0269</b></p>	<p><b><u>Darren Leigh</u></b></p> <p>I object to the proposal of the HNRFI. Elmesthorpe is a small, beautiful village which will be destroyed by this project. The traffic infrastructure will not be able to cope with a project of this size the noise and pollution level will impact the health of everybody living in the surrounding area. I do not believe it is anything more than a warehousing development as there are two Rail freight terminal with 30 miles both of which are underutilised, also it would be better suit to a electrified trainline to cut down on pollution. We are all being told how important the environment is and we need to plant tree and get exercise so why would we destroy woodlands and command land where people exercise</p>	<p>The Applicant is continuing its attempts to agree terms with the landowners for the voluntary acquisition of this parcel which will seek to deal with the issues raised by the Leigh family in respect of the impact on their property.</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
RR-1171	<p><b><u>Rodney Leigh</u></b></p> <p>I am strongly against the proposal of the HNRFI. For me and my family it would personally cause us terrible problems to our 'every day life'. We retired and purchased our farm to tend for our animals together with any wildlife on the farm. The proposed HNRFI would border on our land where we grow hay for the livestock and where the animals graze. The air pollution, Noise, Light Pollution, Visual impact, Wildlife and Loss of Farmland will be devastating. Not to mention the Flooding / Drainage Issues and Highways and Traffic Issues. There is no justification for this development to be built in Elmeſthorpe when you take into account the proximity and capacity of existing Rail Freight Interchanges in the area. Many of which are underutilised. Traffic in the area is already congested at various times of the day so any increase in traffic, albeit with the proposed plans will be dreadful. Flooding is another problem that we have to cope with already and the NHRFI proposals does not fully address this matter. Elmeſthorpe is a lovely village to live in and all residents will be exposed to addition health risks and mental issues should this proposal get the 'go ahead. House prices are already dropping with the threat of the HNRFI proposal and will drop a lot further should the plan go ahead.</p>	
RR-0767	<p><b><u>Lorraine Spicer Leigh</u></b></p> <p>It will be in direct to our Property Noise pollution will have a direct impact on us Light pollution from the flood lights and the lorries Air Pollution from the lorries loading and unloading 24 hours a day It will look aesthetically unpleasing - we have beautiful countryside views</p>	

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>and a beautiful common that is going to be used for awful looking tall warehousing. more traffic - the roads are already too busy - it will be even more difficult to get the children to school More flooding - they will be building on a flood plane - our fields are already flooded when it rains. We had plans to create a nature reserve and a glamping holiday farm - but we will be unable to pursue our dream holiday destination if this proposal goes ahead. Please consider us local people and our children - they will have no where to play and grow up in poor health - due to the growing pollution in this area - Hinckley is already considered to be highly polluted. This is such a beautiful area - it will be dilapidated forever if this proposal goes ahead, many thanks for considering this application.</p>	
<p><b>RR-0270</b></p>	<p><b><u>Darren Mark Leigh</u></b>  The environment impact will devastate the village of Elmesthorpe and the surrounding area. Currently the road infrastructure struggles handle traffic at peak times.</p>	
<p><b>RR-0387</b></p>	<p><b><u>F &amp; J Gent (F &amp; J Gent)</u></b>  REPRESENTATIONS FROM F &amp; J GENT FARMERS We own and farm land at Highgate Lodge Farm, Station Road, Stoney Stanton, which immediately adjoins the application site. Our land falls within the area identified as Land West of Stoney Stanton, in respect of which we understand Shoosmiths Solicitors are submitting representations on behalf of a consortium of land promoters. Our representations are submitted in addition to the observations or representations put</p>	<p>The representations made by F &amp; J Gent refer to the representation submitted by Shoosmiths on behalf of a consortium of land owners and the Applicant's responses set out in <i>section 6 Residents / Businesses</i> covers these.</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>forward by Shoosmiths Solicitors and/or the Consortium, and should be read as supplementary comments to those of the Consortium parties. We are writing to express our significant concern regarding other aspects of the application, in the following respects: 1. Drainage Having previously experienced large scale engineering project when the M69 was built across our land, we have serious concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on our fields to the east of the M69, and the outflow from the site onto our fields to the west of the M69. Some of our land to the east of the M69 drains under the M69 into the same watercourse that it is proposed to use for the drainage of the site. We make no comment on the hydrology work undertaken by HNRFI's consultants, BWB Consulting, as we are not experts in hydrology. However, there does not seem to be much detail about ongoing operation and maintenance plans for the subterranean tanks or the attenuation lakes. As a result, it is difficult for us to determine whether the proposals contained in the application are adequate to protect our land or not. We requested further information from the Applicant in April 2022 but so far none has been forthcoming. We are extremely concerned that insufficient information has been made available regarding how the Applicant intends to monitor and maintain the scheme that their hydrologist has drawn up. Experience of construction of the M69 showed that what might seem to be a small error on their part, had extensive impact on the productivity of our land, and we do not wish to see this being repeated with proposed HNRFI development. 2. Closure of gated level crossings to the east of the site serving U17 &amp; T89 Rights of Way We understand that the Applicant is proposing to close the gated level crossings for two rights of way that are not immediately</p>	<p>The Gent representation also refers specifically to impacts on their property including drainage and the proposed arrangements dealing with the closure of the Thorney Fields level crossing and diversion of the right of way.</p> <p>The watercourse referenced by the Gents would drain a proportion of the Main HNRFI site, as well the land downstream of the development site. The proposed development seeks to maintain the drainage catchments as near to existing as possible. Therefore, a proportion of the development will drain into this watercourse, but this will essentially be the same area as existing. To avoid increasing surface water runoff into the watercourse, the discharge rate from the development will be throttled to the equivalent 'greenfield annual average runoff rate' (QBAR). This means that under typical rainfall events the discharge rate from the site will mirror the existing conditions. In larger storm events, the peak discharge rate from the site will be reduced, and the excess runoff will be stored within the site. It is envisaged that the long-term maintenance of the drainage and watercourse channel within the site will be undertaken by a designated management company. The surface water drainage principles have been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority, and Environment Agency have confirmed that the proposed scheme will</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>adjoining their site, and in the case of the U17 footpath, this is some distance from their site. In both cases, the Applicant is proposing diversions. We are concerned about U17 as this footpath crosses our land and is very well used. We confirm that we were approached by the Applicant with a proposal to divert the footpath at the level crossing westwards along the railway line, crossing the access bridge to Thorney Fields Farm, and then eastwards back to the point of the level crossing. We consider this to be unsatisfactory, and request as part of any conditions to a Consent Order that a footbridge should be provided as part of the scheme over the railway to replace the level crossing because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people will climb over the fence and continue to cross over the railway tracks rather than using a lengthy diversion</li> <li>• it will encourage people to use the metalled access drive owned partially by ourselves. This drive is used by ourselves and others as access for farm machinery. It is narrow and not designed for people on foot as well as agricultural machinery, thereby creating a safety risk</li> <li>• we consider that the cost of a new footbridge will be insignificant in terms of the overall construction costs, and will provide a much safer solution than the Applicant's current proposals which involve putting pedestrians across a narrow high sided bridge which is the only vehicular access to Thorney Fields Farm.</li> </ul> <p>3. Traffic We have other concerns regarding additional generation of traffic in the neighbourhood and the landscape impact of the scheme, but these will be addressed by other objections that you receive.</p>	<p>appropriately mitigate flood risk in line with best practice guidance. Engagement is taking place with the Gent's to describe the drainage proposals for this watercourse.</p> <p>The closure of the Thorney Fields level crossing has been requested by Network Rail and is necessary for the safety of pedestrians. The Explanatory Memorandum provides further explanation (see paragraphs 5.41 – 5.50) (document reference: 3.2, APP-086). The diversion of the public right of way U17/2 across the existing bridge over the railway is considered proportionate because it makes use of existing infrastructure which sufficiently provides a crossing point which is in close proximity to the current level crossing, resulting in minimal change to the footpath route and little inconvenience to the users of the footpath. The proposed diversion amounts to an additional 440m. It is not proportionate or appropriate to provide an additional bridge over the railway in these circumstances and appropriate fencing and measures will be provided and agreed with both Network Rail and the highway authority ensuring the proposed diversion is followed.</p> <p>The Order limits include land which is owned by the Gent family. The relevant land is identified as parcel numbers 57, 57a, 60 and 67 on Sheets 2 and 4 of the</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>Land Plans (document references: 2.20B and 2.20D, APP-059 and APP-061)) and in the Book of Reference (document reference: 4.3, APP-090).</p> <p>In respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parcels 57, 57a and 60 – these parcels are required for the closure of the Thorney Fields level crossing, the need for which is explained above and confirmed in the Statement of Reasons (document reference: 4.1, APP-088). This includes use of the land for temporary access and temporary construction compounds – contained in Work No. 21 as well as the ability to formally dedicate the diverted right of way for public use.</li> <li>• Parcel 67 – as confirmed in the Statement of Reasons, the land is required for the earthworks works and the creation and improvements to the public footpath / bridleway network. The works are contained in Work No. 6 and this particular parcel falls along the boundary of the site as it meets the M69 motorway.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant is continuing its attempts to agree terms with the landowners for the voluntary acquisition of this parcel which will seek to deal with the issues</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>raised by the Gent family in respect of the impact on their property.</p>
<p><b>RR-1028</b></p>	<p><b><u>Shoosmiths Representation submitted on behalf of: Jennifer Taylor and Barwood Development Securities Limited and Parker Strategic Land Limited</u></b></p> <p>We are instructed by a consortium of land promoters predominantly consisting of Barwood Development Securities Limited and Parker Strategic Land Limited (the "Consortium") and Ms Jennifer Taylor. The Consortium has interests in land covering approximately 340 hectares to the west of Stoney Stanton (the "Site"). The Site is adjacent to the HNRFI and will be significantly impacted by it. Ms Taylor owns land which is proposed to be acquired temporarily as part of the HNRFI project. Whilst the Consortium and Ms Taylor do not object to the overall principle of the HNRFI, they have the following concerns: * Insufficient evidence has been submitted in support of the DCO application with regards to the likely effects on highways, noise, air quality and landscape; and * Inadequate justification has been provided for the temporary acquisition of land within the Site adjacent to the junction at Hinckley Road and Stanton Lane. Further detailed comments have been sent separately to the Examining Authority via email.</p>	<p>The representations made by Shoosmiths on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Limited and Parker Strategic Land Limited (the "Consortium") and Ms Jennifer Taylor include matters which are common to many of the representations submitted and the Applicant's responses set out in section 6 Residents / Businesses covers these. The land in which the Consortium and Mrs Taylor have an interest is known as "Land West of Stoney Stanton" and is being promoted under the Blaby District Local plan for development as explained in the representation.</p> <p>The Shoosmiths representation also refers specifically to the temporary use of land which Mrs Taylor owns for a construction compound and access thereto whilst some of the highway works are being undertaken. The Applicant notes that the Consortium and Mrs Taylor do not object to the HNRFI development and its access infrastructure.</p> <p>The land referred to in the representation is parcel 122 as identified on Sheet 7 of the Land Plans (document reference: 2.20G, APP-064) and described in the Book of Reference (document reference: 4.3, APP-090).</p>



RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>It is not correct to state that the Statement of Reasons is silent on the reason for the inclusion of this land in the Order limits. The Statement of Reasons (document reference: 4.1, APP-088) confirms in the table at Appendix 1 of that document (page 47) that the land is required for:</p> <p><i>“The provision of improvements to the footpath along the B4669 Hinckley Road; a temporary construction compound and associated access, alterations to the junction at Hinckley Road and Stanton Lane and signage (Work No. 10)”</i></p> <p>As discussed at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 on 14 September and as mentioned in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (document reference: 18.1), the Applicant has updated the Statement of Reasons to clarify the proposals for the use of this land (Document 4.1B), submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons also explains that the Applicant's approach to the use of temporary powers has been proportionate and deliberately seeks to minimise the interference with the relevant land.</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>A construction compound is required in this location because it is the closest and most suitable location for the temporary use of land whilst the traffic signals and highway works are being undertaken at the junction. The Applicant specifically considered the extent of land that will be required when determining the extent of the Order limits and the parcel is deliberately drawn this way to only use the land required. The compound will be located in the south-east corner of the field, with the remainder of the parcel being necessary for access, making use of the existing access to the land rather than creating a new access which would have a greater impact to the land and also avoids the potential requirement of hedgerow removal. Whilst it is acknowledged that the centre of the field would be 'isolated', this approach specifically and deliberately minimises the impact on the land and the Applicant is not intending that the result of its access requirements would result in exclusive possession.</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that this will sterilise the land for a significant period of time. The land is likely to be used for less than 18 months to facilitate these works including set up and removal of the compound. The highway works must be delivered early in the DCO development, before any warehousing may be occupied and therefore the land required for the temporary construction compound will be returned</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>once those early works have been delivered. Given the progress and timing of the progression of the Local Plan and any subsequent planning application for development it is not considered that this will impact the Consortium's plans or interest and the Applicant would highlight that the provisions in the DCO clearly cover the provision of compensation in respect of these powers, in the absence of any voluntary arrangement with Mrs Taylor.</p>
<p>RR-1027</p>	<p><b><u>Shoosmiths Representation submitted on behalf of: Philip Ian Bailey, Linda Margaret Bailey, David Arnold Woodward, Jane Elizabeth Bailey, Keith William Bailey, David John Bailey (the landowners) and Parker Strategic Land Limited</u></b></p> <p>We are instructed by Parker Strategic Land Limited ("Parker") and the following individuals: i) Philip Ian William Bailey ii) Linda Margaret Bailey iii) David Arnold Woodward iv) Jane Elizabeth Woodward v) Jane Lang Woodward vi) Jonathan Charles Woodward vii) Leonard Cooper Bailey viii) Keith William Bailey ix) David John Bailey (the "Landowners"). The Landowners own land covering approximately 44 hectares to the southwest of the M69 Junction 2 (the "Employment Site"). Parker has an interest in the Employment Site by way of a promotion agreement with the Landowners. The Employment Site is being promoted for the development of 133,000sqm of employment floorspace, a motorway services area and a hotel. The Employment Site partially falls within the DCO land and the northern part of it is</p>	<p>The representations made by Shoosmiths on behalf of Parker Strategic Land Limited ("Parker"), Philip Ian William Bailey, Linda Margaret Bailey, David Arnold Woodward, Jane Elizabeth Woodward, Jane Lang Woodward, Jonathan Charles Woodward, Leonard Cooper Bailey, Keith William Bailey and David John Bailey (the "Landowners") refer to the representation submitted by Shoosmiths on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Limited and Parker Strategic Land Limited and Ms Jennifer Taylor and the Applicant's responses set out in Section 6 Residents / Businesses covers these. The land in which Parker and the Landowners refer to is being promoted under the Blaby District Local plan for development as explained in the representation.</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>proposed to be acquired temporarily for use as a construction compound and soil storage area. Parker and the Landowners robustly object to the temporary acquisition of part of the Employment Site on the following grounds: * The absence of a compelling case in the public interest; * Part of the Employment Site is not needed because there is an alternative means of bringing about the objective of the DCO; and * Lack of consideration of alternatives. Further detailed comments have been sent to the Examining Authority via email.</p>	<p>It is understood that the representation relates only specifically to the temporary possession of parcel 101 and not to the requirement for the permanent acquisition of land required for the new slip road to exit the M69 motorway, which is within the same ownership and included in the same area of land identified by Shoosmiths as forming part of the proposed development for employment land being promoted under the Blaby District Local Plan.</p> <p>Parcel 101 is identified on sheet 4 of the Land Plans (Document 2.20D (PINS Ref APP-061)) and described in the Book of Reference (document reference: 4.3, APP-090).</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that the Statement of Reasons does not set out sufficient explanation for the use of the land, the compelling case or the consideration of alternatives. Paragraphs 6.10 – 6.16 set out the compelling case in the public interest and refer to other application documents which set out the market need and planning case for the development. Paragraphs 6.17 – 6.25 explain the Applicant's consideration of alternatives, including alternatives to compulsory acquisition. The Statement of Reasons also confirms in Appendix 2 that the Applicant has been liaising with the landowner for over five years in</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>respect of the proposals for the development and the need to acquire land and use land temporarily.</p> <p>As discussed at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 on 14 September and as mentioned in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (document reference: 18.1), the Applicant has updated the Statement of Reasons to clarify the proposals for the use of this land (Document 4.1B), submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>A construction compound is required in this location because it is the closest and most suitable location for the temporary use of land whilst the highway works are being undertaken at the junction. Use of part or parts of the main site whilst these works are being undertaken is not practical because of the distance from the site of the works which would require more interference with the use of the B4669 and its continued use by public traffic. The Environmental Statement Chapter 3 (document reference: 6.1.3, APP-112), explains the phasing of the authorised development and this means that earthworks and establishment of development plateaus would not allow appropriate space for use as construction compounds for the highway works..</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that this will sterilise the land for a significant period of time. The land is likely</p>

RR Reference	Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>to be used for less than 36 months to facilitate these works including set up and removal of the compound. The highway works must be delivered early in the DCO development, before any warehousing may be occupied and therefore the land required for the temporary construction compound will be returned once those early works have been delivered. Given the progress and timing of the progression of the Local Plan and any subsequent planning application for development it is not considered that this will impact the Consortium's and Landowners' development plans and the Applicant would highlight that the provisions in the DCO clearly cover the provision of compensation in respect of these powers, in the absence of any voluntary arrangement with the owners of parcel 101. Furthermore, it is understood that the provision of the slip road works are required and relied upon for the development of the employment site and therefore it is understood that the provision of the slip road itself is not objectionable to Parker and the Landowners.</p>