

### Section 4 - Interest Groups

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
<b>RR-1311</b>	<b>Stoney Stanton Action Group</b>	<p>This representation is from the Stoney Stanton Action Group (SSAG). The SSAG is a local community led group whose remit is to investigate and raise local awareness of issues that might affect Stoney Stanton, to find out as much possible what local opinion is and to take action that is possible as a voluntary group, e.g. submitting comments about issues and providing our views to local councils etc. SSAG has a committee of 9 members, 311 signed up supporters and 299 Facebook followers. The group represents Stoney Stanton which has a population of 4,600. The SSAG believes that the HNRFI development should not be allowed to go ahead for many reasons, summarized below:</p>	Comment noted.
		<p>1. Purpose and Need:</p>	
		<p>1.1 Uncertainty about the Intended Customer Base: The original consultation material claimed that the terminal would serve the car industry predominantly in the West Midlands (e.g. JLR), however the claim now is that it will serve South Leicester, including Magna Park and Coventry local businesses. There is no clarity about who will be served.</p>	<p>Both the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 and HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference: 16.2, APP-358) clearly establish the needs case for the HNRFI. This matter is being covered in the SoCG and the Applicant understands the parties position as agreeing that this need is identified in the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 which was commissioned and agreed by the relevant Local Authorities. The level of disagreement is on the level of future need.</p> <p>Estimated future demand is 2.5 times higher than current and known available supply. The Applicant considers this a matter of fact based on the evidence detailed in Document reference APP-358. This level of shortfall between demand and supply clearly evidences a large scale and strategic site such as the HNRFI is needed.</p> <p>The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) sets out the Applicants position on the local market which will be served by HNRFI. A SRFI is a development that comprises an intermodal freight port, with railway and warehousing. The primary land use in area, with a minimum size of 60 hectares, is for warehousing. The need for a SRFI in Leicestershire has been accepted by the local authorities of Blaby District and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, within the Leicester and Leicestershire Warehouse and Logistics Study, which is to</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>form part of the evidence base for the review of development plans. Magna Park is not a rail based warehousing site.</p> <p>The HNRFI Property Market Area (PMA) is the broad 'area of search' the Site sits within that Industrial &amp; Logistics investors and prospective occupiers of large units above 100,000 sq.ft will consider when looking to lease space. Given the Proposed Development relates to nationally significant infrastructure, being a SRFI, it is also essential the PMA captures key operational and supply chain linkages in addition to competitor locations from a market perspective. After discussions with rail freight operators, it is felt a 20-mile truck-drive isochrone from the proposed HNRFI is appropriate. This equates to roughly a 45-minute truck-drive time which most I&amp;L companies would consider a reasonable distance from which to use the rail freight interchange to either collect or drop off materials and goods as part of their supply chain. This recognises that not only the rail-linked units provided within the Proposed Development will use the rail terminal. The extent of the PMA is marked by the red line boundary which is based on the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>20-mile truck-drive isochrone in the HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference: 16.2, APP-358).</p> <p>The Rt Hon Dr Luke Evans MP for Hinckley &amp; Bosworth spoke on the importance of the Automotive Industry for his constituents and indeed the Country, in the House of Commons on Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> July 2023 (see Hansard. Automotive Industry Volume 736: debated on Wednesday 12 July 2023, rising to speak at 2:00 (column 378 - 384 ).</p> <p>This was an important speech and recognised several key points which go to the heart of the Applicants proposed scheme. It recognises that little locally is understood of the work of Horiba MIRA, which he described as <i>“the Silicon Valley of the automotive industry”</i>, <i>“the Google complex of anything to do with the car industry”</i>. As the automotive industry is going through a period of huge technological change to meet the NetZero challenge, Horiba MIRA has been invested in significantly with its own Enterprise Zone, to encourage research and development.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>The Rt Hon Dr Luke Evans MP also explained the success of Triumph Motorcycles. <i>“I am very proud to have Triumph Motorcycles’ headquarters in my patch, creating over 1,000 jobs. In the last three years, it has broken records for the number of bikes it has sold, which has gone up by 30% across the world. All across America and into Latin America, it is breaking into the industry and the market. That means high-end innovative jobs designed and manufactured right here in my constituency.”</i></p> <p>In addition to other companies mentioned, he also referenced Caterpillar <i>“The final jewel in the crown is Caterpillar, which last year made £59 billion worth of sales worldwide. The company, which has 1,000 people working in Desford in my constituency, is looking at making green hydrogen-fuelled electric tractors, forklift trucks, dumper trucks—you name it. I have had the pleasure of sitting there and driving Caterpillar vehicles in Arizona remotely. That is the sort of innovation that we can do. Caterpillar is</i></p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p data-bbox="1447 280 2036 352"><i>sourcing its manufacturing right here in Desford and has been for 70 years."</i></p> <p data-bbox="1447 408 2036 775">The automotive manufacturing sector is highly complex and dependent on strong global supply chains for importing parts and exporting parts and completed products. As more businesses look for resilience in their supply chains, and as the current technology changes significantly alter suppliers and their supply chains, so the opportunity arises to create 'hubs' of excellence.</p> <p data-bbox="1447 831 2036 1370">For South West Leicestershire (Growth Area 5) in the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Economic Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan 2014, this effectively identified the potential to grow the automotive and defence sectors through the development of spin off technologies from the research at Horiba MIRA, in an area where the expertise already existed; and the fact that the new Felixstowe to Nuneaton section of the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Rail Freight Line had then just been completed (late 2012), but went straight through</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>Leicestershire, without providing any direct benefit.</p> <p>The automotive sector is particularly strong throughout the Midlands and the Liverpool City Region. A business based at HNRFI would have the opportunity to use rail for exports and imports using containers through the deep sea and short sea-ports to and from international markets, as well as to and from Liverpool City Region; and even locally in the future to any OEMs with a direct rail link and significant volumes; or by Electric HGVs given the relatively short distances involved to local OEMs, such as Triumph and Caterpillar.</p> <p>The Rt Hon Dr Luke Evans MP in his speech to the House of Commons, also made the point:</p> <p><i>“I mention all this to highlight some of what is going on in my small area of Leicestershire. People choose the UK because of the skillsets we have, the tech environment we create, the regulation we have in place and our stability in the global market. That is why they come here. Does that mean we should shut up shop,</i></p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p><i>because we have done enough? No, of course not. It is important to make sure that there are signposts and avenues so that people know where to invest. When I speak to the likes of the Midlands Engine, which is looking for ways to drive investment in the 11 million people in its area, among the questions that come up are: where should businesses go, and how do they connect with Government?"</i></p> <p>Over the last 8 years the Applicant has worked in good faith to propose and design HNRFI as the answer to that question, in the area that will benefit the Rt Hon Member and adjoining Members' constituents, to a planning agenda which provides the greenest logistics chains, in a region that has no coast – practically everything must be moved by road or rail.</p> <p>The need for the Scheme has now been agreed by the local authorities concerned in their Statement of Common Ground discussions with the Applicant.</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>1.2 Lack of compliance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NNPS) and National significance: We recognise that the inclusion of a rail terminal makes this a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project however the majority of the site is for warehousing. One of the strong claims in the application documentation is that the location in the so called “Golden Triangle” puts the site in a position where most of the UK can be reached by a 4 hour HGV journey. This is contrary to the intention of NN NPS because RFTs should be as close as is practical to their customers.</p>	<p>The NPS NN states (4.83) <i>'Rail freight interchanges are not only locations for freight access to the railway, <b>but also locations for businesses</b>, capable now or in the future of supporting their commercial activities by rail.'</i> (emphasis added)</p> <p>A Footnote 42 to the sub-heading 'Importance of strategic rail freight interchanges in the NPS NN' states: <i>'A strategic rail freight interchange (SRFI) is a large multi-purpose rail freight interchange and distribution centre linked to both the rail and link road system. It has rail-served warehousing and container handling facilities and may also include manufacturing and processing activities.'</i></p> <p>The assertion that HNRFI is not a SRFI by reason of provision of warehouses on the site is misconceived.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>1.3 Addition of the Hub concept as a purpose: The concept that the RFT could operate as a “hub” was not included in the consultation material. This requires freight to be brought in direct from a port (e.g. Felixstowe) and then redistributed by several separate trains to other RFTs nearer to the final destination of the payload (or vice versa). This does not make sense in this location because:</p> <p>a) HNRFI is not designed for this, and would presumably need a different layout with more rail sidings to allow efficient moving of loads between trains b) HNRFI is only on the Leicester to Birmingham link line – trains would need to be able to be moved onto either the East Coast, the Midland or West Coast mainlines in order to access different ports and RFTs for this hub concept to be beneficial and this has not been factored into any rail traffic dimensioning</p>	<p>With reference to HNRFI’s ‘hub’ capability, HNRFI is designed to be capable of exchanging containers between trains as well as putting them to ground and loading then onto a different train, in exactly the same way it loads them from train to truck / tug and vice versa.</p> <p>HNRFI is on the Leicester to Nuneaton section of the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Freight Network, connecting to the East Coast Main Line at Peterborough, the Midland Main Line at Leicester and the West Coast Main Line at Nuneaton. It is also connected to Birmingham via Nuneaton and Water Orton. It is therefore perfectly placed to serve a wide variety of origins and destinations, which will benefit the local market with a potentially wider, earlier opportunity to use rail than other terminals can.</p> <p>Since the HNRFI consultation and as part of Great British Railways Transition Team (GBRTT) freight review, GBRTT is considering how more regional rail terminals can be developed, in order to help with ‘levelling up’</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>and growing rail freight share of the logistics transport market, to help reduce carbon emissions. A hub operation at HNRFI in the early years of such terminals in particular, could be of considerable benefit in achieving this aim, by consolidating flows as set out in the Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 4.28 – 2.32.</p> <p>The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) has explained at paragraph 6.12, the different markets served by existing SRFIs and HNRFI. The contention that there is capacity at existing SRFIs is misconceived. Each serves a distinct market and HNRFI is exceptional in its rail connectivity as explained above.</p> <p>The Government considers there is a ‘compelling need’ for an ‘expanded network of SRFIs (NPS 2.56). As set out in the Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 1.10, Midland Connect in its August 2022 publication – Our Freight Routemap for the Midlands refers to the importance of supporting SRFI’s and the effective access to associated warehousing and clearly sets out the benefits of so doing.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>1.4 The area is already served by many RFTs: We are concerned that there isn't a clear need for the HNRFI. Original statements by the applicant were about how important it was to be on the Felixstowe to Nuneaton line, providing direct access to the Felixstowe port, however there are several other Rail Freight Terminals in the vicinity that already have direct access to Felixstowe (e.g. Hams Hall, Birch Coppice, Birmingham). There are also other major RFTs in the immediate vicinity, e.g. East Midlands Gateway (with existing regular services to/from Felixstowe), Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT).</p>	<p>The Midlands is the largest economy outside of London and the South-East and a major exporter as well as importer. It has no coast, so virtually all movements have to go via road or rail. In terms of imports and exports that constituted £112bn per annum of goods moved at Q1 2022, (The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 5.13).</p> <p>To put this in context the UK's road freight sector as at August 2022 had an annual revenue of c£33.3bn, comprising 58,874 business, of which the Midlands has the far highest proportion, at 27.7% This compared to rail currently at £1.2bn comprising 102 businesses with only 4 major train operating companies. (The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 4.13 - 4.14.)</p> <p>There is clearly considerable potential for more freight to be moved by rail within these volumes. It is therefore inevitable that in order to have a greater volume of freight moved by rail, certain regions with high density of logistics businesses and</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>manufacturing, such as the Midlands, will require a higher density of SRFI's.</p> <p>As demonstrated above, HNRFI provides a critically important development for the local market, the region and beyond.</p>
		<p>1.5 Excessive amounts of Warehousing in the area: If the Magna Park North extension, which is already under construction, is taken into account, then there will be a surfeit of warehousing in Leicestershire to 2041 according to the "Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change report (April 2021)".</p>	<p>Both the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 and the HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment submitted as part of the DCO application, (document reference: 16.2, APP-358) clearly establish the needs case for the HNRFI.</p> <p>The HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference: 16.2, APP-358) estimates future demand to be 2.5 times higher than current and known available supply. The Applicant considers this a matter of fact based on the evidence detailed in the HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference 16.2, APP-358). This level of shortfall between demand and supply clearly evidences a large scale and strategic site such as the HNRFI is needed.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			Importantly Magna Park is not a SRFI and cannot offer rail connection.
		2 Rail Traffic:	
		<p>2.1 Narborough Station crossing: The impact on the Narborough Station crossing has been underestimated. We understand that even with the current amount of rail traffic on this line, road traffic often backs up to the main road through Narborough</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 travelling at 75 miles per hour would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins. 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>Adjustment to base and forecast strategic model was carried out at the request of LCC (Document Ref 6.2.8.1 pt 7 of 20) to account for delay at Narborough. This was signed off by LCC on 01/03/22.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>2.2 Capacity for Increased Rail Traffic on this link line: We would question whether the line has the capacity for the additional number of freight trains that TSH claim the HNRFI will be able to handle.</p>	<p>Network Rail are completely supportive of the development of HNRFI having undertaken its own independent review of capacity, including allowing for the planned growth in passenger traffic. It is satisfied that there is capacity to run up to 16 trains per day.</p>
		<p>2.3 Not an electrified line: The link line from Leicester to Nuneaton is not electrified, therefore trains will need to be diesel powered.</p>	<p>This section of the line is not yet electrified, although the scheme has been designed to accommodate electrification in the future. Freight trains are recognised as the lowest generator of Green House Gases per tonne mile moved compared to Heavy Goods Vehicles (The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 3.22). The industry is also responding with alternative fuels and hybrid technology projects including hydrogen fuel cells and HVO (hydrotreated vegetable oil). (The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 3.34).</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>4. Location:</p> <p>4.1 It is too close to several rural villages and a market town: The site chosen is in a greenfield area at the approximate centre of a ring of rural villages and towns, namely (clockwise around the epicentre): Elmeſthorpe, Stoney Stanton, Sapcote, Sharnford, Aston Flamville, Burbage, the market town of Hinckley, Barwell and Earl Shilton and will therefore destroy the character of these communities which is valued by residents. Also the well established traveller settlement at Aston Firs is very close to the site.</p>	<p>The LAs have acknowledged in the Socio-economics Statement of Common Ground, that there is no site suitable for a SRFI within an existing urban area. A countryside location is required. It is accepted by the NPS (paragraph 4.30) that there may be a limit on the extent to which it [A SRFI] can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area. Some residual impacts will necessarily arise from development such as HNRFI which is required in the overall national interest. A planning balance has to be undertaken weighing the effects of the development against the benefits.</p>
		<p>4.2 Overwhelming the area with Warehousing and Rail Freight Terminals: The national requirement for Rail Freight terminals and warehousing complexes is already met in this area. Continuing to build more and more of these in this area should not be allowed as part of a national strategy for RFTs</p>	<p>There is no evidence base to underpin the contention that ‘the national requirement for Rail Freight terminals and warehousing complexes is already met in this area’.</p> <p>There is no such ‘national requirement’.</p> <p>The Government considers that there is a ‘compelling need’ for an expanded network of SRFIs. National planning policy does not</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>impose a limit on the number of SFRIs within any part of the country.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken for the project in line with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The findings of this EIA are set out in the Environmental Statement chapters 1-21 (document reference 6.1.1-6.1.21, APP-110 to APP-130) and the associated technical appendices and figures. A summary of the significant effects identified and the register of environmental actions and commitments that will be delivered to ameliorate these effects as far as possible is set out in ES Chapter 21 (document reference: 6.1.21, APP-130).</p>
		5. Road Traffic:	
		5.1 Lack of agreement about traffic plans: The public was not consulted about any traffic plan that had been agreed by the Leicestershire Highways Authority.	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

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>projects states (paragraph 55): ‘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.’ The Applicant made clear that the traffic impacts of HNRFI had not been settled with the Highway Authorities. At the time the Strategic Model was being updated and re-run as part of the next phase of assessment. However, the consultation contained much of the proposed mitigation which was submitted as part of the final DCO. This was based on the strategic model, for which the inputs were fully agreed with the Local Highway Authorities. What was not agreed for the final submission was the overall mitigation strategy. This was based on outputs from the agreed model and professional judgement.</p>
		<p>5.2 Lack of consideration of “Sensitivity Receptors” in villages: The applicant did not take into account various important factors when deciding what traffic mitigating factors to offer. The development will make the area much more dangerous to children and vulnerable people.</p>	<p>The ES had been revisited following feedback received from the PEIR submission, this accounts for a greater number of receptors through the Fosse Villages.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>There is nothing in the new proposals to satisfactorily mitigate against these problems.</p>	<p>It is the applicant's view that the measures proposed mitigate the impact of the development and its infrastructure.</p>
		<p>5.3 Additional traffic caused by site employees: The traffic plan does not take into account the full potential traffic through local villages that will be caused by employees at the site.</p>	<p>Strategic modelling considers a wide study area to understand forecast traffic movements including through the Fosse Villages.</p>
		<p>5.4 M69 Southbound exit: The applicant cannot mitigate nor control the traffic impact of non-HNRFI HGV and non-HGV traffic through the Fosse Villages (especially Stoney Stanton and Sapcote) caused by the M69 Southbound slip road being opened.</p>	<p>The HGV strategy (document reference: 17.4 APP-362) is aimed at controlling site based traffic. Calming measures through the villages are designed to deter HGVs, but as these are existing B class roads they are permitted for all traffic.</p>
		<p>5.5: Inadequate infrastructure in the wider neighbourhood: Local infrastructure in the wider neighbourhood does not support the claimed purposes of the HNRFI</p>	<p>The applicant maintains that infrastructure provided adequately mitigates the impact of the development.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>6. Pollution:</p> <p>6.1 Concentrated increase in local air pollution: There will be an enormous concentration of increased airborne pollution in the immediate area, affecting at least all of the surrounding communities.</p>	<p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118).. Modelled concentrations have been compared against the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p> <p>With specific regard to Stoney Stanton, specific receptor locations in Stoney Stanton were included in the air quality model</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>(document reference: 6.2.9.4, APP-166). The predicted impacts on air pollutant concentrations at these receptors were considered to be negligible in accordance with guidance. There were also predicted decreases in air pollutant concentrations as a result of the HNRFI along the B581 Station Road, west of Hinckley Road, thus resulting in a beneficial impact. These decreases in concentrations are observed due to a reduction in vehicle trips along this section of road as a result of the HNRFI. The overall impact of the HNRFI on air quality was not significant.</p>
		<p>7. Ecology and biodiversity:</p>	
		<p>The juxtaposition of the proposed site to an SSSI and to Public Access Land is one of the key issues mentioned by local residents. This proximity raises many concerns, especially with regard to the impact on the flora and fauna of this site and the negative effect on the enjoyment and well-being of visitors.</p> <p>Other areas of major concern: The impact of hedgerow and mature tree removal.</p>	<p>The Woodland Management Plan (document reference: 6.2.12.4A, APP-200) proposes a suite of outline measures to ensure the woodland is appropriately managed in the long-term, both in terms of biodiversity and recreational impact. Subject to appropriate management, the proposals are unlikely to give rise to significant levels of recreational pressure, given their commercial nature (a position held by Natural England in their Relevant Representations RR-0974).</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>Loss of farmland for crop growing and also loss of opportunities for carbon sequestration</p> <p>Loss of aquatic habitat and the effect on dependent wildlife caused by re-routing a stream.</p> <p>The effect on and loss of biodiversity within and around the Main Order Limits.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged in the assessment that the direct loss and fragmentation of the existing hedgerow network is considered to be of high magnitude and extent, with appropriate mitigation proposed on that basis. Currently the net gain calculations show a 7.12% net linear gain, before any local or off-site solutions have been implemented. Future iterations of the Net Gain metric will ensure 10% net gain in hedgerow units will be achieved.</p> <p>The arboricultural impact assessment (document reference: 6.2.11.4, APP-194) details the trees, group of trees and hedgerows to be lost or affected due to the development. Of 898 items surveyed, 356 will be lost and 32 affected, leaving 510 unaffected. To mitigate for these losses, around 20,000 new trees will be planted across the areas of new woodland planting and around 600 individual trees will be planted as street trees and amenity trees within the working logistics park. As noted in the Soils and Agricultural Land Quality Assessment (document reference: 6.2.11.3, APP-193), the land being developed</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>comprises 40ha of previously developed land, 204ha of subgrade 3b land which is not what is termed 'best and most versatile' for agricultural production. The high clay content of the grade 3b land limits drainage, restricts access with machinery and cropping to autumn sowings of cereals and oil seeds. Only 2.9ha of the land is Grade 3a and better quality, some of which will not be developed but will be planted with native woodland, scrub and wildflower meadow planting.</p> <p>The loss of aquatic habitat has been fully accounted for - the majority of wet ditch habitat will be retained, new wildlife ponds will be created to replace existing ponds, and the stream realignment will offer opportunities to create a more feature-rich watercourse.</p> <p>Requirement 30 will ensure the development delivers a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Whilst BNG assessments are ongoing, current calculations show there is sufficient scope to deliver net gains on site, with options to deliver additional through off-site solutions.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>8. Environmental:</p> <p>8.1 Light, Noise and Vibrations: The site will cause: light pollution, excessive noise and vibrations which will affect all of the local communities and wildlife in the area.</p>	<p>The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134) defines the parameters and standards that any proposed lighting installation will have to be designed in accordance with to meet the specific criteria in terms of obtrusive light to meet the applicable standards and guidance.</p> <p>The Lighting Strategy Appendix 1 (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132) is an indicative Lux Plot Layout which indicates where light spill is anticipated to fall to 1 lux which has been considered acceptable by the appointed Ecologist. This is in line with the Leicestershire and Rutland 'Bats and Lighting' guidance document (Leicestershire County Council Planning Ecology Service, November 2014, updated August 2022), where 1lux has been adopted as the precautionary maximum amount of light spillage on to a bat foraging corridor needed to avoid impacts on bat foraging.</p> <p>The current level of assessment is considered appropriate at this stage in the design process. Ecological receptors (including bats)</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>have been considered, with lux radii plans demonstrating that the vast majority of open space will be free of lightspill, thereby maintaining opportunities for local bat species. The ILP Guidance Note 08 is referenced within the submitted AIP, plus the EMMP (document reference: 17.5, APP-363). As per the ILP guidance, vertical calculation planes should be used wherever appropriate (i.e. when considering particularly sensitive features or species). The proposed lighting will be unlikely to affect any roosts, as all known roosts will be removed under licence and the majority of potential roost features will likely be removed (under licence where appropriate). In addition, any artificial roosts will be located away from intense light sources. For any retained potential roost features, these will be buffered by openspace. The existing site is typically utilised by common species which are known to be fairly light tolerant. On that basis, it is considered vertical calculations are not currently necessary.</p> <p>Update ecological surveys in 2024/2024 will confirm if the sites trees support bat roosts. The results of these survey will be used to</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>inform detailed LIA / lighting plans, with vertical calculations undertaken where appropriate.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p> <p>The ecology chapter (Document reference 6.1.12) has also identified where ecological receptors may be sensitive to noise and vibration during the construction phase (including birds – paragraphs 12.163, 12.167; bats – 12.172, badgers – 12.175; otter - 12.179, with appropriate mitigation proposed on that basis.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>8.2 Flooding: The area is also known to have occasional floods. Changes to the level of the water table and changes to drainage caused by such a huge structure in the area will cause more flooding</p>	<p>As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209) the flooding within the Main HNRFI Site is a product of runoff from within the 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 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. 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 and therefore no impact on the downstream catchment. In larger storm events this will represent a reduction in the peak flow leaving the development, offering downstream betterment. The underlying geology is of low permeability meaning that</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			there is not a significant groundwater reservoir or flow pathway that could be negatively impacted by the development.
		9. Power plant:	
		We have concerns about the inclusion of a very large power plant and do not believe this has been properly considered	It is not entirely clear what the 'very large power plant' refers to. There would be an on-site energy centre which is described at Chapter 3 of the ES, paragraphs 3.45 – 3.46 (document reference: 6.1.3, APP-112). The energy centre will contain centralised infrastructure and plant as well as some components that will be distributed at the units and its purpose is to manage the distribution and control of power across the Main HNRFI Site. The energy centre has been assessed in the relevant chapters of the ES.
<b>RR-0344</b>	<b>Earl Shilton Neighbourhood Watch</b>	Severely impact on, and destroy, Burbage Common: an area of natural beauty, full of wildlife and natural habitats, widely used by members of the public from local, and wider, area.	There would be no direct impact on Burbage Common and Woods Country Park. As indicated on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304), there would be areas of strategic landscape planting within the site to screen views of the proposals from Burbage Common and Woods and integrate the

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>scheme into the local landscape. 22ha of additional, publicly accessible areas would be provided adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park.</p> <p>The Woodland Access Management Plan (document reference: 6.2.12.4, APP-200) proposes a suite of outline measures to ensure the Burbage Common and woods are appropriately managed in the long-term, both in terms of biodiversity and recreational impact. Subject to appropriate management, the proposals are unlikely to give rise to significant levels of recreational pressure, given their commercial nature (a position held by Natural England in their Relevant Representations RR-0974). Moreover, the long-term management will implement measures to enhance the woodland.</p>
		<p>Local road infrastructures not adequate to cope with increased traffic from workers etc going to and from site. Roads already a nightmare at busy times. Getting to and from work means you have to leave very early to avoid current traffic queues, and that's before we get large numbers of additional workers travelling into/out of our area.</p>	<p>Significant amounts of strategic modelling has been carried out throughout the preparation of the DCO. This has led to the planning of access infrastructure and highway upgrades which mitigate the impact of the HNRFI development. The upgrade of Junction 2 alongside the provision of a new link road</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>Already problems with A5 not being fit for current purpose. A Link road from M69 will not solve this issue, as workers will not all come from areas where M69 can be joined or want to use it. How do Lorries and workers get to site from the end of M69 Link Road? Have to use current road system, which is currently struggling to cope, so will fail, which will impact on residents even more. Large Container Lorries will impact severely on our local roads, even if its only a short section from Leicester Road/M69 Link Road junction and the proposed site. It's already a nightmare at certain times of the day. The road wasn't built to have continuous, 24-hour, heavy lorries using it.</p> <p>Impact of noise from site, despite concrete barriers being erected, will be massive.</p>	<p>will mean that both development traffic and background traffic will divert to new and higher capacity routes on the strategic road network (motorways) or A class routes. This will help to reduce impacts on some local roads. Where junction congestion was identified through the modelling process, further analysis was carried out and mitigation proposed to improve capacity.</p> <p>The site sits adjacent to the M69 and it is a primary reason for locating the development where it is. Revised layout at Junction 2 allows most HGV traffic to access the strategic road network without needing to use local routes with limited capacity. The new link road and slips will also benefit background traffic seeking more efficient routes to the motorway. Where the workforce comes from other parts of the network, analysis of local roads has helped to identify junctions which require capacity enhancements. For more detail see AS-016 Sections 8 and 9.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p>
		<p>The 24 hour noise of containers being moved and unloaded/loaded, and the noise of huge lorries moving around with engine noise, refuelling noise, voices etc, as well as moving on and off the site, causing huge air and noise pollution, and disruption, for both residents and the area. There will also be vehicles delivering services to the accommodation blocks, i.e. food, clerical, food preparation, cleaning and laundry staff etc. As well as fuel deliveries for refuelling lorries.</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. Acoustic characteristics such as bangs, scrapes, tones etc have also been accounted for noise generated within the SRFI.</p> <p>The results of the assessment indicates that</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p> <p>The air quality assessment provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) was undertaken to predict pollutant concentrations of vehicles moving on and off the site. The assessment predicted no significant impacts with regard to air quality across the whole study area.</p>
		<p>Putting cycle paths through site? Who will want to ride their bike through such a site with its pollution and noise levels?</p>	<p>New cycle paths are to encourage mode shift away from single occupancy car trips as promoted through the Framework Travel Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.2, APP-159). Fewer cars on the road will lead to reduced pollution and noise.</p> <p>The purpose of the cycle paths through the site is to provide a through route as part of the cycle network. The primary purpose of the route is not for recreational purposes and therefore the expectation of the users would be to experience some noise from the surrounding development.</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>The air quality assessment provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) predicted no significant impacts with regard to air quality across the whole study area.</p>
		<p>Green spaces planned are insignificant and are merely a token, not worth the paper they are drawn on. Need to be much higher proportion of green space on site, but nothing will mitigate the obliteration of our green fields, hedges, trees and wildlife and the damage to Burbage Common.</p>	<p>The applied design principles have been outlined in the mitigation and enhancement section at paragraph 11.134 – 11.137 of the ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120). With reference to green spaces these can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall green and blue open space accounts for 28% of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor combined; and</li> <li>- The Western Amenity Area extends to approximately 22ha, which is approximately 25% of the Burbage Common and Woods Country Park; and</li> <li>- As identified in paragraph 11.123 of ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120), corridors up to 70m in places</li> </ul>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>would provide broad natural green ways on the site's boundaries.</p> <p>The objective value of the arable land, hedgerows, trees and the wildlife that these habitats support has been fully assessed. Intensively managed agricultural land, which accounts for the vast majority of the site has no intrinsic ecological value. The opportunities it provides wildlife are limited, with similar opportunities extensively present in the local area. The Woodland Access Management Plan (document reference: 6.2.12.4, APP-200) proposes a suite of outline measures to ensure the Burbage Common and woods are appropriately managed in the long-term, both in terms of biodiversity and recreational impact. Subject to appropriate management, the proposals are unlikely give rise to significant levels of recreational pressure, given their commercial nature (a position held by Natural England in their Relevant Representations RR-0974). Moreover, the proposed management will implement measures to enhance the woodland over the long-term.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>The impact on the local area will be devastating, not just environmentally, but also for residents who have chosen to live in the local area because of its beautiful countryside and small town/village location, these will no longer be reasons to move to this area. Who will want to move here in the future, unless they work at the proposed site?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the development will result in the loss of agricultural fields, trees and hedgerows and the land will change from countryside to a logistics park with public open space. However, the proposals include 20ha of woodland planting, 22ha of meadow and scrub planting and around 600 individual trees within the logistics park itself. This is as described in the Landscape ES Chapter (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that inevitably HNRFI will result in some residual environmental impacts and that for many people '<i>they like the area as it is</i>'. Mitigations shall be put in place to address environmental impacts. The provision of an expanded network of SRFIs is a 'compelling need' in the national interest as set out in the NPSNN. The fears expressed are, with respect, considered to be overstated. The design of HNRFI has sought to minimise the environmental impact of the development.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken for the project in line with the Infrastructure Planning</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>(Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The findings of this EIA are set out in the Environmental Statement chapters 1-21 (document reference: 6.1.1-6.1.21, APP-110 to APP-130) and the associated technical appendices and figures. A summary of the significant effects identified and the register of environmental actions and commitments that will be delivered to ameliorate these effects as far as possible is set out in ES Chapter 21 (document reference: 6.1.21, APP-130).</p>
RR-1228	Save Burbage Common	<p>1. The area in which this development is proposed is already served by a large number of existing or agreed distribution centres, including rail freight interchanges. This includes: • Northampton Gateway RFI • West Midlands RFI • Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT) • Prologis Park RFI • Hams Hall RFI • East Midlands RFI • Magna Park (including extension) (Not directly rail linked, but uses DIRFT facilities and could conceivably be rail linked in the future). • Birch Coppice RFI We understand the at least one of these (the DIRFT) is currently operating significantly under-capacity.</p>	<p>The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: APP-357, 16.1) para 6.12 demonstrates that HNRFI will serve a different role to existing and committed SRFIs. The Market Needs Assessment explains the role served by DIRFT which is distinct to HNRFI.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>2. Burbage Common and Woods (the Common) comprises Burbage Common, Sheepy and Burbage Woods, Elmesthorpe Plantation and Smenell Field. It is the district's prime countryside site and is located on the western side of the proposed development. The site is public access land and is a rich mix of semi-natural woodland and unspoilt grassland covering over 80 hectares and provides a wildlife corridor and habitat. Burbage Wood and Aston Firs is a 126 acre biological Site of Special Scientific Interest. The woodlands are some of the only remaining fragments of Hinckley Forest, which dates back to mediaeval times and they are still managed by traditional methods. There is currently a rich variety of flora and fauna at the common including 20 species of butterflies, many species of flowering plants, 100 species of fungi and over 30 species of mammals and birds including lapwings, skylarks, hedge sparrows, buzzards, sparrow-hawks, nuthatches, jays and great spotted woodpeckers. There are great crested newts using ponds close to the site, and a badger sett on the edge of the site. The site is used heavily by local and wider populations for several recreational activities including walking, horse riding, orienteering, wildlife study, environmental activities and education. It is a highly valued local and regional public asset. Hundreds of people visit the Common every day and thousands attend the annual open days there.</p>	<p>As indicated on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: APP-304), there would be areas of strategic landscape planting within the site to soften views of the proposals. 22ha of additional, publicly accessible areas would be provided adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the development will result in the loss of agricultural fields, trees and hedgerows and the land will change from countryside to a logistics park with public open space. However, the proposals include 20ha of woodland planting, 22ha of meadow and scrub planting and around 600 individual trees within the logistics park itself. This is as described in the Landscape ES Chapter (document reference: 6.2.12.1.4, APP-120).</p> <p>The proposals ensure the woodland will be protected, buffered and enhanced long-term. The Woodland Management Plan (document reference: APP-200) is, at this stage, an outline document. DCO Requirement 33 includes for a detailed iteration of the WMP, which will include a range of measures to</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			ensure Burbage Woods and Common remains of high value.
		<p>3. The site, which is part of the Aston Flamville Wooded Farmland landscape, will impose significantly on the setting of Elmesthorpe and the Fosse villages, which are historic quarrying villages, retaining much of their historical buildings. Blacksmith's Cottage in Sapcote which is situated within the DCO area, is the original village blacksmith's forge and still retains the mounting block. It is the main reason for the narrow footpath and 'S' bend in the centre of the village. Tritax have failed to explain how this will be impacted by footpath widening. Aston Flamville has conservation village status.</p>	<p>The submitted Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13. APP-122) includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact upon the historic environment, including the setting of surrounding heritage assets that have the potential to be affected. In terms of Blacksmith's Cottage in Sapcote, this is identified as a non-designated local heritage assets in the Sapcote Neighbourhood Plan and is not identified as a sensitive receptor in Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13. APP-122) . The building is not within the DCO Site, but is located adjacent to proposed Offsite Highways Works Ref B4 (B4669 Sapcote Road/Hiinckley Road). As set out on Figure 3.3 Highways and Junction Improvement Plans (document reference: APP-232), the proposed works at B4 adjacent Blacksmith's Cottage comprise kerb realignment to improve the layout of the existing cross roads. These works would be contained to the highway and would have no impact on the cottage. The impact of the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>Proposed Development on Aston Flamville Conservation Area is assessed in paragraphs 13.197 to 13.198.</p>
		<p>4. Noise and light pollution will be considerable from a site operating 24 hours a day. Given the nature of noise emitted by freight trains and engines whilst travelling, the nature of the noise generated by shunting etc, the geography of the area and the railway being largely on an embankment, train noise travels long distances, and even further under some common meteorological conditions.</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), the noise model takes account of the existing topography around the site and the proposed topography within the site. The 3D acoustic model does assess the effect of any screening or absorption provided by development landscaping and any features of the existing landscape surrounding the site.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: APP- 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. Acoustic characteristics such as bangs, scrapes, tones etc have also been accounted for noise generated within the SRFI.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p> <p>In respect to lighting, any new development should be specified an Environmental Zone (ranging from E0 'protected environment e.g., UNESCO starlight reserve, to E4 'High district brightness e.g., City Centre). For each Environmental Zone the ILP recommends maximum values of light parameters for the control of obtrusive light. The Site has been considered to fall within Environmental Zone E2 'Low district brightness' e.g., sparsely inhabited rural area. The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2 APP-132 to APP-134) states that the development must not exceed the maximum values for environmental Zone E2.</p> <p>The Applicant will also provide a Technical Note for Lighting which will contain further guidance, information and assessment to</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>demonstrate that the Proposed Development can be provided with an external lighting installation that complies with the criteria as set out in the Lighting Strategy, while not exceeding the obtrusive light limitations for residential properties during E2 post-curfew conditions. This Technical Note is intended to provide additional information to supplement the original Lighting Strategy as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process with the relevant consultees. This Technical Note shall be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p> <p>In accordance with dDCO Requirement 31, each phase of the authorised development shall not be occupied until a scheme for all permanent lighting in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>5. The proposed site lies on higher ground in an area already subject to flooding and slopes down towards the Fosse villages. The site is currently farmland. Concreting over such a large area is likely to lead to excessive run off into the villages below the site, which will inevitably result in flooding of residential properties and possibly M69 motorway.</p>	<p>As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209), the flooding within the Main HNRFI Site is a product of runoff from within the 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 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. 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 and therefore no impact on the downstream catchment. In larger storm events this will represent a reduction in the peak flow leaving the development, offering downstream betterment.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>6. The proposed site is adjacent to at least one environmentally sensitive area (the Common) and either adjacent to, or within sight and sound of, large residential areas and settlements (Hinckley, Burbage, Stoney Stanton, Sapcote, Aston Flamville, Earl Shilton, Elmesthorpe, Barwell and the traveller site and mobile home site at Aston Firs.)</p>	<p>All of these receptors have been considered in the Landscape and Visual ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120).</p>
		<p>7. There will be a significant increase in emissions of pollutants both during construction and then in the operation of the SRFI. The site is in an area that is renowned for the distinctiveness of its local weather - particularly fog and mist - which will exacerbate air quality issues.</p>	<p>The air quality assessment provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) predicted no significant impacts with regard to air quality across the whole study area. The air quality modelling assessment utilises hourly sequential meteorological data representative of the local area and has been undertaken in accordance with the latest guidance and methodologies.</p>
		<p>8. Unemployment levels are low in the area. The workforce will have to commute from the areas that Tritax suggest will supply the staff for the site such as Birmingham and Coventry (places which already have large logistics parks / SRFI's ). The cycle routes will also</p>	<p>As stated in Paragraph 7.298 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (Document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116), although unemployment levels are low in the area, there are still approximately 46,100</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>have limited benefit since the employees are likely to commute from a large distance away</p>	<p>unemployed people in the Study Area. Table 7.8 in Environmental Statement - Chapter 7 - Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference 6.1.7, APP-116) shows that the Study Area also performs worse in youth unemployment in 16–24-year-olds at 13.5% compared to 12.9% at the England level, which the Proposed Development could help to address.</p>
		<p>9. There are several rail issues that do not appear to have been considered such as: • The junction of the line with the Midland Main Line just south of Leicester (at Wigston) is already heavily congested. • The impact of long slow freight trains crossing the East Coast Main Line (near Peterborough), or the Midland Main Line (Leicester) or West Coast Main Line (Nuneaton) • The impact of long slow trains on the level crossing in the village of Narborough. • The time taken for freight trains to slow and stand before entering the site. • The impact of the gradient of the line at the site where the development is proposed on the time taken to enter and leave the site. • Existing plans to enhance both freight and passenger traffic on the line to incorporate for example the use of quarries at Croft to provide aggregate and 'waste' disposal for HS2 and the re-introduction of direct frequent services between Leicester and Coventry.</p>	<p>The detail of the rail studies is set out in the Environmental Statement Volume 2: ES Appendix 3.1:Rail Report. Network Rail has completed its own assessment and is satisfied that there is capacity for HNRFI to operate 16 trains per day (tested at 10 via Wigston Junction and 6 via Nuneaton); and for these to then be able to be dispersed on its wider Strategic Freight Network, as per the Rail Report. This includes allowing for planned growth in passenger traffic with the Midland Connect Leicester – Coventry service; and also does not impact on Croft's ability to serve a maximum of its own on-site operating capacity, of 3 trains per day.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>10. There will be a major impact on transport networks: Tritax have said at their presentations that they expect that most of the traffic accessing and leaving the site will be via the M69 at junction 2. Because they do not know who their customers will be, this is an unrealistic assumption. Tritax would not be able to control which routes drivers take. Drivers are known to take the shortest route and this is likely to have a major impact on Hinckley and the surrounding villages. At busy times, most of the major and some minor roads are heavily congested with stationary traffic. Adding massive additional HGV volume to this will make the situation intolerable.</p>	<p>Significant amounts of strategic transport modelling has been carried out throughout the preparation of the DCO. This has led to the planning of access infrastructure and highway upgrades which mitigate the impact of the HNRFI development. Additional infrastructure including the new slip roads at Junction 2 M69 and the A47 link road add capacity to the existing network and enhance routes and opportunity for existing and proposed traffic to access the strategic road network. The south facing slips mean that traffic that currently routes through Hinckley to access areas to the north and east can use the new slips and vice versa.</p>
		<p>The M69 is exited at the Leicester end by a large roundabout which feeds onto the South M1 and the City ring road. It is a notorious traffic blackspot. Traffic regularly builds up and queues as far back as junction 2 of the M69 are not unknown. Coming from the M1 onto the M69, the situation is even worse as traffic backs up on the slip road daily resulting in stationary traffic sitting on the M1, despite the M1 being a four-lane motorway at this point. There is no direct access south from the M69 to the M6 at Coventry. There are currently queues along the B4669 into</p>	<p>Junction 21 of the M1 has been reviewed in detail, there are existing problems here that require significant investment. The proportionate impact from HNRFI is small at J21 and the re-distributed traffic experienced as a result of the development has been mitigated, where it impacts local roads.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>Hinckley from the M69 roundabout for most of the day. The worker movements from the hub together with the additional exit from the M69 will increase this already severe congestion.</p>	
		<p>Between February 2021 and January 2022, there were 74 crashes on the M69. Bridge smashes occur at the low bridge over the A5 outside Hinckley 26 times each year on average.</p>	<p>A full review of accidents and projected accidents following the inclusion of the site has been assessed within the Transport Assessment. Following discussions with LCC additional work has also been completed using the most up-to-date accident data post-Covid and will be submitted as a technical note at Deadline 2 in response to discussions with LCC and the comments LCC propose to set out in their Deadline 1 submissions.</p>
		<p>There is also no resilience in the local area to closure of the M69 as there are few alternative routes. Any emergency closure currently brings Hinckley and the surrounding villages to a complete standstill. The likely 9,000 HGVs per day which the hub will add to the M69 motorway will magnify the impact of any motorway closure enormously. Extensive growth in the area is already committed along the A5 corridor, which will put an additional burden on the neighbouring road network, especially since</p>	<p>Routing of traffic has been subject to scrutiny and a distribution model which predicts likely trip origins/destinations provided the basis for the forecast models.</p> <p>Mitigation is specifically focused on addressing impacts caused by the development and its infrastructure, the new slips, upgrades to Junction 2 and the link road</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		improvements to the A5 have now been shelved due to funding issues.	will all contribute to better highway access in the area.
		The villages of Sapcote and Stoney Stanton will be particularly badly affected by the traffic impacts due to the opening of the extra slips on the M69, the additional worker movements and the likelihood of HGV's using the roads through the villages as shortcuts. The Tritax consultation completely failed to explain the proposed highway improvements in Sapcote and Stoney Stanton in any detail and it was impossible to work out the effect on the character and layout of the villages. The question of Eastern bypasses has been discussed in earlier consultations, but no satisfactory route has ever been proposed.	Measures to improve safety through the Fosse Villages are proposed, these are all incorporated within the highway envelope. (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-152) Eastern bypass options were all opposed by local people during the 2019 consultation. A review of the data suggested that the proposed A47 link had a better effect on traffic movement than bypasses of the villages, which would induce further traffic to the B4114.
		The additional freight movements proposed will significantly increase downtime at Narborough level crossing which will have a significant adverse impact on local traffic through the villages.	Additional train paths have been factored into traffic modelling at Narborough Level Crossing- increases in barrier downtimes during peak hours are minimal.  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

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4 – 7 pm only two. Each train travelling at 75 miles an hour would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins. 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>11. Narrow geographical spread of potential alternative sites. No 'brownfield' sites such as those west of Hinckley and Nuneaton were looked at. The possibility of a new rail link between Magna Park and the nearby West Coast Mainline was not investigated.</p>	<p>The Applicant is required to outline the main alternatives studied. The genesis of the site search was the findings of the Leicester and Leicestershire Warehouse and Logistics Study 2014, which identified substantial need for rail related warehousing space in Leicestershire. The Applicant is not required to have investigated the possibility of a 'rail link' between Magna Park and the WCML.</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</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>design. This policy advice was taken into account in the Applicant's assessment of locations and design options. The Applicant then considered seven potential locations within the area of Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20.</p> <p>The LAs have agreed with the preparation of the Statement of Common Ground on planning matters that no site within the existing urban areas is suitable to meet the locational design requirements for a SFRI.</p>
RR-0768	Loughborough east community association	The main issues to be considered are as follows: a full and comprehensive environmental impact has not been completed. The overall carbon emissions of the project and lifetime carbon assessment have not been taken into consideration with complete decarbonisation not even being considered within the plans. The precedence that will be set from the scale of this plan on green belt land.	<p>The methodology to assess the effects of HNRFI is consistent with that agreed with the planning inspectorate prior to assessment. Paragraph 18.61 of Chapter 18 (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) explains:</p> <p>Chapter 18 (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) sets out mitigation to ensure that all proposed development minimises vulnerability and provides resilience to climate change and will contribute to achieving national targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging the use of sustainable materials and</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>construction methods and supporting the Government's zero carbon buildings policy which will be increased progressively over the plan period, where feasible, to support the Government's longer-term aspirations for sustainable design. It further meets policy by introducing the use of renewable, low carbon and decentralised energy to allow the site to be self-sufficient.</p> <p>The site is not located on Green Belt land.</p>
		<p>The decreased level of air quality in the area within is already shockingly low (like the rest of the country).</p>	<p>Current nitrogen dioxide monitoring undertaken by Blaby District Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council within the study area indicates that concentrations are below the current annual mean air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide for England (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118).</p> <p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Modelled concentrations have been compared against</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p>
RR-0186	<b>Castlewood Residents Association</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="719 1027 1424 1134">1. The impact of more traffic in the local area impacting our ability to access our site via the lane that joins the B4660 and increased traffic pollution.</li> </ol>	<p>The new link road will alleviate some pressure on the B4669, Therefore, access is unlikely to be significantly affected by the development. As set out in Chapter 8 Transport and Traffic (document reference 6.1.8 APP-117)</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>2. The impact of increased noise from the proposed site which will be operating 24 hrs a day.</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations and additional train movements. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p>
		<p>3. The environmental impact on the adjacent woodlands</p>	<p>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 would be engineering works up to a 25m offset, but the distance to the hard surface of the road has been kept to a 35m offset. All works are well outside the root protection zone for the ancient woodland. During construction protective fencing would be provided with</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>dust and acoustic screening to limit impact. Buffer to include a native planted ecotone with trees, shrubs and meadow grassland.</p> <p>The detailed landscape and planting plans will create a more naturalistic/ecotone edge to the woodlands, which itself will provide a significant ecological enhancement to the woodland. This would be in place of the current hard transition from woodland to intensively managed agricultural land. The large, planted buffers will provide a functional net gain in woodland habitat.</p>
		<p>4. The massive impact on local residents during the construction phase over many years.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that construction of major infrastructure projects such as HNRFI will necessarily have some impact on local residents during construction, particularly in the early phases of construction, when the main infrastructure works are being undertaken, including ground reprofiling; road construction and rail port construction. The Requirements for a Construction Environmental Management Plan (7), <a href="#">Construction noise and vibration (7(2))</a>; Construction Hours (16); HGV Route</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>Management Plan and Strategy (19) and Construction Management Plan (24), will minimise the residual impacts to the surrounding community.</p>
<p><b>RR-0156</b></p>	<p><b>Burbage Heritage Group</b></p>	<p>Following a survey of the 64 members of Burbage Heritage Group, all responses have objected to this development. The reasons for objection are outlined below: 1. The RFI is not needed here; there are plenty of massive freight depots in the Midlands area and existing or approved rail freight interchanges already. Rail freight interchanges – existing, under development or proposed at West Midlands Interchange Freight depots: (A5 Corridor, Magna Park, Hinckley Parks, Rugby, Daventry, Tamworth, etc.) M6 J12 SRFI, Cannock RFI, Burton on Trent RFI, Castle Donington EDMC RFI, East Midlands Gateway SRFI, Hams Hall SRFI, Birch Coppice SRFI, DIRFT Rugby, Rail Central &amp; Northampton Gateway SRFI, etc.)</p>	<p>Both the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 and the HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment submitted as part of the DCO application, (document reference: 16.2, APP-358) clearly establish the needs case for the HNRFI. The level of disagreement is on the level of future need. This matter is being covered in the SoCG and the Applicant understands the parties position as agreeing that this need is identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 which was commissioned and agreed by the relevant Local Authorities. The level of disagreement is on the level of future need.</p> <p>Estimated future demand is 2.5 times higher than current and known available supply. The Applicant considers this a matter of fact based on the evidence detailed in the HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>(document reference 16.2, APP-358). This level of shortfall between demand and supply clearly evidences a large scale and strategic site such as the HNRFI is needed.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to these comments is provided in the Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357).</p>
		<p>2. Although it would take many truck journeys off long distance routes, it would add many many more to the local road network, including the workers traffic causing delays and congestion to commuter routes to Leicester, Coventry and Birmingham and the A5 corridor.</p>	<p>Significant amounts of strategic traffic modelling has been carried out throughout the preparation of the DCO application. Environmental Statement - Appendix 8.1 - Transport Assessment [Part 11 of 20] - PRTM 2.2 Forecast Modelling (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-148) provides the forecast modelling summary which has been used to understand the impacts at the local road network level. The Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.8.1 APP—139)AS – 016) includes further information within Sections 8 and 9. This has led to the planning of access infrastructure and highway upgrades which mitigate the impact of the HNRFI development</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>3. We have an excess of lorries shaking our conservation area foundations at the moment without more using the centre of Burbage as a cut through from the A5, e.g. DPD, Amazon, etc. and also as a diversion route from the A5 and M69. If this development was to go ahead weight restrictions throughout Burbage Village would be necessary.</p>	<p>As set out in Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: APP-122), no effects on the significance of heritage assets, including Burbage Conservation Area, are predicted to arise in respect of Traffic and Transport or Vibration impacts.</p> <p>The noise assessment has considered the potential effect of additional road traffic associated with the proposed development. Only one receptor, at Bridge Farm, is predicted to experience a major adverse effect as a result of development generated road traffic. Remaining receptors are predicted to experience, at worse, a minor significant effect which is not significant ((Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 6.1.10, paragraphs 10.332 and 10.336)).</p> <p>It would be expected that consideration of vibration from additional road traffic movements would be required where significant effects are likely to occur. However, given that the additional traffic movements are not predicted to result in a significant increase in noise level, it is unlikely that</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>vibration would also increase significantly on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>The potential effect of additional road traffic associated with the proposed development in relation to noise has been assessed and mitigation has been recommended where adverse noise impacts have been identified (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119).</p>
		<p>4. It would add to the already strained housing situation whereby local young people cannot afford to buy homes.</p>	<p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Warehousing and Logistics Study concludes that there is a need for a further SRFI within Leicestershire and this will form part of the evidence base for the review of development plans.</p> <p>The effect of the Proposed Development on housing has been assessed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116). Similar approach has been followed in other SRFI DCO applications including Northampton Gateway, East Midlands Gateway, West Midland Interchange and Daventry IRFT.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>5. The increase in population required to service the development will impact local infrastructure, Doctors, School, Dentist, Hospitals and other public services that are already unable to meet demand</p>	<p>The proposed development does not include any residential development, and will not directly alter associated amenities, facilities or services. Facilities and services are accessed from an individuals place of residence rather than employment.</p>
		<p>6. It would infringe and cause immeasurable damage to the adjacent Burbage Common and Woods, an SSSI and registered park and garden, damage which could never be recovered.</p>	<p>There would be no direct impacts on Burbage Common and Woods Country Park noting that part of the area has legal protection as Common/Open Access Land.</p> <p>As noted in Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122), Burbage Common and Woods is not a Registered Park and Garden, and it is not identified as a heritage asset at either a local or national level. Burbage Common is however a Country Park and area of Open Access Land and its status as such forms part of the assessment in the ES. (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120).</p> <p>As indicated on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: APP-304), there would be areas of strategic landscape</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>planting within the site to screen and soften views of the proposals from Burbage Common and Woods Country Park. Also, a 22ha area of additional, publicly accessible land would be provided adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park for enhanced biodiversity and public recreational enjoyment.</p>
		<p>7. The reduction in air quality and increase in noise generated would impact and become detrimental to the health of residents and visitors to the area.</p>	<p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Modelled concentrations have been compared against the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p> <p>With specific regard to Burbage, specific receptor locations in Burbage were included in the air quality model (document reference: 6.2.9.4, APP-166). The predicted impacts on air pollutant concentrations at these receptors were considered to be negligible in accordance with guidance. The overall impact of the HNRFI on air quality was not significant.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.
		8. The frequent "A5 Bridge Lorry Collisions" will increase further delaying both road traffic and rail freight.	The proposed link road will provide a viable alternative to the A5 for high-sided vehicles, reducing delay currently experienced during bridge strikes.
		9. The Tritax Symmetry public consultation did not fully inform on the effects the development would make to the Burbage area.	<p>A Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) was provided for the consultation and included assessment of environmental effects including any effects extending to Burbage.</p> <p>A primary concern for Burbage residents and attendees at the Burbage consultation was traffic impacts. The traffic modelling confirms that the proposed access infrastructure for the development will improve traffic conditions in Burbage as the opening up of the south facing slip roads on to the M69 at Junction 2, traffic through the village of Burbage will be reduced even when the terminal has been fully built out and is operational. It is acknowledged by Burbage Parish Council in their relevant</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>representation that LCC Highways have made this comment to them and it aligns with the Applicants understanding of effects of the development on Burbage.</p>
<p><b>RR-0380</b></p>	<p><b>Elmesthorpe Stands Together</b></p>	<p>EST (Elmesthorpe Stands Together) has concerns over the following areas, this is not an exhaustive list. Location of the proposed development, throughout the process EST feel that the village of Elmesthorpe has almost disappeared, we are a small village and the impact such a large development will have on our doorstep will be irreparable. The overall need for rail freight in the area needs to be balanced with the increasing demand for passenger rail, which would occupy the same line, locally the HNRFI would have a significant impact on the crossing at Narborough and would increase the downtime substantially.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the village of Elmesthorpe is in proximity of the site. The village has been considered in the environmental assessment of where required appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the application.</p> <p>Network Rail have assessed that there is capacity for HNRFI having allowed for anticipated growth in passenger services. Only 3 services can operate in and out of HNRFI in an hour, of which a maximum of 2 can run through Narborough.</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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>barrier downtime of 2.5mins. 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>Overall impact on air quality. NOx and particulate matter is already at high levels of exposure: developments that will undoubtedly further exacerbate this issue are not acceptable. The future proofing of the proposed development with respect to government targets on the switch to electric vehicles (including HGV, cars and trains) or the removal of reliance on fossil fuels.</p>	<p>Current nitrogen dioxide monitoring undertaken by Blaby District Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council within the study area indicates that concentrations are below the current annual mean air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide for England (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118).</p> <p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Modelled concentrations have been compared against the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p> <p>With specific regard to Elmesthorpe, specific receptor locations in Elmesthorpe were included in the air quality model (document reference: 6.2.9.4, APP-166). The predicted impacts on air pollutant concentrations at these receptors were assessed to be negligible in accordance with guidance. The overall impact of the HNRFI on air quality was not significant.</p>
		Lack of mitigation of Elmesthorpe in the traffic plans other than to place an uncontrolled crossing at the base of the	The new link road to the B4668/A47 will remove some of the existing through traffic



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>railway bridge close to Bostock Close – a site which is already high risk to traffic incidents.</p> <p>The use of the Burbage Common Road as an emergency access point to the proposed site, or any consideration as to how traffic will impact the village. As the closest village settlement to the proposed site, the impacts must be considered. Any increase in traffic will have an impact.</p> <p>On-site shuttle bus, services or routes. Bus routes and bus stops associated with the proposed HNRFI are not regarded as appropriate to run through Elmesthorpe.</p> <p>Workforce of the proposed HNRFI parking in surrounding residential areas and using the pedestrian access to the site, to avoid the inevitable shift change bottlenecks as well as HGV's using local roads as rest areas when the HGV park on site is either full or too expensive to use.</p>	<p>on the B582 reducing impacts on Elmesthorpe.</p> <p>The emergency access route is not for use by site traffic- only the emergency services.</p> <p>Bus services will use the new link road and internal circulatory carriageways they are not proposed to use routes through Elmesthorpe. (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153)</p> <p>Parking provision on-site is within the recommended thresholds for the site. Infrastructure has been designed to handle shift changeovers where congestion will be brief or very limited. Parking outside of the development will not be permitted through the travel plan and any transgressions will be monitored and action taken. HGVs using the site will be permitted to use the rest areas provided.</p>
		<p>The design for the proposed RFI site needs to be reassessed. We feel that there is a need for the RFI to be located in an area that is furthest from any residential areas to help to reduce light, noise and air pollution along with the reduction in vibration caused from the trains</p>	<p>Chapter 4 of the ES (document reference 6.1.4, APP-113) sets out the master planning approach that has been taken for the site and the evolution of this in response to site constraints, survey work and consultation.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>themselves, therefore reducing the impact the RFI will have on local residents.</p>	<p>This is set out in paragraphs 4.132 to 4.183. The location of different elements of the Proposed Development within the site itself has been driven by a number of different factors including rail connectivity, highways, location to residential receptors and to ecological and other environmental sites and receptors. All these factors have been balanced against the operational needs to result in the layout proposed.</p> <p>The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2 APP-132 to APP-134) defines the parameters and standards that any proposed lighting installation will have to be designed in accordance with to meet the specific criteria in terms of obtrusive light to meet the applicable standards and guidance</p> <p>A new development should be specified an Environmental Zone (ranging from E0 'protected environment e.g., UNESCO starlight reserve, to E4 'High district brightness e.g., City Centre). For each Environmental Zone the ILP recommends maximum values of light parameters for the control of obtrusive light. The Site has been considered to fall within Environmental Zone</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>E2 'Low district brightness' e.g., sparsely inhabited rural area. The Lighting Strategy states that the development must not exceed the maximum values for environmental Zone E2.</p> <p>The Applicant will also provide a Technical Note for Lighting which will contain further guidance, information, and quantitative assessment to demonstrate that the Proposed Development can be provided with an external lighting installation that complies with the criteria as set out in the Lighting Strategy, while not exceeding the obtrusive light limitations for residential properties during Environmental Zone E2 post-curfew conditions. This Technical Note is intended to provide additional information to supplement the original Lighting Strategy as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process with the relevant consultees. This Technical Note shall be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p> <p>In accordance with dDCO Requirement 31, each phase of the authorised development</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>shall not be occupied until a scheme for all permanent lighting in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy.</p> <p>The air quality assessment provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) predicted no significant impacts with regard to air quality across the whole study area. this includes sensitive locations adjacent to the RFI site.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the master planning approach that has been undertaken, the noise and vibration ES chapter (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119) has considered the parameters of the proposed development, as required at this stage of the proposals.</p>
		<p>The possibility of increased incidence of line cleaning/alignment. This is a procedure that takes place in the small hours of the morning and is exceptionally noisy and disruptive; it prevents almost the entire village from sleeping.</p>	<p>Network Rail have advised that this section of track is considered average with the level of this type of works (Tamping, Stone Blowing and On-Track Machine Works). With</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			the forecast increase in tonnage these activities will only increase marginally.
		<p>Flooding to the local area, Burbage Common Road and the entrance to Bostock Close are both known to flood historically, Local public water supply could be impacted. Any impact on the local water supply is not acceptable to anyone living in the surrounding area from lower water pressure or supply quality issues.</p>	<p>In regard to flooding in the local area, Burbage Common Road and the entrance to Bostock Close are located downstream of the Main HNRFI Site. As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209) and the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210), the Proposed Scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure which will intercept and store storm water falling on the development within a combination of ponds and tanks. 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 and therefore no impact on downstream flood risk. In larger storm events this will represent a reduction in the peak flow leaving the development, offering downstream betterment.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>In regard to the local water supply, the applicant has submitted an application to Severn Trent Water (STW) the statutory undertaker for this area. In accordance with their licence obligations STW has produced a Connection Offer that maintains all network performance and operational criteria.</p>
		<p>The loss of mature trees, hedgerow, flora, fauna, will have a devastating impact on the vast and varied local wildlife, which may never return once their habitats are destroyed.</p>	<p>The arboricultural impact assessment (document reference: 6.2.11.14, APP-194) details the trees, group of trees and hedgerows to be lost or affected due to the development. Of 898 items surveyed, 356 will be lost and 32 affected, leaving 510 unaffected. To mitigate for these losses, around 20,000 new trees will be planted across the areas of new woodland planting and around 600 individual trees will be planted as street trees and amenity trees within the working logistics park.</p> <p>The objective value of the arable land, hedgerows, trees and the wildlife that these habitats support has been fully assessed. Intensively managed agricultural land, which accounts for the vast majority of the site has</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>no intrinsic ecological value. The opportunities it provides wildlife are limited, with similar opportunities extensively present in the local area. The quantitative loss of low value habitat will be mitigated for with a qualitative gain in species-rich habitat.</p>
		<p>A significant concern is how the workforce for the proposed site will be sourced, as locally the unemployment level is very low.</p>	<p>The evolving Employment and Skills Plan will ensure that the effects of construction and operational employment are captured locally as anticipated.</p> <p>The Study Area used in Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116) for the operational employment comprises 16 local authorities based on the modelled HNRFI Employee Trips. Although unemployment levels are low in the area, there are still approximately 46,100 unemployed people in the Study Area. The Study Area also performs worse in youth unemployment in 16–24-year-olds at 13.5% compared to 12.9% at the England level, which the Proposed Development could help to address.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>The 'initiative' for 'green travel' is unrealistic.</p>	<p>Access to sustainable transport is a significant requirement for all developments in accordance with DfT and Planning policy. Proposed new walking and cycling links are significant and tie into the existing networks, bus services are to be enhanced to local and regional centres. This will provide good linkage to other transport interchanges.</p>
		<p>The immense size of the proposed development leaves inadequate areas for landscaping mitigation and biodiversity offset. Landscaping and bunding does not seem sufficient to reduce the visual impact on the surrounding areas. An increase in these would also alleviate the impact of sound and light.</p>	<p>The proposed landscape mitigation is shown on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304), which shows that there would be areas of strategic landscape planting within the site to screen and soften views of the proposals from Burbage Common and Woods Country Park. It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative views and landscape receptors, as noted in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120). The residual effects will be considered by the Inspector in the decision-making process, alongside the benefits of the scheme.</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>There is a commitment to securing a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain which will be delivered through a mix of on-site and off-site provisions, and managed in the long-term through a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (document reference: 17.2, APP-360) which will be subject to regular review.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers and bunds have been recommended as the appropriate form of mitigation. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p> <p>Planting of trees will aid in screening light sources in the long term. The lux plot and lux contour lines presented in Appendix 1 of the Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2 APP-132 to APP-134) is based on a level, clear site with no obstructions i.e.. a worst case scenario</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>The impact on the archaeological and heritage areas are of importance to the local community.</p>	<p>The submitted Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122) includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the HNRFI upon the historic environment.</p>
		<p>Experience of those in the vicinity of the train line is that vibrations of existing train traffic is already felt in homes. The proposed site is exceptionally close to residential areas that currently do not experience any noise or light disturbance</p>	<p>Ground borne vibration propagates over a significantly lower distance when compared with airborne noise. Therefore, nearby receptors would need to be particularly close to transport sources for significant effects to be experienced.</p> <p>Vibration associated with off-site rail movements was scoped out of the assessment as the rail line is currently operational and the additional movements would be unlikely to result in a significant change in the level of vibration currently experienced at nearby receptors. Furthermore, the existing rail line is located between the proposed development and receptors.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the existing Vibration Dose Value (VDV) levels are low and fall</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>within the threshold criteria for 'low probability of adverse comment' as set out in BS 6472:2008. 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 likely to result in a low level. Therefore, the effect of vibration as a result of train movements on the sidings, is likely to remain as permanent, negligible adverse at all receptors, and mitigation is not required.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers and bunds have been recommended. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2 APP-132 to APP-134) defines the parameters and standards that any proposed lighting installation will have to be designed in accordance with to meet the specific criteria in terms of obtrusive light to meet the applicable standards and guidance.</p> <p>Any new development should be specified an Environmental Zone (ranging from E0 'protected environment e.g. UNESCO starlight reserve, to E4 'High district brightness e.g. City Centre). For each Environmental Zone the ILP recommends maximum values of light parameters for the control of obtrusive light. The Site has been considered to fall within Environmental Zone E2 'Low district brightness' e.g. sparsely inhabited rural area. The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132) states that the development must not exceed the maximum values for environmental Zone E2.</p> <p>The Applicant will also provide a Technical Note for Lighting which will contain further guidance, information, and quantitative assessment to demonstrate that the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>Proposed Development can be provided with an external lighting installation that complies with the criteria as set out in the Lighting Strategy, while not exceeding the obtrusive light limitations for residential properties during Environmental Zone E2 post-curfew conditions. This Technical Note is intended to provide additional information to supplement the original Lighting Strategy as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process with the relevant consultees. This Technical Note shall be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p> <p>In accordance with dDCO Requirement 31, each phase of the authorised development shall not be occupied until a scheme for all permanent lighting in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>The site is proposed to be operational 24/7 and 365 days a year and the increase in light and noise have a severe impact on residents especially overnight. The construction phase is planned as a 10-year construction phase, that alone will have an impact on the residents and environment and to some will have permanent and long-lasting effects.</p>	<p>The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2 APP-132 to APP-134) defines the parameters and standards that any proposed lighting installation will have to be designed in accordance with to meet the specific criteria in terms of obtrusive light to meet the applicable standards and guidance.</p> <p>Any new development should be specified an Environmental Zone (ranging from E0 'protected environment e.g., UNESCO starlight reserve, to E4 'High district brightness e.g., City Centre). For each Environmental Zone the ILP recommends maximum values of light parameters for the control of obtrusive light. The Site has been considered to fall within Environmental Zone E2 'Low district brightness' e.g., sparsely inhabited rural area. The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134) states that the development must not exceed the maximum values for environmental Zone E2.</p> <p>The Applicant will also provide a Technical Note for Lighting which will contain further guidance, information, and quantitative</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>assessment to demonstrate that the Proposed Development can be provided with an external lighting installation that complies with the criteria as set out in the Lighting Strategy, while not exceeding the obtrusive light limitations for residential properties during Environmental Zone E2 post-curfew conditions. This Technical Note is intended to provide additional information to supplement the original Lighting Strategy as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process with the relevant consultees. This Technical Note shall be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p> <p>In accordance with dDCO Requirement 31, each phase of the authorised development shall not be occupied until a scheme for all permanent lighting in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy.</p> <p>Given the size of the development site, it is considered unlikely that earthworks would take place close to any one receptor for a</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>prolonged period of time. Any impacts at sensitive receptors as a result of noise and vibration during the construction phase can be controlled through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (document reference: 17.1, APP-359) and industry best practice measures.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p>
		<p>The proximity of the proposed HNRFI to Elmesthorpe means that no amount of mitigation can alleviate the irreversible and staggering negative impact it will have.</p>	<p>The effects upon local residents and any appropriate mitigation to address them are set out in the relevant technical chapters of</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		Quite simply put, should the proposed HNRFI go ahead, the character of this village.	the ES and contained within the REAC in ES Chapter 21 (document reference 6.1.21, APP-130). The CEMP (document reference 17.1, APP-359) specifies the overarching principles and measures to manage and mitigate the effects of the activities associated with the construction of the Proposed Development, ensuring that these effects (including those relating to air quality, noise, drainage, lighting and ecology) will be minimised as far as possible. The CEMP will be further developed once the appointment of the Principal Contractor for the project has been confirmed and a detailed construction programme has been developed. The detailed CEMP (document reference: 17.1, APP-359) will be secured by requirement 7 of the DCO.
<b>RR-0400</b>	<b>Friends of Narborough Station</b>	We are concerned about the impact on the Level Crossing at Narborough, that the project will have. FONS has carried out timings at the crossing and with proposed additional passenger trains and freight trains over the next few years, in addition to the half mile long trains running to and from HNRFI, barrier down times will increase from the present 23 minutes to nearly 45 minutes. The impact on traffic in the surrounding village areas of Narborough,	Network Rail are completely supportive of the development of HNRFI having undertaken its own independent review of capacity, including allowing for the planned growth in passenger traffic. The line is a key part of Network Rail's Strategic Freight Network and as such is does from part of its ongoing investment in improving resilience

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>Littlethorpe, Cosby and Whetstone does not seem to be on anyone's agenda.</p> <p>The project will have a significant effect on the operation of both the South Leicestershire Line and the Midland Main Line, both of which suffer from both capacity and resilience issues today. As a recent example on Friday 28th April 2023, the 05.33 Hams Hall to Felixstowe South GBRF train came to a stand on the up line at Padge Hall Farm LC between Nuneaton and Hinckley with loss of power from the train. The line was closed to traffic from 06.00 until after 11.00, resulting in severe delays to thousands of passengers including students missing their exams. Resilience on the line is poor today and are any improvements planned for example; Bidirectional working, conversion to four aspect signalling, or the provision of refuges or passing loops.</p> <p>FONS has many more questions which so far have not been addressed, not just on the implications on the wider railway and the serious effect the delays at the level crossing at Narborough will have, but in all honesty will trains ever use the facility, bearing in mind the existing, proposed or planned nine similar such facilities within a 50-mile radius of Hinckley.</p> <p>We at FONS are grateful for the opportunity to comment again on the impact HNFRI will have and look forward to</p>	<p>overall, including the provision of freight loops generally Having a terminal at HNRFI improves the current resilience as it effectively creates the equivalent of a private freight loop.</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 travelling at 75 miles per hour would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins. 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>The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) has explained at paragraph 6.12, the different markets served by existing SRFIs and HNRFI. The contention</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
		<p>making our detailed thoughts known, as the consultation process continues. In conclusion FONS is strongly opposed to the implementation of HNFRI and supports the widespread opposition to this proposal from the Leicestershire Parishes and all Action Groups, and hopes the Secretary of State will make the right decision and totally reject the application.</p>	<p>that there is capacity at existing SRFIs is misconceived. Each serves a distinct market and HNFRI is exceptional in its rail connectivity. The Government considers there is a 'compelling need' for an 'expanded network of SRFIs (NPS 2.56). The evidence of Market Need; the support for HNFRI from Maritime as the preferred operator of the rail port and Requirement 10 will ensure that HNFRI will not operate primarily as a road base warehouse facility.</p>
<p><b>RR-0729</b></p>	<p><b>Leicester Forest and Lubbethorpe District</b></p>	<p>My constituents of 5000 are vehemently against such a ridiculous proposal on infrastructure that will just not support all the additional traffic</p>	<p>Significant amounts of strategic traffic modelling have been carried out throughout the preparation of the DCO application. This has led to the planning of access infrastructure and highway upgrades which mitigate the impact of the HNFRI development.</p>
<p><b>RR-1213</b></p>	<p><b>Sapcote Heritage Group</b></p>	<p>Burbage Common is a wonderful area for wildlife and nature. This site would definitely have an adverse effect. Our village does not need to have the increase in traffic that this development will bring.</p>	<p>The applied design principles have been outlined in the mitigation and enhancement section of the ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120). The landscape proposals include 20ha of woodland planting, 22ha of meadow and scrub planting and</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>around 600 individual trees within the logistics park itself which aim to soften the visual effects of the proposed development on the local landscape.</p> <p>The Woodland Access Management Plan (document reference: APP-200, 6.2.12.4) proposes a suite of outline measures to ensure the Burbage Common and woods are appropriately managed in the long-term, both in terms of biodiversity and recreational impact. Subject to appropriate management, the proposals are unlikely give rise to significant levels of recreational pressure, given their commercial nature (a position held by Natural England in their Relevant Representations RR-0974). Moreover, the long-term management will implement measures to enhance the woodland. The detailed landscape and planting plans will create a more naturalistic/ecotone edge to the woodlands, which itself will provide a significant ecological enhancement to the woodland. This would be in place of the current hard transition from woodland to intensively managed agricultural land. The large, planted buffers will provide a functional net gain in woodland habitat.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>Significant amounts of strategic traffic modelling have been carried out throughout the preparation of the DCO application. This has led to the planning of access infrastructure and highway upgrades which mitigate the impact of the HNRFI development</p>
<p><b>RR-1265</b></p>	<p><b>South Leicestershire Liberal Democrats</b></p>	<p>The application for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange should, in our view, be refused. The infrastructure of the local area is insufficient to handle the proposed traffic volumes, and the full wider implications of the proposed development have not been sufficiently or accurately taken into account, especially in respect of J21 of the M1. Furthermore, we are concerned by the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality, noise and light pollution</li> <li>• Location and Need of the development in Leicestershire.</li> <li>• Socio economic impact</li> <li>• Sustainability and alternative opportunities for the land</li> </ul>	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken for the project in line with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The findings of this EIA are set out in the Environmental Statement chapters 1-21 (document reference 6.1.1-6.1.21) and the associated technical appendices and figures. A summary of the significant effects identified and the register of environmental actions and commitments that will be delivered to ameliorate these effects as far as possible is set out in ES Chapter 21 (document reference: 6.1.21, APP-130).</p> <p>Significant amounts of strategic modelling have been carried out throughout the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>preparation of the DCO. This has led to the planning of access infrastructure and highway upgrades which mitigate the impact of the HNRFI development</p> <p>The applicant has maintained throughout the process that measures to address underlying and existing congestive problems at Junction 21 should not be the responsibility of the HNRFI mitigation package. This is based on overall impact of HNRFI and the lack of a proportionate intervention option. Mitigation addresses any impact on the A47 itself as a result of re-routing.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p> <p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Modelled concentrations have been compared against the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p> <p>When assessing lighting effects of new development. Any new development should</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>be specified an Environmental Zone (ranging from E0 'protected environment e.g., UNESCO starlight reserve, to E4 'High district brightness e.g., City Centre). For each Environmental Zone the ILP recommends maximum values of light parameters for the control of obtrusive light. The Site has been considered to fall within Environmental Zone E2 'Low district brightness' e.g., sparsely inhabited rural area. The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134) states that the development must not exceed the maximum values for environmental Zone E2 post curfew. In accordance with dDCO Requirement 31, each phase of the authorised development shall not be occupied until a scheme for all permanent lighting in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken for the project in line with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The socio-economic</p>



RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>findings of this EIA are set out in Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116).</p> <p>The construction of the Proposed Development is anticipated to deliver 461 on-site jobs per annum during the construction period of 10 years. Once leakage, displacement and multiplier effects are considered, it is anticipated that there will be a net addition of 737 jobs per annum. This is judged to be moderate beneficial over the short term.</p> <p>In terms of operational employment, the HNRFI is likely to accommodate a mix of National Distribution Centres (NDCs) and Regional Distribution Centres (RDCs). It is estimated that the proposal would generate between 8,400-10,400 gross on-site jobs. Once leakage, displacement and multiplier effects have been considered, the Proposed Development is expected to generate some 10,400 to 12,900 on and off-site jobs. The effect of operational jobs from the Proposed Development is predicted to be moderate beneficial over the long term.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<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 options. The Applicant then considered seven potential locations within the area of Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20.</p> <p>Chapter 18 (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) sets out mitigation to ensure that all proposed development minimises vulnerability and provides resilience to climate change and will contribute to achieving national targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging the use of sustainable materials and construction methods and supporting the Government’s zero carbon buildings policy which will be increased progressively over the plan period, where feasible, to support the Government’s longer-term aspirations for sustainable design. It further meets policy by introducing the use of renewable, low carbon</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Matter	Applicant Response
			<p>and decentralised energy to allow the site to be self-sufficient.</p> <p>In terms of alternative opportunities for the land it is not the role of the DCO application to suggest other proposals for the land should this be the matter that is being raised.</p>