

Section 5 – Parish Councils

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
RR-1365	Thurlaston Parish Council	<p>Lack of adequate road and rail transport mitigations. Particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a– A47 road - lack of any plan to take traffic away from the A47, which is an already congested highway. b. M6– motorway - Lack of any plan to improve the junction with the M1 (J21). Congestion at this junction is already at dangerous levels. c. Absence of a viable ring road for Stoney Stanton and Sapcote settlements. d. Complete absence of any proposals to deal with the increased closed barrier time and the resulting congestion at Narborough rail station and in the village itself. e. The impact upon local Fosse Villages from increased 'rat run' traffic has not been assessed nor addressed. 	<p>Impacts of the development have been modelled and considered within the mitigation strategy. This includes the A47. Displacement of traffic has been reviewed alongside development impacts at J21 and considered in the mitigation strategy. Existing/underlying issues are not for the development to address.</p> <p>A bypass of the Fosse villages was subject to a public consultation during which residents opposed all options. Technical reviews of data suggested that the majority of the traffic in the area is internally generated- i.e. from the villages themselves. Mitigation within the villages focuses on improvements to requirement 1 safety and road layout.</p> <p>Changes to barrier downtimes during peak hours are minimal and have been accepted by Network Rail. These have been accounted for within the Strategic Modelling.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Impact upon local Fosse Villages of increased noise, light and air pollution.</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>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 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 E2 post-curfew conditions. This will include a quantitative assessment of light at the closest residential</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>property within local Fosse Villages which has been identified as Aston Firs. This Technical Note will be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p> <p>The air quality assessment provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-119) identified no significant impacts with regard to air quality across the whole study area.</p>
RR-0166	Carlton Parish Council	<p>Carlton Parish Council objects to this proposal on the grounds that</p> <p>a) the interchange is not necessary as there are already large SRFIs capable of expansion at East Midlands Airport, DIRFT near Daventry, and Codsall near Wolverhampton. There is also an existing rail freight interchange at Birch Coppice Business Park, and ongoing extensive warehousing development at Bardon Hill;</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. The Government considers there is a 'compelling need' for an 'expanded network of SRFIs (NPS 2.56). The evidence of Market Need set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021; the support for HNRFI from Maritime as the preferred operator of the rail port and Requirement 10 which requires construction of the rail infrastructure as an early phase, will ensure that HNRFI will not operate primarily as a road based warehouse facility.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>b) the proposal will have an adverse impact on Burbage Common and Woods and an unacceptable enclosing effect on this important historic green space;</p>	<p>As indicated on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304), The Burbage Common Country Park would be extended by approximately 22ha (roughly a 25% increase) as part of the proposals. This would provide additional, publicly accessible routes which would facilitate access to Burbage Common.</p>
		<p>c) the proposed warehouses, by virtue of their mass and height, will be highly visible and will have an overbearing visual impact on the landscape over an unacceptably wide area;</p>	<p>The parameters have been informed by landscape and visual analysis. As shown on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304), extensive areas of woodland and scrub planting are proposed to soften views of the proposals.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative landscape and visual receptors, as noted at paragraphs 11.189, 11.190 and 11.191 in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120).</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>d) the proposal will eliminate a network of public rights of way linked to Burbage Common which provide a range of convenient access routes from the urban area into open countryside to the east of Hinckley;</p>	<p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), while some existing routes would be stopped up as a result of the proposed development, there would be several new routes proposed around and through the site, which provide pedestrian and cycle connectivity as well as bridleways connecting to the local network. Alternative routes are being provided for all public rights of way to ensure access can be maintained to Burbage Common from Elmesthorpe and surrounding properties. The Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference: 6.2.11.2, APP-192) illustrates the new routes which are all set within wide green corridors to enhance the amenity of the routes. Furthermore, as indicated on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: APP-304), the Burbage Common Country Park would be extended by approximately 22ha (roughly a 25% increase) as part of the proposals. This would provide an additional, publicly accessible area which would facilitate access to Burbage Common.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>e) the transport infrastructure to the west of the proposal site (the A5 corridor and access to the M42 and M6) is inadequate;</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.</p>
		<p>f) there do not appear to be any guarantees that the proposed warehouses will be reliant upon, or even use, the rail freight hub. The PC also objects to the proposed closure of footpath/bridleway U52 and wishes to propose an alternative route. The PC requests a condition that at least 75% by volume of the goods imported to or exported from the warehousing on the site shall be carried by rail.</p>	<p>The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) and the proposed Requirement (10) will provide sufficient confidence that HNRFI will function as an intermodal rail freight interchange in alignment with the provision of the NPS-NN. The correspondence from Maritime, the preferred operator for HNR^{FI}, dated 19th October 2022 states:</p> <p>‘From experience with other SRFIs startups, we believe that the opportunity to allow warehouse occupation and operations to take place ahead of the rail terminal operation is instrumental in allowing organic growth and encouragement of occupiers to utilise the SFRI to its full potential’. It would be inappropriate to demand precision as to the minimum amount of</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>goods to be conveyed by rail and such a requirement would not meet the relevant legal tests. None of the other DCOs for SRFIs had such a requirement, however it is known that 100% of occupiers at East Midlands Gateway make use of rail. The support for HNRFI for Maritime, which operates 7 fully open access intermodal rail terminals, is powerful testimony to the suitability of HNRFI as a intermodal rail freight terminal.</p> <p>As per Table 1.4 in the Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference: APP-192, 6.2.11.2), a permanent diversion for U52 would be put in place along the northern side of the railway line to connect to Burbage Common via an underpass.</p>
RR-0345	Earl Shilton Town Council	<p>The specific response from ESTC as a statutory Consultee is twofold as follows:</p> <p>a. ESTC stand wholeheartedly behind Leicestershire County Council (LCC) in their 23 Dec 21 written assertion, (copy attached), that Tritax Symmetry has comprehensively failed to prove their highways and rail freight models of traffic flows are accurate, sensitive, or sustainable.</p>	<p>All inputs to the strategic modelling have been signed off by LCC officers prior to the Forecast run. This was between October 2021 and March 2022.</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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>b. ESTC's written position statement of 09 Dec 20, (copy attached), remain totally extant. Tritax Symmetry has not proven there is a short, medium or long-term sensitive and sustainable economic 'pull demand' for the services that the HNRFI seeks to provide. In short, the 'golden triangle' of warehousing already exists and with current permissions is still growing year on year noticeable even to the layperson's eye. Freight ports of entry having for decades enjoyed the benefits of containerisation should now bear their fair share of the burden but, perhaps counterintuitively, organic expansion of such facilities will be an economic good for their communities.</p>	<p>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 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 (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>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 findings of this EIA are set out in Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116).
		<p>5. For the avoidance of doubt ESTC objects to this development on the basis of long-term unproven need. Please re-submit the 09 Dec 20 ESTC written reasoned objection to this application for this latest consultation round.</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 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>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
RR-1102	Ratby Parish Council	Impact it will have on the highways due to extra traffic on mainly single carriageways.	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. Highway Plans 2.4A-H APP 022-029 and AS-005 indicate the proposed mitigation on the local ad strategic road network.
		Emission of noxious gases thereby foiling the effort to de-carbonise	An assessment of greenhouse gases (GHGs) typically does not focus on noxious gases because they serve different purposes and have distinct environmental impacts; GHGs are gases that trap heat in the Earth's atmosphere, contributing to the greenhouse effect and global warming. The most common GHGs include carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), and fluorinated gases. Noxious gases are harmful or toxic gases that can be detrimental to human health and the environment. Examples of noxious gases include sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen oxides (NOx), ozone (O3), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and particulate matter (PM). GHG assessments and noxious

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>gas assessments serve different environmental objectives. GHG assessments are concerned with quantifying gases that contribute to global warming and climate change, while noxious gas assessments focus on harmful gases that directly impact air quality and human health. Both types of assessments are essential for understanding and addressing different aspects of environmental sustainability and public health. An assessment of 'noxious gases' is provided in Chapter 9 – Air Quality (document reference: 6.1.9 APP-118). Whereas the assessment of emissions associated with greenhouse gases is provided in Chapter 18 – Energy & Climate Change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127).</p> <p>It is entirely reasonable and responsible to expect that these proposals are designed to limit and reduce GHG emissions. HNRFI supports the Government's policy framework for rail freight expansion.</p> <p>Implementing energy-efficient measures, integrating renewable energy sources, and adopting green building practices are all feasible approaches that can significantly</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			reduce emissions without compromising the HNRFI's credentials.
		Increase of rail traffic along route to proposed site and increasing closure of level crossings during the day, thereby causing more traffic congestion which will affect villages on route.	Network Rail has confirmed that for the Highway AM and PM Peak Hours including shoulder periods before and after the peaks 7- 10am and 4-7pm, when traffic volumes are highest, there is only one additional train path available in the PM peak which would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins at 75mph. NR confirmed that barrier downtimes would be approximately 20 mins within the hour which is well within their desired thresholds.
RR-0840	Market Bosworth Parish Council	1) Whilst the project includes some proposed road infrastructure changes, these are inadequate to address either the potential negative impact of increased through-traffic across the wider local area, or the local road infrastructure condition. Traffic surveys should be extended to include roads around Market Bosworth (where there could be an increased likelihood of vehicles cutting through the town between the A447 and the A444) and local villages (which could suffer similar cut through' traffic). The Parish Council suggests that traffic monitoring	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 Impacts on Market Bosworth are acknowledged within the modelling and the assessment. The majority of traffic will use the SRN or A Road network.

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>cameras, speed limits and appropriate signage should all be factored into the project and should be put in place, not just in the local vicinity of the proposed interchange, but across the wider rural area which will undoubtedly see an increase in traffic if the development is granted permission.</p>	
		<p>2) The Parish Council is not qualified to comment on local landscape impact but is worried about the wider picture and potential negative impact on the environment of such a large project e.g. in relation to adjacent green areas.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative landscape and visual receptors, as noted at paragraphs 11.189, 11.190 and 11.191 in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120).</p> <p>The Proposed Development responds to adjacent assets such as Burbage Common and Woods Country Park and PRow with regard to accessibility, biodiversity and conservation value. As illustrated within Figure 11.20 (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304) the areas adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park would be safeguarded from development through the conversion to naturalistic, biodiverse areas of public open space.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>3) The Parish Council questions whether another rail freight interchange is really necessary given the relatively close proximity to other such developments in the region. Surely rail freight interchanges should be for longer distances and heavy goods which is simply not necessary in Hinckley especially when considering its restricted local infrastructure and proximity to other interchanges.</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. National policy considers there is a 'compelling need' for an 'expanded network of SRFIs (NPS 2.56). The evidence of Market Need; the support for HNRFI from Maritime as the preferred operator of the rail port and Requirement 10 will ensure that HNRFI will not operate primarily as a road base warehouse facility.</p>
<p>RR-0966</p>	<p>Narborough Parish Council</p>	<p>Below is a copy of the representations we made during the public consultation. We have received no reassurances or response from the promoters, Tritax, and, therefore, stand by our reasons for objecting.</p>	<p>Narborough Parish Councils response to the statutory consultation was fully considered and responded to in the consultation report (document reference: 5.1, APP-091)</p>
		<p>Additionally, we now also have concerns that the large volumes of surface water run-off from such a large development might also exacerbate the tendency of the River Soar to flood in the vicinity of Littlethorpe which forms part of this Parish.</p>	<p>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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>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>
		<p>The main road which runs through Narborough and Littlethorpe crosses the main Birmingham to Leicester railway between the two villages where a level crossing is situated. This is the only level crossing on this main line railway route that runs through a built-up area between Birmingham New Street and Peterborough.</p> <p>The Council's primary concern is about the impact additional rail traffic may have on the closure of the level crossing.</p>	<p>Network Rail have undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Based on the pre-pandemic timetable, in the morning peak hours 7 – 10 am, there is only one possible time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4 – 7 pm only two. Each train would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins. 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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.
		Whilst the long-term need for Rail Freight Interchange capacity is a given in the Statement, this does not automatically mean that any and every application should be consented.	The NPSNN (paragraph 2.56) makes clear that the number of locations suitable for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope for developers to identify viable alternative sites. A developer is not required to demonstrate that the choice of site is the 'best site' in A geographic location. Rather the planning test is whether it is suitable when primarily considered against the policy provisions of the NPSNN. The decision taking matrix is provided for by S104 of the Planning Act 2008.
		We believe that the nature and location of the proposal means that it fails a number of key tests. The NPS states that strategic rail freight interchanges should have good rail and road connectivity and be located near the markets that they serve, advocates a network of large hubs which offer economies of scale, and operating efficiencies, offer the ability to handle increased capability in the longer term, and reduce community severance.	The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) describes the market that HNRFI will serve. HNRFI will not 'consume the lunch' of existing and committed SRFIs as it will serve its own market. HNRFI is extremely well located in terms of its road and rail connections to serve the Midlands market and to act as an intermodal hub serving the country, being

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			centrally located on the Strategic Rail Freight Network.
		<p>We are of the opinion that this proposal fails a number of these tests and that other locations are more suitable, offer greater opportunities for longer term expansion of capacity and would cause less disruption to communities and environmental impacts. For example, expansion of the existing RFIs in the area would avoid costly and extensive road improvements as the infrastructure to support those facilities is already in place.</p>	<p>The NPS identifies a ‘compelling need’ for an expanded network of SRFIs. The NPS does not express a preference for the expansion of existing and committed sites. Even if such expansion is physically achievable, such a policy preference would not realise an expanded ‘network’ of SRFIs, so as to serve customers within say a market hinterland of 20 miles from HNRFI (45 min truck drive time). The HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment Paragraph 2.22 (document reference: 16.2, APP-358), Maritime correspondence 19/10/22 Appended to Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-358). The expansion of existing and committed SRFIs would prevent the greater geographical penetration into local business markets, as the locations would not be within circa 20 miles of the customer base. In short form, more SRFIs are needed, rather than the expansion of existing SRFIs.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Added to this, the lack of refuge loops and sidings on the main Leicester to Birmingham track in this vicinity will be a limiting factor especially if planned passenger service improvements on that route are made.</p>	<p>The Nuneaton & Leicester Railway forms part of Network Rail's Strategic Freight Network and Network Rail is satisfied that sufficient capacity has been identified for 16 intermodal trains (32 movements) to and from HNRFI. This allows for known passenger service development aspirations identified by Midlands Connect, to better link Birmingham, Nuneaton, Hinckley and Leicester. The Needs Case fully explains the demand for rail and HNRFI (document reference: 16.1, APP-357).</p>
		<p>Down time at the Narborough level crossing is a major problem; at peak times the main road route between Littlethorpe and Narborough can be closed for as much as 20 minutes or more in an hour with vehicles queued in both directions, the resultant congestion having an impact on air quality, journey time to Leicester and Coventry, access to services and local businesses.</p>	<p>The railway line crossing at Narborough is located on Station Road. Station Road is not part of the modelled air quality road network as the trip generation for the scheme along Station Road does not exceed the Institute of Air Quality Management and Environmental Protection UK screening criteria for when significant impacts may be predicted. It is, therefore, considered that any changes in traffic flow at the railway crossing at Narborough will not cause any significant air quality impacts at the receptors identified.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>However, it is not just a problem at peak times; the barrier can be down for significant periods outside of those times in the non-peak daytime and evening.</p>	<p>No more than two HNRFI trains in any hour can pass through Narborough Level Crossing. These trains would have a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5 minutes.</p>
		<p>A recent survey found the barrier was down for an average of more than 16 minutes an hour. Planned increases in passenger rail services, other rail freight journeys (including proposals to bring HS2 spoil to Croft Quarry through Narborough by rail) and the inevitable increase in car journeys from additional housing in the area during the period covered by the next Blaby Local Plan will already exacerbate an unacceptable situation that both rail and highways bodies have ignored for too long. Some estimates suggest the impact of all these proposals in combination could double the existing closure times.</p>	<p>Network Rail has confirmed that for the Highway AM and PM Peak Hours including shoulder periods before and after the peaks 7- 10am and 4-7pm, there is only one additional train path available in the AM peak and only two in the PM peak, about an hour apart. On a 16 min down time, this additional traffic, if it ran, would not increase the down time to a level which would require an intervention (being 40 mins). At 75mph, an intermodal train will cause 2.5 mins barrier downtime. . NR confirmed that barrier downtimes would be approximately 20 mins within the hour which is well within their desirable thresholds. This train path would be open to all operators to bid for and not safeguarded for the HNRFI.</p> <p>Changes to barrier downtimes during peak hours are minimal and have been accepted by Network Rail. These have been accounted for</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			within the Strategic Modelling pt 7 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-144).
		<p>So why is the RFI proposal such a problem with a planned maximum of 12 additional closures of 2 minutes (a figure we dispute and which we believe to be over 6 minutes) with all but one outside of peak times ? Put simply, it will be the proverbial straw that breaks the camel's back. We acknowledge that the issue with the level crossing is already an issue and not necessarily of Tritax Symmetry's making. However its proposals will make a difference and a significant one.</p>	<p>Network Rail has confirmed that for the Highway AM and PM Peak Hours including shoulder periods before and after the peaks 7- 10am and 4-7pm, there is only one additional train path available in the PM peak which would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins at 75mph. NR confirmed that barrier downtimes would be approximately 20 mins within the hour which is well within their desired thresholds.</p>
		<p>Its proposals have not been assessed to include longer term and cumulative impacts in respect of this issue as the NPS requires or their impact in combination with other likely changes, nor are there any measures to avoid or compensate for adverse impacts or to reduce community severance.</p>	<p>The CEA for the Proposed Development has been undertaken in line with the structure and approach set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Where required, mitigation measures are set out in each technical topic chapter of the ES, in addition the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) contains all mitigation measures specified through the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			EIA process including their securing mechanism, this is contained in chapter 21 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.21, APP-130).
		Again, we acknowledge that it is problematical to quantify air quality impacts as there is no baseline data as no monitoring currently takes place. The NPS requires the Secretary of State to consider air quality impacts over the wider area likely to be affected as well as in the near vicinity of the scheme and this should include Narborough and Littlethorpe and an assessment by the applicant should also cover this aspect.	Blaby District Council undertake pollutant monitoring within the vicinity of Narborough, which has been used to verify the air quality model (document reference: 6.2.9.8, APP-170). Locations in Narborough which have the potential to be impacted by the scheme with regards to air quality have been included in the air quality modelling assessment (document reference: 6.3.9.9, APP-248) All modelled locations within this area experienced a negligible change in air pollutant concentrations and no significant impacts were predicted (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118).
		Other concerns Narborough in common with other smaller local stations on the Birmingham to Leicester main route has narrower platforms than the bigger main line stations and is not currently connected to a voice warning system.	This matter has already been referred to Network Rail by the Applicant, who has taken it up with the station managers, East Midlands Trains as it is a current concern, regardless of HNRFI.

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Freight trains passing through the station at speed by virtue of their size would cause significant turbulence and a potential health and safety concern.</p>	<p>HNRFI is not introducing a new type of train, intermodal trains already run through Narborough. The latest wagon sets now coming into service are designed to be loaded much more efficiently and will be much more streamlined as a result.</p>
		<p>Were this proposal to be consented, it should be a condition of any Development Consent Order that such voice warning systems be put in place.</p>	<p>As noted above, this request has already been passed to Network Rail and on to the station managers, East Midlands Trains, as it relates to an existing concern, regardless of HNRFI.</p>
		<p>We also consider that a development of this size presents greater opportunities for positive biodiversity measures and the aim of compensatory measures should be to deliver net gain for biodiversity rather than no net loss.</p>	<p>There is a commitment to securing a 10% net gain% (via Requirement 30) which will be delivered through a mix of on-site and off-site provisions and managed in the long-term through a detailed LEMP (secured via Requirement 22) which will be subject to regular review.</p>
<p>RR-0124</p>	<p>Barwell Parish Council</p>	<p>Barwell Parish Council strongly object to this project due to the impact it will have on the surrounding infrastructure particularly for the communities from</p>	<p>The new link road will alleviate pressure in the centre of Hinckley. Better accessibility of the M69 at Junction 2 will also create</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>rural villages trying to travel. B4668 Leicester Road is not considered fit for HGV traffic. The volume of traffic will cause the area to stand still when it is already difficult to navigate through Hinckley to get to the M69 and A5.</p>	<p>improved routes to the SRN. The majority of HGVs from the site will route via Junction 2 rather than the B4668.</p>
<p>RR-0706</p>	<p>Kilby Parish Council</p>	<p>Kilby Parish Council has concerns about the necessity for this project and its potentially adverse effect on rural village communities, high value public amenity space, as well as wildlife habitats and open countryside generally. It is our intention to update our previous comments over the next few weeks.</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. The Government considers there is a 'compelling need' for an 'expanded network of SRFIs (NPS 2.56).</p> <p>The Hinckley and Bosworth Green Infrastructure Strategy (May 2020) has been considered in the preparation of the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304) particularly in the creation of 22ha of new publicly accessible green space adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park which accords with Spatial Priorities 6 and 10 – to enhance the Southern Green Wedge and provide a more resilient Burbage Common and Woods.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>It should be noted that the enhancements actually fall within Blaby District although this does not diminish the role that these areas would play in the enhancement of the Country Park.</p>
<p>RR-0471</p>	<p>Higham on the hill parish council</p>	<p>This development will erase acres of green space.</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. Overall green and blue space accounts for 28% of the Main HNRFI Site. This is as described in the Landscape ES Chapter (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120)</p>
		<p>Will increase traffic in an area already under pressure from vehicles.</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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
RR-0379	Elmesthorpe Parish Council	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1.1. Around 95% of the main site (excluding the proposed motorway slip roads) is in Elmesthorpe Parish.</p> <p>1.2. The proposal will have by far the greatest impact on the lives of the residents of Elmesthorpe. The nearest residential property is approximately 100 – 200 metres from the DCO boundary.</p> <p>1.3. These representations are based on the input received from residents, many of whom feel that this proposal will have a devastating impact.</p>	<p>The comments of the Parish Council are noted and detailed response is set out below to the representations of residents advanced by the Parish Council.</p>
		<p>Location</p> <p>2.1 There is no justification for this development to be built at Elmesthorpe, taking into account the proximity and capacity of the existing Rail Freight Interchanges in the area. It is believed there is capacity at existing Rail Freight Interchanges in the area.</p> <p>2.2. It is further believed this development will operate primarily as a road-based warehousing facility with a disproportionately low amount of freight actually being transported by rail.</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. The Government considers there is a ‘compelling need’ for an ‘expanded network of SRFIs (NPS 2.56). The evidence of</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Market Need; the support for HNRFI from Maritime as the preferred operator of the rail port and Requirement 10 will ensure that HNRFI will not operate primarily as a road base warehouse facility.</p> <p>Estimated future demand is 2.5 times higher than current and known available supply. The Applicant considers this 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 evidences a large scale and strategic site such as the HNRFI is needed.</p> <p>Requirement 10 and the engagement of an operator demonstrates the Applicants commitment to investment in rail. The phasing of the rail port and dDCO requirement 10 are covered in detail in the Highways Position Statement attached as appendix A to this report (document reference 18.2.1) .</p>
		Workforce / need for jobs in the area	The availability of labour supply will be supported by the evolving Employment and

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>3.1. It is suggested that this development will result in 8,400 new jobs. Unemployment in this area is not high, and therefore most of the workforce will need to travel into the area at present.</p> <p>3.2. The site is very poorly served by public transport. If the jobs are to be filled by people from outside the area, this will result in additional vehicle movements. This would also impact on the potential green benefits of this development.</p> <p>3.3. There are insufficient amenities or infrastructure in the area to support the needs of the workforce and volume of people using the site.</p>	<p>Skills Plan which will seek to match future employees with jobs and suitable upskilling and training.</p> <p>As stated in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116), in terms of construction employment, according to the Jobseekers' Allowance data (June 2022) (ONS), there are 1,250 individuals claiming JSA in the Study Area who usually work as labourers in the building and woodworking trades, and in other construction trades. The data also shows that overall 2,535 individuals claim JSA. This means that 49% of individuals claiming JSA within the Study Area are looking for work in the construction sector. In England, the data indicates that 35% of individuals claiming JSA are within the construction sector. Therefore, the Study Area has a higher proportion of JSA Claimants in construction and building and woodworking trades than England.</p> <p>Although unemployment levels are low in the area, there are still approximately 46,100 unemployed people in the Study Area. The Study Area performs worse in youth</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>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>The application includes a Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.1 pt 15 of 20, APP-153) which contains detail of DRT services and further sustainable transport provision this is to be read in tandem with The Framework Travel Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.2, APP-159). A contribution is proposed towards enhancing the X6 bus service.</p> <p>The nature of modern large scale logistics buildings is such that they contain quality amenities on site to support the needs of employees.</p>
		<p>Highways and Traffic Issues</p> <p>4.1. The Parish Council has very limited expertise in matters relating to traffic modelling. However it is concerned about the impact of fleets of distribution vehicles at the M69/M1 junction at peak times when there is already congestion from existing traffic.</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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>4.2. There is a knock-on effect from the traffic/highways work being incomplete, namely that air pollution from vehicle movements cannot currently be properly assessed.</p> <p>4.3. Residents concerns include: • congestion on the roads surrounding the site caused by HGVs and the workforce • increased traffic using the B581 through Elmesthorpe creating safety risks as the sole single pavement through the village is so narrow that it is impossible to walk two abreast • an increase in HGVs and other large vehicles using the B581 through Elmesthorpe as they struggle to pass each other at various points in the village, resulting in vehicles mounting the pavement especially on the railway bridge • the siting of the proposed uncontrolled crossing on the B581 which needs to be re-assessed</p>	<p>proportionate intervention option. Current constraints at Junction 21 are driven by underbridges of the M1 on the circulatory carriageway. Widening to address such constraints would be of a significant magnitude and require RIS levels of Government investment. Impacts of the HNRFI site have been quantified and the impacts reported to the TWG core team on 10 October 2022- included in the Transport Assessment APP-117 chapter 8 and Table 8-6 shows that with the development in place there is a small increase in traffic in the evening peak period and a small reduction in the morning peak. Further information is included in Appendix B, Highways Position Statement these are proportionately small. Mitigation addresses any impact on the A47 itself as a result of re-routing.</p> <p>Strategic modelling inputs were agreed with the TWG prior to the processing of the forecast model. This included; trips generated from the site and methodology of distributing these onto the highway network and agreement on the base model outputs as a reasonable approximation of the surrounding highway network.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Forecast models have been processed using this information and therefore the outputs for the Environmental Statement including for air quality are complete. The details of mitigation is to be agreed. Modelling of the Rugby Rural area was outstanding at the time of submission, however this has been completed and submitted, no further assessment is required AS-.</p> <p>Specific to the B581, there will be displacement of vehicles away from the route and on to the new link road. This is visually demonstrated in the Figure 3.6 of the Forecast modelling output (document reference: APP-148). Which should result in less through traffic in Elmesthorpe itself. There will be an independent Road Safety Audit undertaken for the development and this will include reviewing the proposals for the Elmsthorpe level crossing closure, rerouting of the Public Right of Way and the siting of the proposed uncontrolled crossing.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p data-bbox="696 320 1099 352">Access to Site & Parking Issues</p> <p data-bbox="696 400 1424 544">5.1. Whilst it is proposed Burbage Common Road will not be used for access either by HGVs or workforce vehicles, the measures that are being put in place may be insufficient to prevent this happening.</p> <p data-bbox="696 592 1424 775">5.2. The Parish Council is concerned about any alteration to the road layout at the junction of Burbage Common Road and the Stanton Road/Station Road as we understand the current junction is already suitable for emergency services.</p> <p data-bbox="696 823 1424 1246">5.3. There are concerns that members of the workforce who do not wish to queue to get on or off site at shift changeovers, will choose to park their vehicles in Elmesthorpe Village and to walk along Burbage Common Road to gain access on foot via the gate on the north eastern boundary. This gated access should be restricted to emergency vehicles. The same concerns arise in respect of the workers during the construction phase. There are only six public roads in Elmesthorpe, and workforce parking on them would cause absolute chaos and insanitary conditions.</p>	<p data-bbox="1447 400 2040 775">There will be no non-emergency vehicular access to the B582. All staff on site will have access to adequate parking on site. Any transgressions will be monitored by on-site Estate Management. Construction traffic will be closely controlled by the contractor under their Construction Management Plans (document reference: 17.1 to 17.3, APP-359 to APP-362) HGV Parking is for layover of vehicles accessing the Site.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>5.4. There are also concerns that if the lorry park is not free, drivers will not be incentivised to stay on site and will drive off to park locally.</p>	
		<p>Noise</p> <p>6.1. One of the major concerns to residents is the noise that will be generated by the freight trains, and the loading and unloading equipment which it is understood will be on a 24/7 basis.</p> <p>6.2. There is limited information regarding the noise mitigation being provided, or the circumstances in which trains will be queueing on the line where it passes through the village, and how the noise generated will be mitigated.</p> <p>6.3. In addition to the noise created by the interchange, there are concerns about the operational noise from stacking the containers, vehicle reversing alarms, loading and unloading vehicles, and the gantry cranes.</p> <p>6.4. There are concerns about the quality of sleep that residents will get with the increased number of trains throughout the night and the limited noise attenuation proposals, with further implications for the mental health and well being of any affected residents.</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the proposed operational phase of the development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with SRFI operations and additional train movements.</p> <p>Acoustic characteristics such as bangs, scrapes, tones etc have also been accounted for. 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	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Notwithstanding this, the Applicants transport consultants have provided the following response with relation to the additional barrier down time at Narborough “The Narborough Level crossing was subject to scrutiny by the LHA and models were adjusted to suit the existing and forecast delays. Network Rail have agreed that there is adequate capacity at the cross roads. Impacts at peak hours are minimal.”</p>
		<p>Light Pollution</p> <p>7.1. It is proposed that this development will operate 24/7 giving rise to concerns regarding the impact of overnight lighting on the village.</p> <p>7.2. Assurances are sought that: • the buildings will only be lit at the top of the door/loading bays • the lighting in any vehicle parking areas and on the link road to the A47 will be at the height of normal street lighting • the proposal to use motion sensed lighting in the outer areas is not being pursued as it will be harder for the residents to adjust to an ever changing lighting level.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development shall be illuminated in accordance with the Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134).</p> <p>Building mounted luminaires will be provided at a maximum height of 10 metres, lower mounting heights will be used wherever practical. Standard lighting columns will be a maximum height of 10 metres. The A47 link road will be illuminated to LCC adoptable standards via standard lighting columns not</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>exceeding 10 metres. High mast lighting is restricted to the Rail Terminal and Rail port Returns area.</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 (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134), 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>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Air Quality</p> <p>8.1. The residents consider that this development will give rise to additional air pollution from the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plant and equipment used during the building/construction phase • additional diesel trains once the rail port is operational • increased HGV movements to and from the site • increased workforce vehicle movements to and from the site • ancillary vehicles such as delivery vans • the on-site power plant and the chimney height 8.2. <p>The air quality information provided by the Applicant has been limited, especially with regard to the construction phase. There are major concerns regarding the impact on the well being of residents of the dust and equipment emissions during the construction phase.</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 assessment of both construction and operational impacts was undertaken in accordance with the latest guidance and methodologies.</p> <p>Public Health:</p> <p>All tangible changes in environmental and socio-economic conditions with the potential to influence public health have been assessed and addressed through the assessment process set to objective thresholds and guidance that are protective of the environment and health and facilitate sustainable development.</p> <p>A Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference: 6.2.7.1, APP-137) has been further provided to aid navigation of the DCO and summarise how and where health has been addressed.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Visual Impact</p> <p>9.1. There are widespread concerns about the visual impact of the proposed development. This impact was not addressed by the poor visual images provided at the public consultation events.</p> <p>9.2. It is hugely important that the proposed warehousing is constructed of materials in varying tones of colour so as to better blend into the landscape, and thereby reduce the visual impact.</p>	<p>Photomontages of the proposed development at Year 1 and Year 15, showing the matured landscape mitigation are provided in Figure 11.16 (document reference: 6.3.11.16, APP-300).</p> <p>The units have been designed to ‘blend’ within their surroundings, particularly in winter when they would be more visible. In other locations such as at Symmetry Park Aston Clinton, different colours have been used. However, the standard Tritax colour palette is considered the most appropriate in this location. It has been developed over time in response to various consultations and design considerations, in particular how the units are viewed against the sky.</p>
		<p>10. Flooding & Drainage Issues</p> <p>10.1. There are major concerns regarding the likelihood of flooding of the development site, and how any steps taken to alleviate the risk of flooding of the development site will impact on adjoining watercourses. The fields off</p>	<p>10.1, 10.2, 10.6 & 10.7: 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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Burbage Common Road are regularly flooded, and visibly have a high water table.</p> <p>10.2. There are major concerns that issues with drainage and sewerage infrastructure locally will be exacerbated once the site becomes a massive area of hard surfacing.</p> <p>10.3. Certain aspects of the modelling give rise to major concern as the Applicant's consultants were unable to gain access to several areas of land to undertake their research and it is therefore assumed that the modelling has included an element of guess work.</p> <p>10.4. The consultants indicated that the cost of improvements to watercourses outside the boundary of the site would be borne by the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency has subsequently advised that they will not be paying for this. The Parish Council is seeking reassurance that Elmesthorpe residents will not bear the cost of any drainage improvement works.</p> <p>10.5. The attenuation lakes may be of insufficient size for the extent of the development proposed.</p> <p>10.6. The stream to the rear of homes in Bostock Close takes water from the existing farmland and is already subject to sudden and dramatic increases during periods of heavy or prolonged rain. There are concerns that if</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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> <p>10.5, 10.6 & 10.7: Sufficient surface water attenuated storage has been incorporated within the proposed scheme to meet local and national requirements.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>the measures proposed to control the outflow of water from the site are insufficient, their homes may be flooded.</p> <p>10.7. The Parish Council also understands that properties to the south of the Bridle Path Road crossroads are at a low point in the surrounding area. During high rainfall, they already have standing water in their gardens and adjoining fields, and the brook to the north of these homes already struggles to cope with high rainfall, so there are concerns that these properties will also flood if the outflow of water is not correctly managed.</p>	<p>10.3: The hydraulic flood modelling is based upon topographical surveys of the ground, watercourse channels, and hydraulic structures. This has been supplemented with asset data from Leicestershire Highways, National Highways, and Network Rail, as well as aerial LiDAR survey. This is a standard approach for developing hydraulic models. The Environment Agency have undertaken a detailed review of the hydraulic model and have confirmed that it is fit for purpose.</p> <p>10.4: As the Proposed Scheme will not detrimentally alter the peak flows leaving the site or affect the flood risk in the wider area, there is no requirement for the Proposed Scheme to include any watercourse improvements outside of the DCO boundary.</p>
		<p>Wildlife & the Loss of Farmland</p> <p>11.1. The impact of the proposed development on local wildlife has attracted extensive concern, and it is believed that surveys have under estimated the wildlife in the area.</p>	<p>The value of the habitat within the site boundary 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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>11.2. It is generally felt that the provision of a green area as an extension to Burbage Common will not be sufficient to offset the loss of natural habitat for the wildlife as the construction work alone will drive much of the wildlife away and it may never return. Further, the value of a green area close to the new A47 link road is considered to be limited.</p> <p>11.3. The site adjoins the Elmesthorpe Land Settlement Area which is considered by many to be a unique area of open countryside.</p>	<p>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 is species-rich habitat. The large buffers to Burbage Common and woods will create a more naturalistic/ecotone edge to the woodlands, which itself will provide a significant ecological enhancement to the woodland structure. This would be in place of the current hard transition from woodland to intensively managed agricultural land. Potential impacts from noise, light and dust pollution have been fully assessed within the Environmental Statement, with no significant effect concluded, subject to the sensitive construction measures and measures to protect retained habitat outline within the CEMP (document reference: 17.1, APP-359) and EMMP (document reference: 17.5, APP-363) respectively.</p> <p>The onsite green space provided including the 22ha of new green space adjacent to Burbage Common is not sufficient to achieve the 10% biodiversity net gain that the Applicant have committed to and additional land offsite will also be enhanced for wildlife</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			as part of the delivery of that biodiversity enhancement.
		<p>Rights of Way & Access to Burbage Common/Woods</p> <p>12.1. The access via Burbage Common Road to Burbage Common & Woods and the Elmesthorpe Plantation is well used by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, horses and riders. There is currently an extensive network of footpaths and bridleways across the site which the Parish Council understands are to be re-routed. The alternatives put forward to replace what is being lost are considered to be neither practical nor of the same quality.</p> <p>12.2. The proposals for T89 footpath give rise to specific safety concerns involving the B581 (see 4.3.)</p> <p>12.3. Given the forecast 10 year period the development is expected to be in the construction phase, the Parish Council is seeking an assurance that any proposed rights of way diversions will be in place from the point in time at which the site is physically secured for construction purposes. It is not acceptable for the Burbage Common SSSI to be inaccessible from Elmesthorpe at any time.</p>	<p>12.1 The likely effects on the local network of Public Rights of Way (ProW) is presented in the Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference: APP-192). Whilst it is acknowledged there will be a change, the new routes will be set within green corridors of up to 70m with tree, shrub and meadow planting to mitigate the effects of the motorway and adjacent logistics park. These cannot replicate the open countryside of the original routes but every effort has been made to create as natural an experience as possible given the changes proposed.</p> <p>12.2 The redline includes the junction of Bostock Close and Station Road (B581) to facilitate a safe crossing point – see Highways Plan Sheet 2 of 8 (Document reference: 2.4B, APP-023)</p> <p>12.3 The new and diverted footpath and bridleway routes will be delivered during the enabling works to ensure continuous safe access to Burbage Common.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>12.4. In summary, the residents consider the proposed erasure, alteration or diversion of rights of way to be to the detriment of the whole community.</p>	<p>12.4 The Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference: 6.2.11.2, APP-192) finds that the proposed mitigation package would be proportionate in relation to the proposed development. As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14. APP-298), while some existing routes would be stopped up as a result of the proposed development, there would be several new routes proposed around and through the site, which provide pedestrian and cycle connectivity as well as bridleways connecting to the local network.</p>
		<p>Construction 13.1. The Parish Council requests that the Applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commence the construction work at the M69 J2 end of the site • the heavy machinery required for earth moving and other construction work will enter the development site at the M69 J2 end of the site • heavy machinery and construction traffic will not be travelling through the village • retain all soil on site where possible 	<p>See document reference: 17.1 (APP-359) and 17.4(APP-364) on Construction Management. The site access will be first established from Junction 2, Parking access will be direct from here from the earliest phases. Any parking on local streets can be reported to the Construction Management staff. All soil will be retained on site where possible.</p> <p>The HNRFI is estimated to support 737 net additional on and off site construction jobs per annum over a 10-year construction period, including 461 on site jobs per annum.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • heavy machinery and construction traffic will not gain access to the site via Burbage Common Road • retain all earth moving and heavy machinery on site once the construction work commences. <p>13.2. The Parish Council is seeking further information regarding how large the workforce for the construction phase is likely to be and whether it is expected that they will arrive and leave the site in private vehicles. If they are using private vehicles, there are extensive concerns that they will be accessing the site via Burbage Common Road.</p>	<p>The Contractor will be required to provide a Transport Plan for staff travel to site in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 17.1, APP-364) to reduce impact during each phase of the construction.</p>
RR-1214	Sapcote Parish Council	<p>The need is not properly established, both in terms of the level of need and the provision of other sites.</p>	<p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021, the HNRFI Market Needs Assessment –Rail Freight Market Demand & Supply (document reference 16.1, APP 357) 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 Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 which was commissioned and agreed by the relevant Local Authorities. The</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>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 as 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> <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 4 of the Environmental Statement (document reference: 6.1.4, APP-113) explored location options for the main site</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			and provides justification for discounting site options and selecting the preferred site location.
		It has not been demonstrated that the rail network would or could be utilised to the extent assumed, both in terms of the network constraints and in terms of the uncertainty about how much the terminal will actually be used.	Network Rail is satisfied that sufficient capacity has been identified for HNRFI services in the Working Timetable to run up to 16 trains per day. This assessment has allowed for known passenger service development aspirations identified by Midlands Connect, to better link Coventry, Nuneaton, Hinckley and Leicester.
		The direct and indirect traffic impact would be serious. In particular this would be likely to include increased traffic on local roads and through local villages, including Sapcote and Sharnford, with impacts on safety, congestion and amenity, especially when there are restrictions on other routes.	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. These are shown in Works Plans (document reference: 2.2 to 2.2H, APP- 007-015). Impacts at Sharnford are predicted to be reduced as indicated in the Transport Assessment (AS 016) Figures 5-10 and 5-11 and in more detail within the modelling summary (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP 148)

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Impacts on Sapcote are acknowledged within the modelling and the Environmental Assessment (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117). Mitigation has been proposed where appropriate.</p>
		<p>The major change of introducing slip-roads to the M69 Junction 2 would have detrimental impacts, both from development traffic to the HNRFI and from other induced traffic.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there will be some additional demand created by the opening of south facing slips at J2 M69. This has been quantified within the Transport ES Chapter (document reference: 6.1.8, APP- 117) and further analysis provided within the Transport Assessment (AS 016) Paragraphs 5.84 to 5.112. Where appropriate, new infrastructure is proposed. Many of the new trips in the Fosse Villages are re-routed local vehicles choosing to access the motorway rather than use local roads.</p>
		<p>Access to the site by public transport and other sustainable modes would be likely to be limited.</p>	<p>The Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) outlines the public transport proposals for the area. This includes improved DRT services around the Fosse Villages, it will also connect the site to the main Hinckley Rail Station,</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>enabling linkage to the wider area, including Nuneaton and beyond.</p> <p>The X6 express bus service between Coventry and Leicester will also be enhanced with additional services and diverted into the site. This will pick up key areas of potential employees at the site.</p>
		<p>There would be impacts on the landscape, biodiversity and amenity of the area which cannot be adequately addressed, including loss of countryside and landscape, impacts on habitats and species (including SSSIs and other designated sites), light pollution and loss and degradation of footpath network.</p>	<p>As noted in the Summary and Conclusion section of ES Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120), there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative landscape and visual receptors. The Inspectors will consider these effects against the benefits of the scheme in their decision-making process.</p> <p>The potential impacts on habitats and protected species have been fully assessed. 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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>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>Statutory designated sites will be fully protected from the potential construction and operational impacts of the proposed development. As per para. 12.144 - 12.148 of the ES Chapter 12 (document reference: APP-197, 6.2.12.1) Elmesthorpe Plantation Hedgerow LWS, Field Rose Hedgerow LWS, Woodland adjacent to Aston Firs pLWS, Junction 2 Grassland pLWS, B4669 Road Verge pLWS and Elmesthorpe Boundary Hedgerow pLWS are being retained and buffered.</p> <p>The Burbage Common Road Railway Bridge pLWS, Freeholt Meadow pLWS will be lost to facilitate the proposals. Following habitat survey work, these pLWS are not considered to be of any significant ecological value and therefore considered at a local level. The results of this survey work are outlined at within Appendix 12.1 (document reference: 6.2.12.1, APP-197)</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>A section of the Burbage Common Road Hedgerows pLWS will also be lost. However, the hedgerow is considered to be of no greater importance than the other hedgerows within the Main Order Limits and therefore is not considered as a LWS when assessing impacts.</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 (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132) contains 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, based on 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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>amount of light spillage on to a bat foraging corridor needed to avoid impacts on bat foraging. The appointed Ecologist has reviewed and approved this Appendix and has not considered the anticipated lux levels to be unacceptable.</p> <p>The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134) states “5.54. The final detailed design may deviate from the indicative external lighting design presented but must meet all parameters and criteria as set out in this report and demonstrate equal to or less than the quantity of light spill achieved. An adequate and safe level of lighting must be provided for site tasks, amenity, and security, whilst maintaining acceptable impact on the site surroundings, environment, railway and neighbouring properties.”</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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Strategy, while not exceeding the obtrusive light limitations for 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>A number of PRow will be stopped up and diverted as part of the proposals. Diverted or replacement routes are proposed, set within broad green corridors to maintain separation from vehicular traffic and provide an amenity route. The proposals include safer PRow routes which include signalled road crossing points and bridges as alternatives level crossing points over the railway line.</p>
		<p>There would be impacts on air quality, noise and vibration and we are unconvinced that the mitigation proposed would resolve these issues.</p>	<p>Locations which have the potential to be impacted with regard to air quality have been included in the air quality modelling assessment, including locations in Sapcote. All modelled impacts are predicted to be</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p data-bbox="1447 280 2036 352">negligible and not significant (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118).</p> <p data-bbox="1447 400 2036 663">As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: APP-119), noise associated with the proposed operational phase of the development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with SRFI operations and additional train movements.</p> <p data-bbox="1447 711 2036 975">Acoustic characteristics such as bangs, scrapes, tones etc have also been accounted for. 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 data-bbox="1447 1023 2036 1254">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>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>The overall impact on climate emissions would be likely to be serious, both from construction and operation, as well as traffic induction resulting from changes to the network and further new developments</p>	<p>It is acknowledged (paragraph 18.29 of Chapter 18: Energy and Climate change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) that GHG emissions from all projects will contribute to climate change, the largest interrelated cumulative environmental effect. GHG emissions have a combined environmental effect that is approaching a scientifically defined environmental limit as such any GHG emissions or reductions from a project might be considered to be significant. The crux of the significance test therefore is not whether a project emits GHG emissions, nor even the magnitude of GHG emissions alone, but whether it contributes to reducing GHG emissions relative to a comparable baseline consistent with a trajectory towards net zero by 2050'. This is consistent with best practice guidance in assessing the impacts of a project (IEMA, 2022). To meet the 2050 target and interim budgets, action is required to reduce GHG emissions from all sectors, including projects in the built and natural environment. An EIA for any development must therefore consider whether and how that development will contribute to or jeopardise the achievement of these targets.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>All new GHG emissions contribute to a significant negative environmental effect; however, some projects will replace existing development that have higher GHG profiles. The significance of a project's emissions should therefore be based on its net impact, which may be positive, negative or negligible'. The methodology of the assessment (para 18.96 of document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127), sets out the requirement to compare the scheme's GHG emissions relative to the 6th UK Carbon Budget (Climate Change Committee 2021) with 1% being defined as the threshold for significance. The net residual GHG emissions from the scheme equates to less than 0.03% of the 6th UK Carbon Budget and therefore constitutes a "non-significant effect".</p>
		<p>The cumulative impact of the development also includes further development enabled by the changes to M69 Junction 2 which would cause further impacts of concern.</p>	<p>The strategic modelling has accounted for redistribution of traffic along with changes in growth within the wider county area. The inputs were as complete as possible at the time of the forecast model production, with inputs agreed with LCC and NH.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>There are a number of developments under consideration at the Local Plan level which will be reliant on the upgrade of Junction 2 however these proposals are at a very early stage in a Regulation 18 plan. .</p>
<p>RR-0158</p>	<p>Burbage Parish Council</p>	<p>Consultation The consultation from Tritax was not adequate to fully explain to residents the impacts, particularly on traffic volumes through Burbage.</p> <p>Blaby District Council (AoC-001) Leicestershire County Council (AoC-007) and Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (AoC-005) in their adequacy of consultation reports highlighted concerns about the quality of the consultation carried out.</p> <p>The maps provided showing traffic impacts, during the consultation, were of low resolution and Tritax-Symmetry claimed during the consultation period that improved maps were not possible to provided.</p> <p>This left Burbage residents unable to fully understand and assess the impacts on traffic through the village.</p> <p>Residents are at a loss to understand how traffic will reduce if this scheme is implemented.</p>	<p>A Pre-liminary Environmental Information Report was prepared for the Statutory Consultation including information on traffic volumes through Burbage. At the public exhibitions the transport consultants made best endeavours to respond to questions regarding traffic volumes including traffic volumes through Burbage.</p> <p>Maps and drawings were capable of being downloaded as well as being enlarged on the project website and online consultation platform.</p> <p>Contact has been made with Burbage Parish Council to offer assistance in locating the relevant information in the application documents.</p> <p>The strategic model shows that the provision of the A47 Link Road will divert traffic from</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>the B581 as it provides a quick, parallel route to the motorway network. Figures 5-10 and 5-11 within the Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-138) give an overview of traffic flow change from the without development to the with development scenario. Further detail can be found in the PRTM 2.2 Forecast Model report (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-148). Overall, the development increases traffic on certain roads, whilst decreasing traffic on others, this is primarily due to background traffic diverting to faster or more efficient routes created by new infrastructure.</p>
		<p>Site Selection The work carried out to support the choice of site was basic and did not establish direct need, it drew upon the National Policy Objective of more SRFIs in the UK, rather than demonstrating the need for Leicestershire and hence this site. The site selection process starts with an assumption that a site is required in Leicestershire, and therefore only considers sites in this area, based upon a warehousing report for Leicestershire which identified a need for a rail connected site.</p>	<p>The genesis of the site search for a SRFI by the Applicant was its finding of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Sector Study November 2014, which concluded a substantial requirement for rail related logistics development.</p> <p>The local authorities accept the need for a SRFI within Leicestershire. The need for HNRFI; the business market it will serve are addressed in the Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357). the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>This report does not provide detailed evidence of this need by manufacturers or industry in the area and only draws upon market evidence from estate agents. As with much of the surrounding area, the concept of a “golden triangle” in the Midlands (the definition of this area having at least three different boundaries), which has led to a ‘development bubble’ for warehousing in this area, which developers appearing to be desperate to achieving consent for development before the bubble bursts.</p> <p>The concept of this “golden triangle” is now flawed as it was built upon being able to deliver from the area to a large percentage of population of England within 4 hours. A concept which is now at odds with the notion of moving to rail-based carriage taking the goods as close as possible to the intended market. This has been recognised by Government in a recent consultation of the National Policy Statement which recognises that there has been a clustering of SRFIs in the Midlands and that this is against the intended objectives of the 2014 Policy statement.</p> <p>Together with the unnecessary clustering of both huge warehouse estates and SRFIs, the expansion of the number of these sites is proving difficult to recruit the necessary local workforce and employees are required</p>	<p>Market Needs Assessment includes a letter of support for the preferred operator of its rail port. Maritime clearly have confidence in HNRFI functioning as a intermodal freight interchange. The Relevant Representations from Network rail states ‘Network Rail is therefore satisfied that strategically the Hinckley proposal, if consented, will support Government and rail industry targets for intermodal rail freight growth and delivering freight mode shift from road to rail’.</p> <p>The NPSNN states (paragraph 2.57) that 'Existing Operational SRFIs and other Rail Freight Interchanges are situation predominantly within the Midlands and the North.' This is a statement of fact.</p> <p>The draft NPSNN does not suggest that this situation is 'against the intended objectives of the 2014 Policy Statement.' Rather the draft NPSNN states that ‘consideration should be given to ensuring existing SFRI locations are taken onto account when making an application.’ The Applicant has indeed undertaken this exercise with the Market Needs Assessment (Document 16.1 APP-357) Paragraphs 6.6-6.15 explain the market need</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>to commute many miles from a number of the surrounding large urban settlements.</p>	<p>for HNRFI in the context of other SRFIs, which are in operation and committed within the Midlands. Paragraph 6.12 explains the distinct market which HNRFI 'will serve'. The relevant Local Authorities do not dispute the need for HNRFI.</p> <p>The gravity model used as part of the HNRFI assessment takes into consideration the anticipated commuting patterns and the schemes labour pool. The scheme has been assessed on this basis.</p>
		<p>Highway Impacts The highway impacts of this proposal have not been clearly established and communicated to local residents and have not addressed key concerns relating to the impact of the local road network in the event of a closure of the M69 motorway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Throughout the consultation period we were advised by Leicestershire County Council that a fully developed highways model had been agreed, thus preventing residents from being able to contribute to the assessment process. - We are told that by opening up the South facing slip roads on to the M69 at Junction 2, traffic through the 	<p>Forecast Traffic modelling (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-148) Figure 3.6 provides a visual overview of the change in traffic flow with the development and slip roads in place. This is generated by the Strategic Modelling, for which the inputs had been signed off by LCC and NH. The new link to the B4668 combined with the slips enable better diversion routes should road closures occur. This removes pressure currently experienced within Burbage through diverted traffic, and also existing traffic wishing to access the M69 south- which is only achievable via Junction 1 currently. The</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>village of Burbage will be reduced – even when the terminal has been fully built-out and operational. Burbage remains to be convinced of the accuracy of this argument. In trying to understand the modelling which supports this prediction the traffic tables within the application are poorly labelled, and in some cases with seeming bizarre predictions for some of the local roads in Burbage. It is essential that clear understanding of the traffic modelling is achieved, not only by highways engineers, but by the general public.</p> <p>Locally we are experienced in the impact of unintended road closures. We have the misfortune to have ‘the most bashed rail bridge’ in the country which on average closes the A5 25 times per year. On each occasion traffic in part diverts through the village and hours of standing congestion occurs – We have seen NO modelling of scenarios in which, once fully operational, the SRFI will operate with an emergency closure of the M69. What operational contingency will be deployed and how many HGV movement will be diverted via Burbage village streets. The application considers ‘disaster’ scenarios, but more common motorway closures are not modelled.</p>	<p>connection to the A47 directly from Junction 2 around Hinckley will allow diversions to avoid sensitive B Roads should the low bridge be struck.</p> <p>Emergency routes are for the consideration of National Highways, however, the A47 link and the south facing slips provide additional alternative routing to the SRN should closures occur.</p> <p>HGV routing plans have been submitted and are intended to prevent impacts on sensitive village locations.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the development proceed we would urge that the opportunity is taken to introduce an HGV ban of vehicles using the route through the centre of the village of Burbage (B578). This route is already clearly unsuitable for HGVs and only continues due to a lack of alternative. The opening of the south facing slip roads on the M69 J2 would provide that alternative. 	
		<p>Air Quality Whilst the overall air quality calculations for the nation may be beneficial, these national benefits should not be at the expense of a concentration of pollution in this area, particularly in an area of open space enjoyment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is essential that an air quality management plan is part of the scheme of implementation such that there is a defined air quality management plan to ensure that the additional concentrations of air pollution in the local area. Air quality studies around the local area of Magna Park to the east along the A5 showed a significant impact on the local air pollution resulting from the warehousing estate and associated HGV movements. 	<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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>(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 Magna Park, specific receptor locations in the vicinity of Magna Park 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 was not significant.</p>
		<p>Ecology The impact upon the wildlife in Burbage Woods and surrounding areas will cause unacceptable foreseeable disruptions to local habitats and potentially more unforeseeable impacts with such a large 24-hour operation with the associated light and noise pollution.</p>	<p>Potential impacts from noise, light and dust pollution have been fully assessed within the Environmental Statement, with no significant effect concluded, subject to the sensitive construction measures and measures to protect retained habitat outlined within the CEMP (document reference: 17.1, APP-359) and EMMP (document reference: 17.5, APP-363) respectively. Detailed versions of these documents will be produced at the detailed design stage and include further details of appropriate mitigation to make sure any design changes are fully accounted for.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Social Amenity Impact Burbage Common & Woods is a significant local amenity which will be reduced by its setting, namely an edge of urban settlement leading to farmland, giving a sense of nature and countryside to visitors. Our response to the formal consultation stated “The [Burbage] common is the single most important green space in the immediate locality. Without doubt complete mitigation of the impact of having a rail terminal of the planned size next door to this treasured amenity is impossible.” Unfortunately, Tritax Symmetry does not appear to engage in our comment in a positive way but majored on the fact that Burbage Common and Wood have no national designation or protected status. We sought a recognition that this area of common land and woods, irrespective of national designation, has a tremendous role on the heart of our community. It is our ‘area of outstanding natural’ beauty, and it is used on a daily basis – throughout the whole year. It is essential that this area is protected with the maximum level of mitigation possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A development of the proposed scale, albeit on the boundary of the common will fundamentally change forever the nature and setting of this area on the edge of existing farmland. 	<p>The local value of Burbage Common and Woods Country Park is clearly understood. As indicated on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304), extensive new areas of strategic landscape planting are proposed to help protect the visual amenity and wildlife value of Burbage Common. Additional open space is proposed that will effectively extend Burbage Common Country Park by approximately 22ha (roughly a 25% increase) as part of the proposals and new PRoW connections will provide safer access to the common with traffic free access routes and signalled crossing points where road crossings do occur. The Woodland Management Plan sets out proposals to enhance the existing woods as well as the new woodland and is being discussed with HBBC (document reference 6.2.12.4A).</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The love the community holds for this area is enhanced by gifts of Burbage Woods to the area managed as public open space. The Local Rotary Club were instrumental in 1929 and later years in securing the Woods, with newspaper reports of the time declaring “[Burbage Woods] for generations [was] the beauty spot of the Hinckley District”. 	
		<p>Cumulative Impact of Developments to the East of Burbage. Spatial separation of settlements is a long-standing planning consideration and Burbage residents have adopted a Neighbourhood Plan in 2021 which has a specific sensitivity to protecting the green space to the east of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents are concerned about the cumulative growth of developments around junction 2 of the M69. Most notably the development proposals for the SRFI at this location but other developments are being considered on the wedges of land which come together at this junction. The additional slip roads will undoubtedly increase the commercial attractiveness of these developments. - It is essential the knock-on development impacts are taken into account during the considerations of these proposals. No recognition of the real risk of the urban sprawl of Hinckley/Burbage towards 	<p>Section 5 of the Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) explains the Midlands context for SRFIs, acknowledging that the Midlands economy is the largest outside London and equivalent to the size of Denmark’s national economy. Some 11 million people reside within the Midlands. The compelling need for an expanded network of SRFIs is required to serve the Midlands market, providing geographical spread of SRFIs which will serve customer needs typically within circa 20 miles.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		Stoney Stanton and Sapcote and resulting loss of spatial separation of these settlements should be included in the considerations.	
RR-1415	Whetstone Parish Council	Lack of mitigation offered at both Highways Infrastructure and impact on local existing neighbourhoods.	Highway infrastructure proposed is proportionate to the impact of the Site and its associated infrastructure,
RR-1416	Wigston Parva Parish Meeting	Initial observations and objections from Wigston Parva Parish as part of registration are as follows. More detail will be added as the proposed project application process continues: The application fails to meet the criteria laid out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks in the following areas: - The proposed site is not appropriately located relative to the markets it will serve, given the close proximity alternative logistics facilities in the immediate area as well as East Midlands RFI nearby, DIRFT Prologis RFI to the south already serving the potential 16 million square feet storage at Magna Park Distribution Park. - Is located far too close to existing settlements. - The M69 motorway to which the site borders will require major improvements to make it suitable. - The adjacent railway line is woefully unsuitable due to the constraints of the Narborough level crossing. - The proposed site consist of 100% greenfield arable land, currently actively farmed	<p>The Market Needs Assessment (Document Ref: 16.1 APP-357) has specifically considered the business market for HNRFI. Paragraphs 6.6-6.15 address this issue. At paragraph 6.12 the Assessment explains the markets served by committed SFRIs - and the distinct market HNRFI will serve.</p> <p>The M69, with the proposed enhancements at Junction 2 and the link to the A47 provide additional resilience in the network. Signal timing loops at Junction 1 will also improve throughput efficiencies.</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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>which would cause a significant loss to agriculture. - Local workforce would not begin to meet labour needs</p>	<p>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>As noted in the Soils and Agricultural Land Quality Assessment (document reference: 6.2.11.3, APP-193), the land being developed 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>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>The availability of labour supply will be supported by the evolving Employment and Skills Plan. 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> <p>In terms of construction employment, according to the Jobseekers' Allowance data (June 2022) (ONS), there are 1,250 individuals claiming JSA in the Study Area who usually work as labourers in the building and woodworking trades, and in other construction trades. The data also shows that overall 2,535 individuals claim JSA. This means that 49% of individuals claiming JSA within the Study Area are looking for work in the construction sector. In England, the data indicates that 29,225 out of 84,680 individuals claiming JSA are within the construction sector, which is 35% in percentage terms. Therefore, the Study Area has a higher proportion of JSA Claimants in</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			construction and building and woodworking trades than England.
RR-0436	Groby Parish Council	Dear Sirs Re: Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Following a meeting held on Thursday 15th June 2023, members of the Planning & Development Committee of Groby Parish Council agreed to submit the following comments on the proposal:	Comments noted
		i. The Planning & Development Committee are deeply concerned of the increase in vehicle movements within this area, on roads which already cannot cope.	<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</p> <p>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. Junction 21 of the M1 has been reviewed in detail, there are existing problems here that require</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>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>
		<p>ii. The loss of Green Field Sites and Environmental impact.</p>	<p>The NPS NN, explains (paragraph 4.84) that due to the locational requirements for a SRFI a countryside location may be required. BDC/HBBC have confirmed that there is no suitable site to meet these locational requirements, within existing urban areas.</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.83 – 4.89 of the NPS provide specific policy guidance on the assessment principles for SRFI, including their function, locational requirements and scale and design. This policy advice was taken into account in the Applicant’s assessment of locations and design options. The Applicant then considered seven potential locations within the area of Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>iii. Question as to whether this is the most appropriate location for a National Rail Freight Interchange.</p>	<p>The NPS NN does not impose a limit on the number of locations that may be suitable for SFRIs.</p> <p>The NPS states that the locational requirements will restrict the scope for developers to identify viable alternative sites. (NPS NN paragraph 2.56). As stated in the R6 letter (Document ref: R ule 6 letter – Notification of the Preliminary meeting and matters to be discussed). The focus [of the examination] will be on the merits or disadvantages of the Proposed Development, tested to the appropriate extent using the tests set out in relevant designated NPSs that are in force. In the context of the NPS identifying a compelling need for an expanded network of SFRIs, the NPS does not require an Applicant to demonstrate that the Proposed Development is the ‘best site’ or ‘only site.’</p> <p>The Applicant considered that HNRFI is its preferred choice for promoting the development of a SRFI in meeting the locational requirements and being situated in</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>a location where there are no substantial environmental constraints.</p> <p>The planning test is whether HNRFI satisfies the provisions of Section 104 of the Planning Act 2008.</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>
		<p>iv. Concerns on the increase of Air Pollution throughout the County.</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 assessment of both construction and operational impacts was undertaken in accordance with the latest guidance and methodologies.</p>
		<p>v. The huge impact this will have on the biodiversity of the area – affecting wildlife and hedgerows.</p>	<p>Subject to the proposed mitigation, impacts are not considered to be significant. The value of the habitat within the site boundary has been fully assessed within Chapter 12 of</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>the ES paragraphs 12.99 – 12.104 (document reference: 6.1.12, APP-121)– paragraphs 12.99 – 12.104) and the BIA Appendix 12.2 (document reference: 6.2.12.2, APP-198). 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 quantitative loss of low value habitat will be mitigated for with a qualitative gain is species-rich habitat which will provide new opportunities for a range of protected species.</p> <p>A 10% net gain in biodiversity, hedgerow and river credits will be achieved to ensure the proposals remain consistent with national, local policy, and forthcoming legislation.</p>
		<p>vi. The Committee didn't feel that the project would achieve Net Zero overall including the construction of the site and surrounding infrastructure required.</p>	<p>Chapter 18: Energy and Climate change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) sets the applicants commitment to delivering Net Zero in construction, aligned with their Gold accreditation of the UK Green Building Council.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>vii. Due to the nature of the build, the increased volume of traffic & local journeys to the HNRFI will affect the National Forest and surrounding areas.</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</p> <p>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. 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-0478	Huncote Parish Council	<p>Huncote Parish Council's relevant representations to the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange proposal Huncote Parish Council (HPC) has considered the</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>application submitted by Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (the Applicant) for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI) and considers the following should be deemed among the main issues and impacts. Matters are categorised by technical areas and are only in summary form. These will be developed in HPC's further responses during the Examination of the application. Highways and Transport There is no agreement to the following elements of the proposed development:</p>	
		<p>Highways and Transport</p> <p>There is no agreement to the following elements of the proposed development: Proposals indicate a varied level of employment (8,400 and 10,400 jobs) for the site, with no consistent measure of impact. The scheme also fails to specify the nature of the businesses. This issue is considered important to ensure that the Scheme operates principally as a rail-linked facility and not a road-served distribution centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These inconsistencies don't accurately reflect the greatest impact of jobs on the site, and surrounding area. Who will be coming to the site, where do they live and how will they get there? 	<p>Trip generation figures (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-141) had been agreed through substantial negotiation and technical appendices including detailed review of the onward freight percentages and their derivation. The trip generation has always been based on floor area as per the standard approach to Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The employee numbers sit independent to this derivation as these are often uncertain at the time of submission. Estimates have been stated for the socio-economic purposes. The lower value being 8,400 and the socio -</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All logistical businesses will require vehicle movements to move products along the supply chain. It isn't unreasonable to suggest that more jobs, means more vehicle movements. We don't believe the Transport Assessment adequately reflects these variances. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Limited analysis of the housing market has taken place, with any new housing development proposed to deal with the impact of the site further compounding the impact on local roads and congestion, as well as health & wellbeing impacts. o The addition of a lorry park also is inadequately assessed, for trip generation and draw. 	<p>economic report stating an upper ceiling of up to 10,400 employees. This was based on the HCA Employment Density Guide 3rd edition. On review of the absolute projected trip generation figures (Table 7 within the Trip Generation Addendum note) (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-141) these equate to approximately 8,200 car trips the site (half the arrivals plus departures). Which, for the lower employment figures, would be extremely robust with close to 100% of employees driving to site in their own car. For the upper employee estimate this value would be around 78% mode share, which remains robust and in line with other distribution sites. The figures used for car trips are high when compared with the floorspace and usage. This was to test the infrastructure provision with a likely worst case.</p> <p>It is the role of the local plan to plan for the accommodation of any new housing, BDC and HBBC are currently working on new local plans for their administrative areas. Highway mitigations required to deliver new homes will be addressed through the local plan or at the planning application stage depending on</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>the nature of the proposals. The planning logs for the highway modelling inputs included all known commitment including proposals for new housing.</p>
		<p>The overall design, capacity, phasing and access infrastructure for the site cause great concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Routing of the A47 link road, impact on local roads and early dismissal of a southern by-pass option have shown inadequate mitigation, and haven't been agreed with the local Highway Authority. - There also seems to be insufficient consideration of the impact on the site should the road network; both strategic and local, not be operating at optimal conditions. M1 J21 often sees closures with traffic backing up to the site (M69 J2). This will impact worker access to the site and strategic vehicle movements, as well as significantly increase demand on the proposed lorry park facilities. - Visual, health and wellbeing, and amenity impact on local countryside seem inadequately dealt with within the reports and are inconsistently reviewed. 	<p>The inclusion of the A47 link road provides a complete link around Hinckley removing traffic from the centre of the town whilst providing capacity for vehicles wishing to access the M69. This is supported by Strategic Modelling carried out by LCC's consultants. The proposed changes to highway infrastructure proportionately mitigate the developments impacts, whilst providing benefits to Hinckley and surrounding areas in terms of access to the Strategic Road Network. The mitigation is not intended to address existing network issues. J21 has underlying problems at the roundabouts, which additional queueing capacity will not resolve and for which the inclusion within this application, in the view of the applicant, would not be proportionate to the impact.</p> <p>Health and well-being impacts resulting from new residential developments will be addressed by those proposals, it is not for the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>HNRFI DCO to assess the health and well-being impacts of unknown residential developments.</p> <p>All tangible changes in environmental and socio-economic conditions with the potential to influence public health have been assessed and addressed through the assessment process set to objective thresholds and guidance that are protective of the environment and health and facilitate sustainable development.</p> <p>The Health and Equality Briefing Note has been provided to aid navigation of the DCO and summarise how and where health has been addressed. No gaps have been found in the assessment scope.</p>
		<p>Mitigation proposals for the impact of movements on both local and strategic junction assessments and design have shown inconsiderate consideration of travel impact between impacted sites.</p>	<p>Mitigation proposals and assessment in the TA document ref 6.2.8.1, APP-138 take into consideration the forecast outputs of the Strategic Modelling that includes congestion, distribution and routing of traffic on the highway network between junctions and at each junction. Further assessment of link impacts can also be found in the Traffic and</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Movement Chapter 8 of the ES Document Ref 6.2.8, APP – 117.</p>
		<p>Impact on existing passenger rail and freight movement proposals, and knock-on impacts at Narborough crossing.</p>	<p>Network Rail has undertaken a review of the proposed freight movements, allowing for the existing and proposed passenger services and has concluded that there is capacity for 16 trains per day, with no more than trains 2 per hour between HNRFI and Leicester and 3 per hour overall, This relates to the capacity of the rail terminal to receive and dispatch trains, not the capacity of the line.</p> <p>Network Rail has confirmed that for the Highway AM and PM Peak Hours including shoulder periods before and after the peaks 7- 10am and 4-7pm, there is only one additional train path available in the PM peak which would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins at 75mph. NR confirmed that barrier downtimes would be approximately 20 mins within the hour which is well within their desired thresholds.</p>
		<p>Travel management issues</p>	<p>As stated in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact of Narborough Rail crossing closures. - HGV routing strategies and enforcement. - Staff travel strategies to/from Hinckley Station and Narborough Station for the site. - Cycle network impact of the site o Public Rights of Way strategies and walking, cycling and horse-riding assessments. - Construction traffic management plan and strategy. - Sustainable transport policies and solutions. <p>Consideration of lane improvements to the M69 between J1 and M1 J21 seems to have been inadequately considered and assessed</p> <p>Cycle network infrastructure seems to have been insufficiently considered o Insufficient safe, lockable parking provision for bicycles at Hinckley or Narborough stations. Lack of consideration for e-bike schemes</p> <p>Opportunities missed to utilise the local public transport network to shuttle staff to the site in line with determinable shift patterns, from both Hinckley and Narborough rail stations.</p>	<p>Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116), the varied level of employment (8,400 to 10,400 jobs) is due to the different employment densities associated with National Distribution Centres (NDCs) and Regional Distribution Centres (RDCs). The HNRFI is likely to accommodate a mix of NDCs and RDCs.</p> <p>As shown in Figure 7.1 of Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116), the large majority of those employed in the construction sector in Leicestershire (86%) travelled less than 30km to their place of work. The Study Area used for construction employment therefore covers the local authorities within a 30km radius from the Main Order Limits. These local authorities form the main area of impact that would benefit from employment opportunities during the construction of the HNRFI project.</p> <p>AECOM developed the HNRFI employee trips model in 2018, which shows the likely location of HNRFI workers. Further information and details on the model are</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>There seems to be an insufficient explanation for the site selection in open countryside, away from significant current warehousing operations, when greater utilisation of sites near Magna Park/Rugby, and the Solent and Felixstowe lines connecting close to Nuneaton, provides the opportunity for a single facility to serve two ports which may represent a more suitable location.</p>	<p>provided in Appendix 4 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-138-158). The local authorities including zones within a minimum employment trip density of 0.1 are used to define the Study Area for operational employment, to show all the areas where the HNRFI employees are likely to come from.</p> <p>In the absence of the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HENA) 2022 at the point of assessment, the Applicant used the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) 2017 and also took into account the latest 5 year land supply (Table 7.11 of Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116) to update the study. The Applicant understands the limitations of using 5 year trends for a longer time period and considers this as the best alternative.</p> <p>A Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan pt 15 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) has been submitted which provides further detail on Public and Active Transport Measures. The Framework Travel Plan (document reference 6.2.8.2, APP-159) will</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>also provide opportunity for review of sustainable transport measures and improvements throughout the life of the site.</p> <p>A Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.1. APP-153) has been submitted which provides further detail on Public and Active Transport Measures. The Framework Travel Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.2, APP-159) will also provide opportunity for review of sustainable transport measures and improvements throughout the life of the site. E-bikes are to be considered through the S106.</p> <p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), while some existing routes would be stopped up as a result of the proposed development, there would be several new routes proposed around and through the site, which provide pedestrian and cycle connectivity as well as bridleways connecting to the local network.</p> <p>HNRFI is in an optimal rail location to connect to Felixstowe and London Gateway (avoiding the North London Line), the East Coast Ports, as well as Liverpool, the Northwest and</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Scotland. Any terminal west of Nuneaton would have to access Liverpool, the North-West and Scotland via the congested passenger lines around Birmingham, through Water Orton.</p> <p>HNRFI can serve Southampton, currently routed through Birmingham or in due course, via the proposed Nuneaton Dive Under, if required, but it is not a target market.</p> <p>There are considerable restrictions to and from Southampton through Oxford and its capacity is better suited to other terminals, including DIRFT once the East West Rail Phase 2 is completed between Bicester and Bletchley.</p> <p>Between DIRFT and HNRFI, Magna Park will have access to exceptional rail services, which would not be available without HNRFI, or if this SRFI was located west of Nuneaton.</p> <p>The detail of the rail studies is set out in the Environmental Statement Appendix 3.1: Rail Report (document reference: 6.2.3.1, APP-131). Network Rail has completed its own assessment and is satisfied that there is</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>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> <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</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.
		<p>Air quality management</p> <p>noise impact assessments and lighting impacts both during construction, development and operation haven't been adequately considered for human and wildlife health. o It would also be helpful to know if the assessments will be revised once the Government publish revised Air Quality Objectives later this year.</p> <p>Impact on amenity sites in the wider locality has been satisfactorily considered, particularly noting vehicle movement pattern changes once development of the site commences through its operation.</p> <p>Concerns about capacity and impact on health service provision both during construction, development and operation.</p> <p>Impact of landfill gas on the site, leaching from any of the many waste landfill sites operating in the vicinity of the site since the 1950s, hasn't been properly considered.</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>The air quality assessment provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) assesses the impact of air quality on human health and ecological designations. 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 Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Impact of barrier downtime on air quality for pedestrian traffic, residential impacts and school children from idling vehicles, adjacent to the Narborough crossing.</p> <p>The impact of the various lighting proposed around the site on residential windows and amenities such as Burbage Common should be further assessed.</p> <p>An assessment of nighttime noise levels from the site for the wider community is required.</p> <p>Proposals for de-restricted road speed limits within the site are not welcomed, with concerns over the audible changes in engine revs and potential for tyre screeching as limits change near significant bends near the railway.</p>	<p>An air quality addendum (document reference: 6.4.1, AS-023) has been prepared and submitted which takes consideration of the quality assessment results in accordance with the revised PM_{2.5} air quality objectives published in early 2023.</p> <p>Overall, the impact of the HNRFI is predicted to be not significant in relation to the future PM_{2.5} objectives.</p> <p>The railway line crossing at Narborough is located on Station Road. Station Road is not part of the modelled air quality road network as the trip generation for the scheme along Station Road does not exceed the Institute of Air Quality Management and Environmental Protection UK screening criteria for when significant impacts may be predicted. It is, therefore, considered that any changes in traffic flow at the railway crossing at Narborough will not cause any significant air quality impacts at the receptors identified.</p> <p>Our transport consultants have provided the following response with relation to the additional barrier down time at Narborough "Network Rail have undertaken a detailed</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Network Rail is satisfied that sufficient capacity has been identified for HNRFI services in the Working Timetable. This allows for known passenger service development aspirations identified by Midlands Connect, to better link Birmingham, Nuneaton, Hinckley and Leicester. The Narborough Level crossing was subject to scrutiny by the LHA and models were adjusted to suit the existing and forecast delays associated with the barrier down time. Network Rail have agreed that there is adequate capacity at the cross roads.”</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 the 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 assessment has considered both the daytime and night-time periods. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.</p> <p>For receptors located further way than those identified, noise may be experienced at these receptors, but this is likely to be equal to or less that those identified in Chapter 10</p>
		<p>Socioeconomics</p> <p>Concerns of potential impacts on demand for local housing making ensuring community cohesion unviable for future generations. o Limited/lack of analysis of housing market characteristics - undermines conclusions about the impact on the housing market.</p> <p>Concerns around the benefits of construction for the local population and suppliers will not be appropriately secured. o Consideration of a Training Officer within the draft s.106 isn't proposed for long enough. o There isn't enough of a guarantee that spending from the site will happen with local businesses.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the availability of local workforce to match required skills and how an effective training strategy will be secured.</p>	<p>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 soften views of the proposals. The Proposed Photomontages (document reference: 6.3.11.16) illustrate the effectiveness of the mitigation from selected representative viewpoints.</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 availability of labour supply will be</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Impact of barrier downtime on Narborough businesses, due to increased traffic restrictions.</p> <p>Concerns around the timing of rail movements impacting the viability of rail connections at nearby Croft Quarry. The Applicant has failed to adequately mitigate the Scheme and should propose a comprehensive package of additional s.106 funding should be made available to mitigate all of these concerns. The Council has concerns that this is not a rail-based scheme and is more likely to end up as a warehousing scheme with potential rail access.</p>	<p>detailed in the evolving Employment and Skills Plan. In terms of construction employment, according to the Jobseekers' Allowance data (June 2022) (ONS), there are 1,250 individuals claiming JSA in the Study Area who usually work as labourers in the building and woodworking trades, and in other construction trades. The data also shows that overall, 2,535 individuals claim JSA. This means that 49% of individuals claiming JSA within the Study Area are looking for work in the construction sector. In England, the data indicates that 35% of individuals claiming JSA are within the construction sector. Therefore, the Study Area has a higher proportion of JSA Claimants in construction and building and woodworking trades than England.</p> <p>In terms of the assessment of effects on the housing market, in the absence of the HENA 2022 at the point of assessment, the Applicant used the HEDNA 2017 and also took into account the latest 5-year land supply (Table 7.11 in Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116) to update the study. The Applicant</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>understand the limitations of using 5-year trends for a longer time period and considers this as the best alternative.</p> <p>We confirm our commitment to Sustainable Urban Drainage, consistent with paragraphs 18.268 and 18.298 and Table 18.21 of Chapter 18: Energy and Climate Change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127).</p> <p>The rail element is capable of being operated with hydrogen powered or hybrid hydrogen and battery electric powered locos, as they would operate as diesel do now, under their own power. The ability to use Over Line Electric (OLE) equipment and trins has also been allowed for in the design.</p> <p>Planning obligations through the provisions of S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, must satisfy tests of lawfulness as provided by Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010. The planning process does not operate on extracting extraneous benefits from new developments - within the principle that planning permission can neither be bought or sold. The Applicant will enter Requirements and Obligations which</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>may be reasonably sought to satisfactorily mitigate the impacts of the development.</p> <p>Network Rail have investigated the impact on barrier down time at Narborough Level Crossing and it is not significant with HNRFI services. A maximum of 2 trains in any one hour can run via Narborough meaning a nominal overall impact, with only 1 in the 7:00 -10:00 AM peak and 2 about 1 hour apart, in the 4:00 to 7:00 PM peak.</p> <p>Croft has consent to a scheme which has its own operational capacity constraints, relating to its rail design and the time taken to unload trains, which is 3-4 trains per day. There is ample capacity for Croft services.</p> <p>The suggestion that this scheme is not really a rail-based scheme, only one with potential rail access is to fundamentally misunderstand the critical importance in rail terms, of this scheme, both to the logistics market in its efforts to establish the most sustainable transport in and out of the Midlands, and to Network Rail and its remit from Government to grow rail freight.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Ecology</p> <p>Impact and extent of mitigation measures such as acoustic fencing on nearby residential properties.</p> <p>Planting schemes fail to ensure existing communities are protected from increased noise and air pollution, by not ensuring high tree/hedge planting levels are provided along major strategic routes, to limit impacts on communities both in their current form and as they expand in the future.</p> <p>Failure of lighting strategy to show maximum lighting plans impact across the local area on sensitive wildlife receptors.</p> <p>Hours of operation for the site cause concern for the impact on wildlife and the residential environment of the surrounding area, with issues of noise, vibration, non-natural lighting and traffic disruption impacting the area.</p> <p>The impact of hedgerow removal seems to have lacked significant consideration for the impact on wildlife. Net-Zero</p>	<p>20ha of woodland planting, 600 amenity trees along routes and within amenity areas within the development are proposed to provide a number of ecosystem services including wildlife habitat, visual amenity, microclimate control and water management.</p> <p>Trees and hedges do not provide any acoustic screening or benefits from a noise perspective. Therefore mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers have been recommended to reduce noise levels where required. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels will be reduced and adverse impacts are unlikely.</p> <p>As outlined in Table 12.7 of the Ecology and Biodiversity Chapter (document reference: 6.2.12, APP-197 and APP-198), the development proposals will result in the unavoidable loss of approximately 13,990m of hedgerow. However, in line with local and national policy, and in line with the forthcoming Environment Act 2021, the</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Designs allowing for electric car charging points at only 20% of spaces are insufficient and mitigation does not facilitate the transition to ultra-low emission vehicles or decarbonised road freight.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration for alternative fuel consideration (i.e., hydrogen) and recharging points being practicably deployable for use on or around the site.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the use of ground-source heat pumps and air-source heat pumps on the site. Their exclusion from consideration doesn't get adequately explained, especially in light of current and future requirements for their use.</p> <p>It is disappointing not to see greater opportunities taken to improve natural energy production within areas of the site such as car parking, where canopies could be deployed to hold solar panels and generate additional renewable energy for the site.</p> <p>While many water attenuation ponds are illustrated in plans, there is little proposal for the re-use of harvesting any of this water for simple uses such as lorry washes and flushing toilets.</p>	<p>proposals will deliver at least 7% net gain in hedgerows on site with additional gains sought elsewhere where necessary.</p> <p>Lighting within the central/operational parts of the development will necessarily be well-lit. A sensitive lighting strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134) has been designed to ensure that light spill to surrounding habitats has been kept to a minimum and dark corridors surrounding the proposals will ensure continued opportunities for faunal species. The submitted lux radii plans demonstrate that light spill on retained, newly created and off-site features will be kept to a minimum.</p> <p>The ecology chapter (document reference: 6.1.12, APP-121) 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 (i.e. a detailed CEMP secured via Requirement 7).</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<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>Under the proposals, the HNRFI development site will deliver a minimum of 20% EV charging spaces for both LDV and HGV with capacity to provide 100% dependent on phasing and demand. This is confirmed by the Design and Access Statement (document reference 8.1, APP-349). The Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) provides further information.</p> <p>Ground-source and Air-source heat pumps do feature as part of the energy strategy (6.2.18.1) and the mix of technologies that drive the sustainable credentials for the site.</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>The use of solar panels do feature as part of the energy strategy and will be applied to 100% of the available roof space on the buildings, generating sufficient power for the site to be self sufficient in normal consumption periods.</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>Water harvesting systems require significant amounts of infrastructure which significantly increases the embodied carbon of the building, they are power hungry, making the carbon in operation increase for the life of the building, they require considerable additional maintenance, which has negative impacts on both cost and carbon and they can only be relied on for a proportion of the year, so you have to have a mains</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			connection which feeds all of the water fittings anyway.
RR-0110	Aston Flamville Parish Meeting	Alternative site appraisals appear minimalistic	<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 4 of the Environmental Statement provides a summary of the seven site locations considered. Although the information provided is in summary form, each site was assessed against the following principles and their respective criteria as noted in Chapter 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail access • Road access • Amenity and environmental impacts • Commercial and economic setting

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			Chapter 4 provides a justification for site options being discounted and for the selection of the preferred site option.
		Local traffic mitigation efforts are undefined	Mitigation and explanation of impacts are included in the Environmental Chapter and its associated Appendices. See document reference (document references: 6.1.8 and 6.2.8.1, APP-117 and APP-152).
		Market need & areas served are questionable	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. 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 HNRFI from Maritime as the preferred operator of the rail port and Requirement 10 will ensure that HNRFI will not operate primarily as a road base warehouse facility.

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>The HNRFI Property Market Area (PMA) is the broad 'area of search' the Site sits within that I&L 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&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 20-mile truck-drive isochrone in the HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference: 16.2, APP-358).</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<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 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 as 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>
		Adverse effect on roads	ES Chapter relating to transport (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117) discussed impacts on the Highways around the Site

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<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. 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>
		Adverse effect on rail services	<p>The detail of the rail studies is set out in the Environmental Statement (document reference: 6.2.3.1, APP-131) Appendix 3.1:Rail Report. Network Rail has completed</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>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>
<p>RR-0730</p>	<p>Leicester Forest West Parish Meeting</p>	<p>Impact on local roads and communities by increased traffic volumes</p>	<p>ES Chapter 8 (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117) discusses impacts on roads and communities in detail.</p>
<p>RR-0157</p>	<p>Burbage Neighbourhood Plan Working Party</p>	<p>Impact of this NRFI would have upon the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan which was 'Made' in 2021</p>	<p>No part of the DCO Order Limits lies within the administrative area of the Burbage Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan contends that HNRFI ‘would have a significant impact upon the environs of Burbage, especially the sites close proximity to Burbage Woods’. The impact of HNRFI on</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>Burbage has been considered within the Environmental Statement,</p> <p>Any potential adverse impacts on Burbage Woods will be fully mitigated, as outlined within the Ecology and Biodiversity Chapter (document reference: 6.2.12, APP-197 and APP-198). Burbage woods will be significantly buffered (from development by large areas of open space, comprising habitats such as new woodland, wildflower grassland and mixed scrub. The detailed Woodland Management Plan (secured via Requirement) will ensure off-site woodland habitats of value will not be adversely impacted as a result of increased (or redirected) foot traffic.</p> <p>The Ecology and Biodiversity Chapter (document reference: 6.2.12, APP-197 and APP-198), based on assessments undertaken within the Air Quality assessment, concludes that there will be no significant impacts on off-site woodland as a result of reduced air quality, subject to appropriate mitigation (secured through detailed CEMPs via Requirement 7). The ecological receptors adjacent the site are not considered to be</p>

RR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
			<p>sensitive to noise and vibration, subject to standard engineering protocols.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is acknowledged by Burbage Parish Council in their relevant 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>