

Section 6 - Summary Residents Businesses

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Traffic and Transport		
Highways infrastructure inadequate		Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts. Further detail is contained within the ES Appendix 6.8.2.1 (AS-016) Transport Assessment Sections 8 and 9 .
Poor road networks		Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts. Further detail is contained within the ES Appendix 6.8.2.1 (AS-016) Transport Assessment Sections 8 and 9
Limited access routes		Access infrastructure has been developed to ensure development has very good linkage to both the strategic road network (SRN) and the local A road network.
The company proposing this site have submitted incorrect and unresearched impacts on the local infrastructure on several occasions		All inputs to the strategic modelling have been agreed through the Transport Working Group made up of the key Highway Authorities in the vicinity of the site- including Leicestershire County Council, National Highways and Warwickshire County Council. Where agreements are not in place, best professional judgment has been used to develop a mitigation strategy based on the proportionate impact of the Site.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Congestion is already a problem	Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts of the development. Further detail is contained within the ES Appendix 6.8.2.1 (AS-016) Transport Assessment Sections 8 and 9F	
The M69 roundabout from the A5 is already problematic	The new slip roads proposed as part of the Development will reduce pressure on J1 of the M69 by allowing traffic to route to and from the south without needing to use the centre of Hinckley or Burbage.	
Will reduce road safety	Road safety has been fully considered as part of the design process and mitigation introduced where safety is perceived to have changed.	
Will increase traffic through and around Hinckley	The strategic modelling indicates that traffic is likely to reduce in Hinckley as the slip roads and new A47 permit better access to the M69. The ES Appendix part 7 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-145) which provides a summary of the strategic modelling outputs in terms of traffic flow change both with and without development.	
Heavier traffic will begin to undermine the roads and buildings subjected to the impact of their weight and, indeed, noise vibrations adding to the cost and frequency of road and building repairs.	Restrictions on HGVs using specific routes are proposed. The majority of heavy vehicles will route to the motorway network which is designed for the strategic movement of goods as well as people. A HGV Routing Strategy has been produced to ensure an operational plan is in place for managing the movement of HGVs to and from the site. (document reference: 17.6, APP-364	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Increased traffic through the villages	Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts. Further detail can be found in ES Appendix 6.8.1 Transport Assessment (AS-016) paragraphs 5.104- 5.110	
When the M69 has issues with accidents and has to close, the A47 will become the route in and out, which is not ideal for local traffic getting to and from their villages.	Currently there is no alternative route if there are closures on the A5. The new link road and south facing slips permit more efficient alternative routes using A roads or the SRN should a closure happen on the A5 or M69.	
Bypass needed to eliminate traffic through Fosse Villages.	A bypass was opposed by the majority of people within the Fosse Villages when consulted on in 2019. A bypass in these locations will draw more traffic to it and create more problems at either end on the B4114 and the B4669.	
No improvements to existing major junctions.	Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts of the development. Further detail is contained within the ES Appendix 6.8.2.1 (AS-016) Transport Assessment Sections 8 and 9. This includes a substantial upgrade to Junction 2 of the M69.	
Inadequate traffic modelling	All inputs to the strategic modelling have been agreed through the Transport Working Group. made up of the key Highway Authorities in the vicinity of the site- including Leicestershire County Council, National Highways and Warwickshire County Council. Where agreements are not in place, best professional judgement has been used to develop a mitigation strategy based on the proportionate impact of the Site.	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>The proposal to provide an access road to link to the B road opposite the rugby club, cricket club, squash club and football club is dangerous. The B road cannot accommodate the amount of HGV traffic planned and the number of sports people, including many young people, using the sports facilities, put their lives at risk due to the sheer volume of heavy traffic.</p>	<p>The proposed junction has been designed to route vehicles to the link road and the A47. This has been designed to be safe for the volumes of traffic forecast. The junction will have widened footway/cycleways on the approach with widening to the existing footway on the sports club side of the B4668. improvements to pedestrian/cycle access.</p>
	<p>It would be more sensible to open a 2b exit a bit further up to avoid clogging and, dangerous and careless drivers including lorry drivers.</p>	<p>Additional accesses to the SRN are not possible in this location. Where there is opportunity, National Highways policy requires access via existing junctions, unless included within local infrastructure plans. The new junction is designed to minimise congestion.</p>
	<p>The southern slips will open the villages up to more traffic</p>	<p>Through traffic in Sapcote appears to be heading to Broughton Astley and surrounding villages. A substantial proportion of traffic in Sapcote is generated by the village itself. As evidenced by the select link analysis included within the Forecast Model Report (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-148) Figure 3-12. This indicates the origin and destination of flows within the centre of Sapcote. The images show that traffic is drawn from the area and surroundings rather than significantly further afield as would be expected for through-routing</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	Traffic on Hinckley Road is already bad	The new slips will reduce the need for traffic from the Fosse Villages and from the northern side of Hinckley routing through the town to access the motorway network. Impacts on Hinckley Road are predicted to be reduced.
	Cycle route between Hinckley and Sapcote/Sharnford will require a longer deviation or need to cross newly formed heavy traffic access	A cycle route is provided for the length of the new A47 link Road and routes internal to the site, these connect to existing routes to Hinckley. Existing movements across Junction 2 are very low. The existing routes make use of the footbridge which will remain in-situ as part of the scheme and connect with the new routes around the site. Further information is contained within the public rights of way appraisal and strategy (document reference: 6.2.11.2, APP-192)
	The lorry park will attract crime, May be more appropriate to locate this near to the M69 roundabout where police could monitor more easily?	The HGV Park is private and will be for those operators serving the rail port and the B8 units. Usage will be monitored by on-site management
	Concerned about the affects should there be a bridge strike on the nearby A5, or accidents on the M69, M1 and M6	Currently there is no alternative route if there are closures on the A5. The new link road and south facing slips permit more efficient alternative routes using A roads or the SRN should a closure happen on the A5 or M69.
	The A47 access road exits onto the very narrow B4668 road. The only way for any	Appropriate widening is provided as part of the mitigation scheme at the interface with the B4668.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>HGV to exit or access the site is to either turn left through the centre of Hinckley or right to the roundabout to join the A47 at Clickers Way. Anyone local will tell you the A47 by pass narrows to single lanes and getting access to either the A5 Going east or the A47 to Leicester, going west, is already beset by major traffic jams for the majority of the day. This is because of the rapid growth of housing estates and industrial areas along the bypass. It is now a regular occurrence for Tesco Lorries to sit in the middle of the road outside their warehouse awaiting access. Once you are off the bypass the roads and traffic issues are already subject of major debate. There is currently no access to or from Coventry on the M69 at the junction of the B4669. The new junction does not clearly show the plans to address that major omission.</p>	<p>The new slip roads proposed as part of the Development will reduce pressure on J1 of the M69 by allowing traffic to route to and from the south without needing to use the centre of Hinckley or Burbage.</p>
<p>Concerned about HGVs on the A47</p>		<p>Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts. An HGV Strategy has been developed to manage HGV movements to and from the site this is to be monitored by site management and to be agreed with the members of the transport working group.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Impact on J21		<p>J21 has existing and underlying capacity issues which have been present for at least twenty years. Full models and assessments have been carried out to understand the extent of intervention required as a result of the development. Proportionately the impacts of the development will be relatively low, but any mitigation would need to address the width of the circulatory carriageway at the J21 roundabout. This type of mitigation is extremely costly and will require a strategic and/or Government level commitment to improve. It is under review for the Governments Roads Investment Strategy 3.</p>
Snarling up traffic will not help emergency vehicles get around.		<p>Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts. Additional capacity will be provided with the additional of the J2 slip roads and the A47 link road which will improve accessibility and alternative route planning for emergency vehicles.</p>
Local bus routes have been cut		<p>There are no proposals to cut existing services. The plans are to significantly enhance services to the site between Leicester and Coventry as well as provide modern demand responsive routes closer to the site, covering neighbouring towns and villages.</p>
No consideration given to the event where HGVs do not follow suggested motorway routes and instead choose to take quicker, more convenient, routes through the village		<p>Restrictions on HGVs using specific routes are proposed. The majority of heavy vehicles will route to the motorway network which is designed for the strategic movement of goods as well as people. These will be monitored and enforced, under agreement with the local highway authorities, by the Site Management. This is managed through the HGV routing strategy as part of the suite of Management documents submitted through the DCO and secured through Requirements of the DCO (document reference: 17.4, APP-362)</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	Lack of weight limits preventing HGVs from coming through a very small village	Weight limits have been investigated, though routes around the Fosse Villages provide access for local businesses and are therefore not practicable
	Would increase traffic on Sapcote Road	Sapcote Road will experience increased traffic. However, strategic models suggest that most additional traffic on this route, is generated within the Fosse Villages themselves. The PRTM 2.2 Modelling outputs Figure 3.12 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-148) illustrate the source of traffic travelling on Sapcote Road
	Circa 35k a day using Drayton Lane, a road without any pavements	Net change of traffic flow on Drayton Lane is negative in the Future year when compared with the Future baseline. Further information is within APP 148 PRTM 2.2 Modelling Report
	The road infrastructure needs to be present before the terminal is built.	The highway infrastructure is intended to be built in the first phase of construction, to ensure adequate access for the earliest occupation.
	Already have issues with bridge strikes on the A5	Currently there is no alternative route if there are closures on the A5. The new link road and south facing slips permit more efficient alternative routes using A roads or the SRN should a closure happen on the A5 or M69.
	Will have a major impact on the A5	All inputs to the strategic modelling have been agreed through the Transport Working Group made up of the key Highway Authorities in the vicinity of the site- including Leicestershire County Council, National Highways and Warwickshire County Council. Where agreements are not in place, best professional judgment has been used to develop a mitigation strategy based on the

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		proportionate impact of the Site. A5 impacts have been reviewed through both Leicestershire's PRTM model and Warwickshire's Rugby Rural Area model and mitigation developed where impacts are significant This includes changes to the Cross-in-Hand roundabout.
How will enforcement work for HGVs to prevent them entering Hinckley / Burbage, will there be cameras, will fines be passed back to the community		Restrictions on HGVs using specific routes are proposed. The majority of heavy vehicles will route to the motorway network which is designed for the strategic movement of goods as well as people. These will be monitored and enforced, under agreement with local highway authorities, by the Site Management.
Improvement works to the M69 and A47 will cause severe delays to local people		A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) sets out how this will be managed to minimise disruption to local people.
The applicant has been reticent to provide base traffic data to the County Council to allow formal independent traffic modelling to be undertaken.		All inputs to the strategic modelling have been agreed through the Transport Working Group. Where agreements are not in place, best professional judgement has been used to develop a mitigation strategy based on the proportionate impact of the Site. Transparency in all work done to date has been a core part of the application development.
HGV movements have been underestimated		All inputs to the strategic modelling have been agreed through the Transport Working Group made up of the key Highway Authorities in the vicinity of the site- including Leicestershire County Council, National Highways and Warwickshire County Council. This includes substantial amounts of debate around HGV numbers and suitable derivation of trip generation/distribution.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>HNRFI would encourage traffic through Sharnford which already experiences heavy traffic</p>	<p>Strategic Modelling indicates that flows on the B4114 through Sharnford are likely to decrease as a result of the opening of the south facing slips at J2 of the M69</p>
	<p>Already have traffic problems on Normandy Way</p>	<p>Where appropriate, enhancements to the A47 (Normandy Way) junctions are proposed to improve capacity and throughput of vehicles.</p>
	<p>The proposal for the small roundabout in Stoney Stanton, with traffic lights (to back up traffic past the doctors surgery and school) to the parking bays there will somehow be width for up a road which is already single file traffic during rush hour is just untenable.</p>	<p>The new junction improves access for pedestrians to improve safety in this location. Proposed parking has been reconsidered in light of comments at the consultation in 2022.</p>
	<p>The proposed link road to the A47 traffic island on the outskirts of Barwell will tempt hauliers to take this route, rather than the M69 as proposed (do support the improvements to the M69 junction to create new on/off slip roads). This will cause chaos on the A47 Normandy Way, especially at the junction with the A5 main trunk road at Dodwells Bridge and</p>	<p>The site is located close to the M69 as the majority of demand for freight movement will be via the strategic road (motorway) network (SRN). Some local movements will be made to businesses closer to the site via the A47- but these are less attractive for longer distance movements.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	continuation of the A47 Long Shoot which is already chaos at peak times or when the M6 or M69 are closed due to accidents.	
	In favour of the M69 slip road changes as this will open opportunities for the area.	The new slip roads will substantially improve access for all to the strategic road network and will remove traffic from the centre of Hinckley and Burbage.
	Majority of the workforce will commute vast distances from less employment opportunity provided areas which will only increase the number of vehicular movements and further impact on the environment.	Catchments for future workers have been predicted and a sustainable transport strategy has been developed to enhance public transport services which serve the most populated destinations. Demand responsive transport is also planned to improve shorter local trips to and from the site.
	Junction changes to M69 J2 will create greater throughput of traffic through the proposed link roads and the B4669 with not only HGVs but other road users being able to exit south onto the M69 as well as exit from the M69 northbound onto the B4669. The B4669 and this end of Hinckley is not equipped for the traffic levels currently, to enable commuters and others to increase the use of the B4669 will create traffic chaos.	The new slip roads will substantially improve access for all to the strategic road network and will remove traffic from the centre of Hinckley and Burbage. The majority of demand for the junction is generated by local trips.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Inevitably there will not be enough car parking for people working at/from the terminal, they will then start parking in the Burbage Common visitor car park, preventing Common visitors from using it and on local residential streets causing more problems.</p>	<p>There is a significant amount of parking on site, but within the recommended maximum values suggested by Leicestershire County Council. On-site movement will be strictly controlled by an on-site travel plan coordinator within the Site Management Team. Any reports of parking off-site will be dealt with swiftly.</p>
	<p>Mini roundabout in the centre of Stoney Stanton – no specific detail given as to how this will be turned into a traffic light junction given tight land constraints in the village centre.</p>	<p>The new signals will permit better pedestrian safety in this location. A signal junction can be delivered within a tighter highway envelope than a mini roundabout.</p>
<p>Where will staff park?</p>		<p>On site- there are significant amounts of parking provision within the Site. ES Transport Assessment Appendix 8.1 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-138) contains a full breakdown of parking provision against the Leicestershire Standards.</p>
<p>How will staff get to work, no bus or rail service?</p>		<p>Bus services are proposed to be significantly enhanced to Leicester and Coventry with a Demand responsive service for villages and towns closer to the site. This will also connect with the rail station at Hinckley.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Lack of clarification of improvements to highways through Stoney Stanton / Sapcote	Improvements have been included within the DCO to address safety concerns within the villages. Works Plan 7 (document reference: 2.2G, APP-014) indicates the proposed improvements	
Statistics used by Tritax ignore the proposed housing development between Stoney Stanton and Elmesthorpe and therefore traffic projections are inaccurate.	A full uncertainty log was agreed with the Transport Working Group. This is required for the strategic modelling and reviews planning applications and local plans for surrounding authorities. At this stage these sites have been considered in a Regulation 18 plan as suitable for further consideration, they currently have a limited planning status as they are not subject to a planning application or draft allocation.	
The B581 has had at least two fatalities and numerous accidents so additional measures should be considered to deter usage e.g. 30mph limit	The new link road to J2 of the M69 will displace traffic away from the B581, reducing throughput and the likelihood of further accidents.	
PEIR chapter section 8.259 is incorrect, "local services are also available from Hinckley and through to Nuneaton. These include higher frequency services 158 and 48 which pass close to the site from the A47". The 48 and 158 buses do not pass near the HNRFI site at all, they go north towards Market Bosworth then turn right into Barwell and Earl Shilton and then to Leicester and v.v.	The PEIR suggested these routes as connecting services. The X6 and demand responsive routes are proposed as part of the enhancement to the public transport offer.	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Sutton Elms Service Station, a high-quality roadside facility serving all categories of road traffic, located on the B4114 close to its junction with the B581. This junction is included within Works package 17 of the scheme as shown on the documents registered as 2.2H Works Plans [Sheet 8 of 8]. The service station is a trade related facility and any proposals which interfere with its access arrangements have the potential to seriously adversely affect its trading performance and market value. Although the proposals as presently drafted do not involve the acquisition of any land from the service station, the limits of the orders for works at the junction extend across the frontage and incorporate land within the highway directly adjoining the single vehicular egress from the property. At present, the service station is able to cater for nearside traffic which uses it on a left-in, left-out basis and offside traffic on a right-in, right-out basis using the ghosted right turn.</p> <p>Consequently, vehicles and significantly HGVs are able to turn both left and right out</p>	<p>Noted, the proposed design will not restrict access to properties as it stands. However, should this proceed to detailed design it will be fully considered. It is not the intention of the scheme to harm access to other businesses.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>of the egress, which adjoins land included within the works package. The owner is therefore concerned to ensure that any works in the highway or land to be acquired take full and effective account of these existing trading arrangements.</p>	
	<p>Fantastic scheme that will offer reduction in through traffic through Burbage Village, better access to the M69.</p>	<p>The new slip roads will substantially improve access for all to the strategic road network and will remove traffic from the centre of Hinckley and Burbage. The majority of demand for the junction is generated by local trips.</p>
	<p>Access on and off the M1 corridor. Despite junction 21 being widened with additional lanes added a few years ago we are faced with long and dangerous queues of traffic lining up both north and southbound exits on junction 21 every day from 4pm onwards</p>	<p>J21 has existing and underlying capacity issues which have been present for at least twenty years. Full models and assessments have been carried out to understand the extent of intervention required as a result of the development. Proportionately the impacts of the development will be relatively low, but any mitigation would need to address the width of the circulatory carriageway at the J21 roundabout. This type of mitigation is extremely costly and will require a strategic and/or Government level commitment to improve. It is under review for the Governments Roads Investment Strategy 3.</p>
	<p>Ashby Road crossroads will constantly have traffic and associated problems (air quality noise)</p>	<p>A proportionate mitigation scheme is proposed at the junction to improve capacity and vehicular throughput.</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>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p> <p>With specific regard to Ashby Road crossroads, specific receptor locations at the crossroads were included in the air quality model (document reference: 6.2.9.4, APP-166). The predicted impacts on air pollutant concentrations at these receptors were considered to be negligible in accordance with guidance. The overall impact of the HNRFI on air quality was not significant.</p> <p>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).</p>
<p>Maps at consultation events not at all accurate, country lanes being shown as main roads</p>		<p>Public consultation used mapping from public sources. The consultant team were available to discuss the maps and assist the community to identify roads.</p>
<p>Dodwells Island is always busy and extremely congested at peak times which has knock on effects on surrounding roads informed at the consultation that A5/Dodwells out of Tritax remit and that</p>		<p>The improvement of M69 J2 reduces the pressure on the A5 according to the outputs from the strategic modelling. Other developments are upgrading this part of the network alongside National Highways.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	alterations would be made at other junctions but not Dodwells, the development will add to the problem.	
Travel Plan mentioned in the community explanation document but no details have been made public		A full Travel Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.2, APP-159 to APP-162) has been included with the DCO submission. A draft was shared through the PEIR
The turning from Roundhills onto Station Road is also a very dangerous right turn as you cannot see enough ahead to pull out safely and if this is to become an even more busier road then there is a greater potential for even more accidents at this dangerous junction.		The new link road to J2 of the M69 will displace traffic away from the B581, reducing throughput and the likelihood of further accidents.
Public transport inaccuracies. 158 and 48 services misunderstood.		The PEIR suggested these routes as connecting services. The X6 and demand responsive routes are proposed as part of the enhancement to the public transport offer.
Electric HGVs are unlikely to happen		Future technologies are under review. Hydrogen fuel and EV are being used currently within Europe for HGVs.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>There are plans to put an uncontrolled crossing on the B581 as part of the plans to close a Public right of way that runs alongside Bostock–Close - to put a crossing in an area that is already dangerous is putting lives at risk.</p>	<p>The new link road to J2 of the M69 will displace traffic away from the B581, reducing throughput and the likelihood of further accidents.</p>
	<p>HGVs accessing the site may also not follow the designated routes, if a HGV were to follow the sat nav they may end up in the village and attempting to enter the development via Burbage Common Road, the turning point that is planned for Burbage Common Road will not be big enough for a HGV to turn, resulting in them trying to reverse back out onto the B581</p>	<p>Restrictions on HGVs using specific routes are proposed. The majority of heavy vehicles will route to the motorway network which is designed for the strategic movement of goods as well as people. These will be monitored and enforced, under agreement with the local highway authorities, by the Site Management. HGV Routing Strategy (document reference: 17.4, APP-362) provides further detail on the routing and proposed enforcement</p>
	<p>If drivers run out of driving hours on their Tacho and are not able to get to the Service area in the development, then they will have to park up in surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Parking on-site will be available to drivers attending the site in this situation by way of an on site private lorry park</p>
	<p>What road works are taking place on Leicester Road</p>	<p>A new junction to access the link road between M69 J2 and the B4668 (Leicester Road). Positioned close to the sports club.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	Traffic data collected in school summer holidays - therefore not representative of actuals	None of the surveys were executed outside of the neutral months for data collection.
	No cycle racks	Cycle racks are proposed across the site.
	No EV Charging	EV charging is proposed within each plot and car park.
	When the M69 was approved, one condition was that J2 should only be accessible to and the Leicester (M1) direction. This was to protect the residents of Sapcote from an unacceptable level of traffic, noise and pollution, and the residents believed this to be set in stone.	No historical reason to not introduce the J2 slips has been found. Evidence has not been provided to the applicant team.
	Weight limits	Weight limits have been discussed and reviewed, existing roads are A or B class routes with no weak structures. Restrictions would also harm existing business and their established access routes.
	The new link road should be dual carriageway through to the A47	The link road up to the railway bridge from J2 is dualled, but dualling is not required at the

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		western end of the link road based on predicted flows and current highway configurations on the B4668 and the A47.
How will the site be reached if the M69 is blocked due to an accident		The new link road and south facing slips permit more efficient alternative routes using A roads or the SRN should a closure happen on the A5 or M69.
HGV drivers will take shortcuts on local roads.		Restrictions on HGVs using specific routes are proposed. The majority of heavy vehicles will route to the motorway network which is designed for the strategic movement of goods as well as people. These will be monitored and enforced, under agreement with the local highway authorities, by the Site Management.
A Sapcote bypass that includes Sharnford should be built		A bypass was opposed by the majority of people within the Fosse Villages when consulted on in 2019. A bypass in these locations will draw more traffic to it and create more problems at either end on the B4114 and the B4669.
Impacts to the junction on the Ashby Road and capacity to handle increased lorry traffic by opening up the site to Leicester Road. Current and increased difficulty accessing driveways close to the junction and the lack of visibility coming up to the junction from the direction of Barwell. The speed limit of 40 miles per hour which is dangerous due to the number of houses		A proportionate mitigation scheme is proposed at the junction to improve capacity and vehicular throughput by increasing the number of lanes at the respective stop lines. The scheme also enhances pedestrian facilities. Further information is within Highways Plans 2.4H APP 029

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	and the proposed decrease in footpath width.	
	Concerned that traffic from Daventry and Magna park will short cut through the village to get to the new depo, plus the additional weight of traffic if the motorway is opened up both ways	Restrictions on HGVs using specific routes are proposed. This is to be delivered though an HGV Routing Strategy which is a requirement through the DCO. The majority of heavy vehicles will route to the motorway network which is designed for the strategic movement of goods as well as people. These will be monitored and enforced, under agreement with the local highway authorities, by the Site Management.
	Will result in further bottlenecks at Ashby Road traffic lights alongside planned new housing.	The mitigation strategy includes for additional capacity at Ashby Road including pedestrian safety improvements. Further information is within Highways Plans 2.4H APP 029
	Barrier down time at Narborough will push traffic to the Foxhunter roundabout and through Cosby	<p>The HNRFI scheme does not excessively impact the downtime at Narborough. The additional train paths have been approved by Network Rail.</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 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
A thoroughfare through the Common will destroy the SSSI and environment		The new link road is proposed to pass through farmland to the north of the Common and not through it.
Impossible to turn right onto the A47 from Drake Way.		Proposed amendments at Ashby Lane/A47 will help traffic congestion in the vicinity of Drake Way.
Ecology		
Detrimental to wildlife		<p>Impacts on wildlife have been fully assessed. Comprehensive wildlife surveys have been undertaken and will be updated where necessary in line with adopted guidance. The results show that the site is of limited value for wildlife, with opportunities mainly identified for common and widespread species which will also utilise the surrounding areas where similar (and occasionally, better) opportunities are present.</p> <p>The proposals will deliver a range of species-rich habitats which will offer new and varied opportunities for wildlife.</p>
Early purple spotted orchids right on the boundary of the proposed development (these are protected), this development would impact their eco system		Boundary habitats of value will be protected and enhanced as part of the proposals, with large areas of semi-natural habitat buffering off-site habitats of value.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	New wildlife corridors could be incorporated to link existing habitats	A net gain in linear habitat will be achieved. New wildlife corridors will be planted at the boundaries of the site as shown on illustrative landscape strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304). These corridors will include a mix of species-rich habitats such as wetland habitat, woodland planting, scrub and grassland. This will allow continued opportunities for commuting/dispersing wildlife. Green corridors and open space is maintained around the site boundaries, allowing for continued connectivity northeast to southwest.
	It is a natural disaster of the wildlife in the area, the Muntjac deer, the foxes, badgers, trees, farm land for cattle etc	<p>Comprehensive wildlife surveys have been undertaken and will be updated in line with adopted guidance. The results show that the site is of limited value for wildlife, with opportunities mainly identified for common and widespread species which will also utilise the surrounding areas where similar (and occasionally, better) opportunities are present.</p> <p>Muntjac deer is a schedule 9 invasive species which has a serious impact on the native wildlife. In any event, it is highly unlikely that the proposals will significantly affect this species. There will be continued opportunities for foxes and badgers, including new foraging, commuting and sett building. The loss of intensively managed pasture is not considered to be ecologically significant.</p> <p>The impacts on trees are recognised as adverse, and so approximately 20ha of woodland planting and around 600 individual trees will be planted as part of the proposals.</p>
Impact on skylarks		A moderate amount of skylark was recorded across the site during surveys. Numbers are fairly low for a site of this size and reflects the typically unsuitable or ever-changing habitat associated with grazing or intensive / rotational arable management. Similar opportunities are available in the wider area and on that basis, the site is unremarkable. The proposed landscape designs include new opportunities for breeding birds, including skylark.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
All birds will be lost		<p>The proposed landscape designs include new opportunities for breeding birds. The impacts on priority and red/amber list species have been assessed. New nesting and foraging opportunities are inherent in the landscape designs, plus new nesting opportunities will be provided in the form of nest boxes installed in suitable locations.</p>
Wildlife 'corridors' would be destroyed leading to the loss of wildlife across the area.		<p>The proposals will result in a net gain of linear habitats across the site. New linear habitat within the Proposed Development's open spaces will be native and species rich. These features will connect green spaces in order to offset some of the losses incurred through the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The illustrative landscape strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304) ensures dispersal and commuting opportunities are maintained at the boundaries of the site.</p>
Burbage Common and Woods, being a home to many species of bird, deer, foxes, hedgehogs as well as many other animals affected by industrialisation.		<p>The Woodland Access Management Plan (document reference: 6.2.12.4, APP-200) proposes a suite of outline measures to ensure the Burbage Common and woodland is appropriately managed in the long-term, both in terms of biodiversity and recreational impact. Subject to appropriate management, the proposals are unlikely give rise to significant levels of recreational pressure, given their commercial nature (a position held by Natural England). The proposed open space buffers plans will create a more naturalistic/ecotone edge to the woodlands, which alone will provide a significant ecological enhancement to the woodland. This would be in place of the current hard transition from woodland to intensively managed agricultural land. The large, planted buffers will provide a functional net gain in woodland habitat.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
There are no wildlife corridors in the RFT development proposals	New wildlife corridors will be planted at the boundaries of the site as shown on illustrative landscape strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304). These corridors will include a mix of species-rich habitats such as wetland habitat, woodland planting, scrub and grassland. This will allow continued opportunities for commuting/dispersing wildlife.	
Negative impact on pollinators	The existing habitats present are limited in their diversity / floristic value. The loss of intensively managed agricultural land is not considered to negatively impact pollinators. New species-rich habitats will see new and more varied opportunities for this group.	
Modified M69 junction and additional trunk road would create hard barriers for wildlife diminishing diversity and populations.	The existing site is already confined between the M69 and railway corridor which coalesce to the north-east of the site. Landscape designs ensure wildlife corridors remain open, allowing for continued movement of wildlife. The species-rich planting designs will offer more varied opportunities for a range of wildlife.	
There is no net biodiversity gain by this proposal only loss.	Demonstratable net gains will be delivered and secured via Requirement 30. A quantitative loss of low value habitats will be mitigated for by the provision of qualitative gain of species-rich habitat.	
There are at least 4 species of red listed birds - tree sparrow, grey partridge, lapwing and skylark, owls, badgers, a variety of bats, brown hares, slow worms, water voles, great crested newts, sightings	Comprehensive survey work has fed into an assessment of which protected or notable species the site supports or is likely to support. Appropriate mitigation has been proposed on that basis.	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	of otters on occasions in the watercourses and surroundings.	
	Rich variety of flora and fauna currently including 20 species of butterflies, many species of flowering plants, 100 species of fungi and over 30 species of mammals and birds including buzzards, sparrowhawks, nuthatches, jays and great spotted woodpeckers. There are Great Crested Newts using ponds close to the site and a badger settle on the edge of the site.	Habitats of value to these species named will be protected (e.g., Burbage Common and Woods) retained (e.g., woodland within the site), enhanced or created. Great Crested Newt are considered likely absent from the site, however update surveys in 2024/2025 will confirm this but regardless, a series of new wildlife beneficial ponds will be created. The site will offer continued and enhanced opportunities for badger post-development. Any sett closures or creations will be agreed with Natural England in advance, with any appropriate mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence.
	Greater, Green Woodpeckers and Tawny Owls, Green plover (–lapwing - peewit), yellowhammer, bullfinch, red kite, linnet blackcap, red legged partridge, barn owl, heron, little egret, kestrel, buzzard, hares	Impacts on birds has been assessed, with appropriate mitigation proposed.
	Needs clear separation from existing woodlands with ecologically beneficial transition zones as a buffer and preservation of mature hedgerows	This is an integral part of the landscape designs, with significant and ecologically valuable buffers providing new eco-tone habitat to adjacent woodland. There will be an unavoidable loss of hedgerow habitat to facilitate the proposals, however an overall net gain in hedgerow habitat will be achieved and secured via Requirement 30.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Seek to develop open wet areas for wildlife and design sensitively including perspectives from Burbage Common</p>	<p>Wetland habitat will be retained where possible, with new pond creation and enhancement measures an integral part of the landscape designs. The majority of wet ditch habitat will also be retained and enhanced within areas of open space. The realignment of the stream (which is currently constrained by overshadowing and agricultural land practises) will see an opportunity to improve the watercourse with measures such as species-rich riparian planting.</p>
	<p>Net gain commitments questioned.</p>	<p>There is a commitment to 10% net gain - secured via Requirement 30.</p>
	<p>Who can be certain what specific conditions some of these species need - flowers such as early purple, common spotted or greater butterfly orchids, broad-leaved helleborine, common twayblade or moschatel. Butterflies such as purple hairstreak, white-letter hairstreak or silver-washed fritillary, beetles such as hazel leaf-roller or black clock. Who can be certain that the development won't cause a change in drainage paths, deterioration of air quality or light pollution that means these or any other might not survive?</p>	<p>Species listed are typically associated with woodland habitat (i.e. Burbage Common and Woods) which will be protected and enhanced as part of the development proposals. The intensively managed agricultural nature of the land which occupies much of the site is unsuitable to support many of these species. The potential impacts from light, degraded air quality and drainage have all been assessed within the relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement, and found impacts on off-site designated woodland features to be insignificant. The significant buffers proposed will, in the long-term, provide new opportunities for some of these species.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>It has just been established that diesel fumes mask the scent of flowers for pollinating insects. A site of this size using diesel vehicles will produce a huge plume of pollution over a huge area.</p>	<p>There is no framework in place to assess the impacts diesel fumes on pollinators, with such impacts an emerging science. However, the proposed development will result in a significant net reduction of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) using roads on a national level. In turn, this will see a significant reduction of diesel fumes. Additionally, the proposed development is future-proofed for electric HGVs charging as part of the move to net-zero.</p>
	<p>Impact on endangered species - Green plover (lapwing-peewit) Yellowhammer, Bullfinch, red kite, linnet blackcap reed bunting red legged partridge barn owl tawny owl heron little egret kestrel Buzzard.</p>	<p>Impacts on birds has been assessed, with appropriate mitigation proposed.</p>
<p>Muntjac deer and hares live in the fields</p>		<p>Muntjac deer is a schedule 9 invasive species which has a serious impact on the native wildlife.</p> <p>Brown hare is a common (non-native) game species of 'least concern'. They are however listed as a priority species and so have been given due regard within the assessment. They require arable habitats which are extensive in the local area.</p>
<p>Concerned about- birds - Grey Partridge, Yellow Wagtail, Linnet, Yellowhammer, Reed Bunting</p>		<p>Loss of farmland will have an impact on such species, however such impacts - based on overwintering and likely breeding numbers - are not considered significant. Similar opportunities for such species are prevalent in the wider area. In any event, the proposed open space will include some continued opportunities for these species.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Concerned about light pollution on wildlife		<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 sensitive lighting strategy limits light spill onto retained habitats and new habitats of value, and avoided significant light spill on off-site habitats of value (such as Burbage Common and Woods). As such, foraging and dispersal opportunities for nocturnal species will be maintained, and through new species-rich planting, enhanced.</p>
Rail		
<p>Daventry is under-used as per report, freight moved down 9% lowest since records began, Freight Lifted down 17% as per October to December report 2022 compared to a year earlier, it's Obvious Daventry terminal is in Decline and by opening another In Hinckley will speed up the Decline</p>		<p>DIRFT and its hinterland are primarily focussed on the Fast-Moving Consumer Goods Market (FMCG), demand for which has been significantly hit by the current 'cost of living crisis'. It has also suffered from being heavily reliant on electric traction for trains, which became uneconomic to run compared to diesel trains and HGV's post the Russian invasion of Ukraine.</p> <p>DIRFT was designed as a Channel Tunnel terminal for the FMCG market and as an M6 by-pass for the Scottish market. It is now picking up unitised short sea shipping trade from and to the EU, where companies are seeking alternatives to accompanied HGV's going through the Ports, for FMCG customers. It should also secure FMCG traffic for its hinterland through Southampton, once East West Rail is completed.</p> <p>Its routing for Felixstowe is overly long, having to go via the North London Line and as such is simply not sustainable when competing with road. Network Rail developed the Felixstowe to Nuneaton section of its Strategic Freight Network, completed in 2012, to resolve this issue for the Midlands and the North. HNRFI will best serve this line, which also connects the East Coast</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Main Line, the Midland Main Line and the West Coast Mainline, being able to offer the most efficient and flexible services from the South, East and the North-West, Scottish and North-East markets.</p> <p>Short term market fluctuations do not reflect the underlying importance and potential of rail freight, including for DIRFT and HNRFI.</p>
Close proximity of several existing rail freight terminals better located.		<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.</p> <p>Reducing miles travelled, by rail and in stem road mileage to end customers is key for the rail industry, the climate and the economy.</p> <p>HNRFI is particularly well located on the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Freight Line, to be able to offer ready access to a wide variety of locations for occupiers and local logistics and manufacturing businesses. In rail terms, it is ideal.</p>
Down time and closure of Narborough level crossing including effects on emergency vehicles		<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 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	Fully utilise the other rail hubs	<p>As has been demonstrated at East Midlands Gateway, the provision of a rail terminal with warehousing has led to the scheme being fully occupied within 6 years; and all the occupiers are utilising the rail terminal.</p> <p>Birch Coppice, Hams Hall, East Midlands Gateway and Prologis Park are all fully let. Northampton Gateway and DIRFT serve different markets to HNRFI, as will West Midlands Gateway. This is in part due to location and part because of the rail routes. The Market Needs Assessment sets this out (document reference: 16.1, APP-357)</p> <p>The move by the logistics industry to better use rail is critical for the climate and the economy; and as recognised by Midlands Connect, has to be done through the development of new capacity as well as better utilisation of existing. The capacity at other terminals will be taken up where it suits the local market and can offer viable rail services. Where services are compromised via uneconomic routing (e.g. Felixstowe to DIRFT via London) and restricted congested routing (such as through Birmingham and Water Orton), then terminals may rely on a few rail routes, restricting the benefits of rail to some occupiers.</p> <p>NR has confirmed there is sufficient capacity for HNRFI to operate 16 trains per day dispersed through Nuneaton and Glen Parva / Wigston junctions onto its wider Strategic Freight Network, being the WCML, The Midland Main Line and the East Coast Main line at Peterborough. No other terminal in the Midlands can offer this ease of access to the Strategic Freight network, which will be good for occupiers, the region's importers and exporters; and the train operating companies. the Environmental Statement Volume 2: ES Appendix 3.1Rail Report (document reference: 6.2.3.1, APP-131).</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Will make passenger services worse		<p>Network Rail are completely supportive of the development of HNRFI having undertaken its own independent review of capacity, including allowing for existing planned growth in passenger traffic. The terminal can operate a maximum of 3 trains an hour with a maximum of two via Leicester (with only 1 during the morning peak and 2 in the evening peak). Passenger services are protected and indeed, it has been assumed the Coventry-Leicester service will also be added. The Environmental Statement Appendix 3.1: Rail Operations Report (document reference: 6.2.3.1, APP-131).</p>
There are a number of Rail Freight parks within the area, DIRFT (Daventry), BIFT (Birmingham) and ABP (Hams Hall Rail Freight Terminal) without the need to build another one right in the middle of villages		<p>The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) has explained at paragraph 6.12, the different markets served by existing SRFIs and HNRFI. The contention that there is capacity at existing SRFIs is misconceived. Each serves a distinct market and HNRFI is exceptional in its rail connectivity as explained above.</p> <p>HNRFI is unique in its direct access onto the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Freight Network (also adjoining Jn2 M69 on the Strategic Road Network), such that it can offer exceptional rail connectivity via the West Coast Mainline at Nuneaton (avoiding the West Midlands congestion), the Midland Mainline at Leicester and the East Coast Mainline at Peterborough.</p> <p>Locating SRFI's is recognised as difficult and the scheme has been designed to minimise its impact as far as possible.</p>
Bring a rail link to Magna Park		<p>Magna Park is not rail linked. Suggestions have been made in representations to reinstate the old Grand Central Line between Leicester and Rugby, running through Magna Park, but this is no longer possible as developments have been built in several places on the old route. An</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>alternative was proposed by a young rail enthusiast, running from Rugby to the south of Magna Park and connecting to the mainline to the west of Narborough Station.</p> <p>In both cases the underlying concept was to create a Northampton - Rugby - Leicester passenger service, with rail freight also using the line. The problems with both proposals is that they are simply not viable. There is not enough demand for passenger use. Magna Park is fully consented and there is insufficient funding, either private or public, to afford such a significant scheme. From a rail freight perspective, Lutterworth/ Magna Park would be difficult to access for traffic from the north and north-west, as it would need to use the already congested Rugby station, through which DIRFT and Northampton Gateway are serviced.</p> <p>Unlike HNRFI, it could not act as a rail hub linking and consolidating rail freight routes from different ports and end destinations. Connecting the new line to the west of Narborough Station would mean additional passenger stopping trains which cause the longest level crossing down times. HNRFI will act as part of a network of SRFI's each serving a high concentration of users, some, such as HNRFI and DIRFT providing complimentary noncompeting services to locations such as Magna Park. There is not public infrastructure funding being applied to the HNRFI project, it is entirely private investment, including all the mitigations.</p>
<p>This will be a warehousing estate not a rail hub</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 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>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>As has been demonstrated at East Midlands Gateway, the provision of a rail terminal with warehousing has led to the scheme being fully occupied within 6 years; and all the occupiers are utilising the rail terminal.</p> <p>As set out in the Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 1.10, Midland Connect in its August 2022 publication – Our Freight Route map for the Midlands refers to the importance of supporting SRFI's and the effective access to associated warehousing and clearly sets out the benefits of so doing.</p>
	<p>Strategic Line From Felixstowe A substantial element of the original proposal was the strategic positioning of Elmesthorpe on the Hinckley to Leicester line with strategic access to Felixstowe, via Leicester, for the Midlands industries. It is now the case that that requirement is now being completely fulfilled by the East Midlands hub, which also sits within the alleged Tritax 'Golden Triangle for logistics', with a proposal and agreement to connect that East Midlands hub to the Felixstowe line. Thereby negating this original strategic objective for which Elmesthorpe was chosen.</p>	<p>The East Midland Hub is at Toton, between Derby and Nottingham, which if it were an intermodal terminal, would serve a different market to HNRFI and indeed would compete with East Midlands Gateway. It is however being substantially aimed at providing a completed car transporting service for Toyota.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Physical ability of tracks It should be noted that the tracks servicing the current line may not meet the needs of this increase in freight and tonnage over the existing tracks, local bridges and crossings (both road and river) either in the immediate vicinity of Elmesthorpe or further afield. There appears to be no survey completed that shows how this increase in traffic will impact what is primarily a spur track for passenger trains. There is a flood plain 2 miles to the west just after the village of Croft where the train track crosses the River Soar. There are regularly floods between the Coventry Road and Croft when the Soar overflows and the provided consultations by Tritax show no plans to address this.</p>	<p>The line is part of Network Rail's Strategic Freight Network and works to upgrade it for intermodal traffic, including the development of the Nuneaton Chord, were completed in 2012. It is already running identical traffic.</p>
	<p>Concerned that the development will not have any trains going to it</p>	<p>Requirement 10 limits the amount of warehouse space which can be occupied in advance of the rail terminal being capable of handling a minimum of 4x 775m trains a day. This amounts to some 105,000 square metres of ground floor space of total warehousing ground floor space of 850,000 square meters (Planning Statement document Reference: 7.1, APP-347 paragraph 3.124).</p> <p>A similar restriction was placed at East Midlands Gateway where the provision of a rail terminal with warehousing has led to the scheme being fully occupied within 6 years; and all the</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>occupiers, including those in occupation before the terminal was complete, are utilising the rail terminal.</p> <p>Network Rail have confirmed there is capacity for 16 trans per day and due to HNRFI's location on its Strategic Freight Network, it can offer exceptional connectivity nationally and Network Rail is fully supportive as a result. The selected Terminal operator as maritime Transport Ltd, who operate a number of other terminals and they have already identified existing customers who will use rail through HNRFI.</p>
Existing rail hubs could be expanded		<p>The move by the logistics industry to better use rail is critical for the climate and the economy; and as recognised by Midlands Connect, has to be done through the development of new capacity as well as better utilisation of existing. See Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 1.10, Midland Connect in its August 2022 publication – Our Freight Route map for the Midlands</p> <p>The capacity at other terminals will be taken up where it suits the local market and can offer viable rail services. Where services are compromised via uneconomic routing (e.g. Felixstowe to DIRFT via London) and restricted congested routing (such as through Birmingham and Water Orton), then terminals may rely on a few rail routes, restricting the benefits of rail to some occupiers.</p> <p>HNRFI is unique in its direct access onto the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Freight Network (also adjoining Jn2 M69 on the Strategic Road Network), such that it can offer exceptional rail connectivity via the West Coast Mainline at Nuneaton (avoiding the West Midlands congestion), the Midland Mainline at Leicester and the East Coast Mainline at Peterborough.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>The concept of taking more lorries off the road as a result of this NRFI is not proven.</p>	<p>This is recognised by Government following its own independent research as imbedded Government Policy. As Government has identified in the 'Williams-Shapp Plan for Rail' 2021, <i>'freight trains reduce road congestion, connect markets over long distances and are much less carbon intensive than road freight'</i>. The DfT's detailed study, 'Future of Freight – a long term plan' 2022 <i>'Rail freight is on average 76% more GHG efficient per freight tonne km than road freight'</i>.</p> <p>Economically, where rail can provide the service, it will increasingly become the logistics preferred mode of choice. To provide the service it needs rail terminals, with the least cost to use rail being borne by occupiers based at an SRFI, as recognised in Midlands Connects Freight Routemap referenced above.</p>
	<p>Not close to the marketplace it is intended for</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. HNRFI will be able to provide exceptional connectivity for the market it will serve, due it being directly on the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Rail Freight Line, connecting the West Coast Main Line, the Midland Mainline and the East Coast Mainline.</p>
	<p>Use Northampton Gateway</p>	<p>HNRFI will form a critical part of the Midlands rail freight terminal network, with particularly significant importance for port traffic to and from manufacturers and retail and e-tail distribution networks. Its position on the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North (F2MN) line means it will be able to run very efficient rail services, maximising the shift from road to rail, off the national road networks. Being next to the M69 Jn2 means the bulk of the onward distribution will be on the strategic road network, unless serving a very local business.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Northampton Gateway is not well linked by rail for deep sea port traffic from Felixstowe (typically containing Slow Moving Consumer Goods (SMCG) and manufacturing parts) and is an area primarily focussed on Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG). As such the schemes are substantially aimed at different markets.</p>
Removal of 300,000 HGV journeys is false		<p>At 12 trains per day, at 75% utilisation 960 containers will be moved. Allowing for 1.35 lorry moves per container (which assumes some empty running as well as drop and collect), then that is equivalent to 1,296 HGV moves per day. At 5 days and 52 weeks, that is 336,960 HGV journeys.</p> <p>At capacity HNRFI can operate 16 trains per day.</p>
<p>The rail line from Leicester to Burton is littered with disused industrial land and would benefit from improvements that could have a dual benefit of reintroducing passenger traffic.</p> <p>Have the developers seriously considered the line from Leicester to Coalville and beyond that must have derelict land ripe for development and improve an existing rail asset possibility contributing to the reintroduction of passenger traffic.</p>		<p>This line has an inadequate gauge for intermodal freight and has historically been heavily undermined by the surrounding coal mines. NR have advised this makes it very expensive to bring to a safe standard for heavier freight, compared to passenger services, for which it is much better suited. This location is served by East Midlands Gateway.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Why haven't the developers considered reopening Elmesthorpe station to provide public transport to their site.</p> <p>There should be passenger services to the site</p>	<p>In respect of the potential of a passenger station at Elmesthorpe, in connection with the Rail Freight Terminal, this was considered and discussed with Network Rail on 17th May 2018. The discussion confirmed NR's position regarding the consideration by Midlands Connect for a new passenger station at Stoney Stanton. A station at Elmesthorpe would clearly be too close to a station at Stoney Stanton.</p> <p>Since that meeting the Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted and includes Policy FV2:</p> <p><i>'Proposals for the delivery of a railway station, associated parking and access at Station Road Croft, as shown on Policies Map, will be supported. Conversely, proposals which would prejudice the delivery of such infrastructure will be resisted.'</i></p> <p>Any proposal for a station at Elmesthorpe would be contrary to this policy.</p> <p>Physically it would be impossible to provide a passenger station within the DCO limits. Clearly there could be no public access through a freight terminal. Network Rail would hence not support any proposal to develop a passenger station at HNRFI or Elmesthorpe.</p>
	<p>Narborough level crossing, while it may be able to cope with the extra freight trains it won't handle the extra passenger trains that are proposed under the midlands rail hub plan meaning worse service for all.</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 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Network Rail in its assessment of capacity have allowed for the extra passenger trains proposed by Midlands Connect.</p>
<p>The development could be sited on the power station site in Nottingham</p>		<p>This is a different market, currently served by East Midlands Gateway</p>
<p>Magna Park already utilizes DIRFT</p>		<p>Some occupiers have been able to use DIRFT successfully and this can continue. We suspect that once East West rail is completed to Bletchley, DIRFT will be able to offer Magna Park customers a good new service to Southampton.</p> <p>However, some businesses have been unable to establish viable cut off times for services to Scotland, with the drive south first and then restricted paths on the Northampton Loop Line and through Rugby, causing difficulties. This may become more so once the new terminal opens and trains have to negotiate their way to and from the remote reception sidings.</p> <p>Likewise, Magna Park traffic cannot get a viable rail service to Felixstowe via DIRFT as it has to run the long way round, via the North London Line. In fairness to DIRFT, it was designed as a FMCG terminal for the Channel Tunnel and as an M6 by-pass to Scotland. It was not established to serve the deep sea / Slow Moving Consumer Goods (SMCGs) traffic, unlike HNRFI.</p> <p>With HNRFI, Magna Park would be able to benefit from a terminal directly on Network Rail's Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Freight Route, which can then offer the fastest times to Felixstowe and late cut off / fast times to Scotland, as it joins the West Coast Mainline at Nuneaton, north of Rugby.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Magna Park will benefit from both DIRFT and HNRFI, which will offer predominantly different services, for different core traffic. Without HNRFI, Magna Parks access to rail will remain relatively limited.</p>
<p>DIRFT brings in freight from Felixstowe via the all-electric line round London as well as from Southampton, Tilbury and Liverpool</p>		<p>The route from Felixstowe to DIRFT via the North London line is not an economically viable route. This has become an even bigger issue with the current price of electricity. HNRFI is by comparison, shorter and quicker and as such can compete with road movements; and will do so increasingly as the cost of fuel rises, whatever its source.</p> <p>Southampton is not electrified and East West Rail under construction to Bletchley, which will serve DIRFT better is not electrified.</p> <p>HNRFI is not competing with DIRFT, they have different target markets, with DIRFT / Northampton primarily FMCG focussed; and HNRFI has a much stronger manufacturing / export element, critical to the economy of the area it will serve. They may well have some similar destinations, but they will also have some very different ones. HNRFI is not predicating significant volumes via Southampton, for example.</p>
<p>In its quarterly review, the Office of Rail and Road has revealed statistics highlighting the impact of the UK's economic position on freight rail usage and performance from January to March 2023. The data indicates a significant decrease in freight moved, dropping by seven per cent compared to the previous year. So why is this</p>		<p>There has been an impact on rail demand nationally in the last year due to the UK's current economic position, with high fuel costs as a result of the Russian invasion of Ukraine as well as high domestic inflation. This has hit the electrified rail services particularly badly.</p> <p>This is not expected to be a long-term trend and if the UK is to economically grow its way out of this, with international trade being a focus; then HNRFI is critical infrastructure to serve the Midlands Engine, as identified by Midlands Connect, with its exceptional connectivity to deep-sea (and indeed short-sea) ports.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>interchange needed especially when DIRFT is better suited to serve the area, is closer to Magna Park and the M1 and is still expanding. As well as the East Midlands Gateway being very close to the north too. While there may have been a demand and requirement for this rail freight terminal several years ago it is now no longer required.</p>	<p>DIRFT has benefits on some routes, but has difficulties viably servicing many of the needs of Magna Park, particularly to Felixstowe and for time sensitive late cut offs to the North West and Scotland, due constraints on the Northampton Loop line and through Rugby. HNRFI by-passes these by joining the West Coast Main Line at Nuneaton.</p>
	<p>Cannot understand how the railway line runs from Nuneaton to Felixstowe on looking at maps cannot see the link but is shown on TSL maps</p>	<p>HNRFI – Leicester – Syston – Melton Mowbray – Peterborough – March – Eley – Bury St Edmunds – Stowmarket – Ipswich Chord – Trimley – Felixstowe.</p>
	<p>Would be more logical to create a branch line to that location from the Peterborough-Birmingham line than create another RFT within 10 miles of an existing one. DIRFT connects to Nuneaton therefore there are tracks in place, with some relatively small additions to fulfil Tritax's desire to have an RFT on the East/West mainline.</p>	<p>There is not the capacity through Rugby and the Northampton Loop Line to add another connecting branch line. This was considered by Network Rail in response to requests for a passenger service between Northampton, Rugby and Leicester, with the suggestion the line could also serve Magna Park, joining west of Narborough Station. There is not enough traffic to fund the very significant cost; and overall it does not increase the capacity to lift more freight by rail; and have more warehousing on SRFI's to grow this market as per the Midlands Connect analysis; and as per East Midlands Gateway example.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>No sites in Warwickshire were investigated, despite Coventry being seen as a key market. (Coventry is on the West Coast Main Line and close to the new HS2 route, and also M6, M40 and A45. The Coventry to Leicester railway line proposed by Midlands Connect may offer further potential sites for a SRFI in Warwickshire, if needed.)</p>	<p>Whilst the original focus was in Leicestershire in response to the Leicestershire Logistics Study and the Leicester & Leicestershire LEP's Strategic Economic Plan (2014-2020), research was undertaken to seek to identify potential sites in Warwickshire..</p> <p>The WCML through Coventry is on the mainline section to Birmingham International and Birmingham New Street, with a spur to Nuneaton, which currently does not connect to the Nuneaton to Felixstowe line. As such any site would simply seek to serve similar traffic and routes as DIRFT and Northampton Gateway.</p> <p>The proposed Nuneaton Dive under for Coventry to Leicester passenger services may be able to accommodate freight, but there are no sites along this line between Nuneaton and Coventry due to extensive urban development and active land fill.</p> <p>There are no suitable sites available for an SRFI. See Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Site selection and evolution (document reference: 6.1.4, APP-113)</p>
	<p>The proposed rail operator (Maritime) already operates Birch Coppice, East Midlands Gateway, Hams Hall and will operate the Segro site in Northamptonshire -there would seem to be little strategic value from the rail point of view to having an additional site in such close proximity to their others.</p>	<p>Maritime Transport Ltd is a significant logistics service provider with road and rail business interests, that has operated these terminals and fully understands the market it serves; and the differences between the different terminal offers, based on their hinterland and rail routes.</p> <p>It has already identified core traffic from its own customers that will use HNRFI. It is investing in Electric HGV for terminal operations, to allow the terminals to create a network of services throughout the Midlands. HNRFI is a key part of that offer and its strategic plan, to use more rail and better use of electric HGV's.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Benefit claimed of saving 1.6billion HGV km a year by using rail instead of road transport, massively overstated and equates to 1 HGV doing 3618 km a day. This is not possible and so this rail freight terminal cannot deliver this kind of saving.</p>	<p>The ES (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117) identifies a maximum saving of 83m lorry miles / 133 kms per annum for the scheme. The reference to 1.6bn is not for the scheme saving and is an all-industry estimate.</p>
	<p>Can the bridge on Nutts Lane and on the A5 by the BP garage withstand these loads?</p>	<p>There is no weight restriction on the bridge at Nutts Lane and is subject to use by general traffic. The loading is no different to existing traffic movement.</p>
	<p>The junction of the line with the Midland Main line just south of Leicester (at Wigston) is already heavily congested</p>	<p>Network Rail have undertaken their own review of the Rail Report capacity study and have confirmed there is capacity for 2 trains per hour through Wigston Junction North to serve HNRFI, except for the morning and afternoon peaks. There is only 1 between 7:00 and 10:00 and 2 between 16:00 and 19:00</p>
	<p>The impact of long slow freight trains crossing the East Coast Main Line (near Peterborough), or the Midland Main Line (Leicester) or West Coast Main Line (Nuneaton).</p>	<p>This line and its connections to the East Coast Main Line, Midland Main Line and the West Coast Main Line all form part of Network Rails Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic freight Route, designed for the traffic and routes HNRFI will serve.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	The impact of the gradient of the line at the site where the development is proposed on the time taken to enter and leave the site.	The scheme has been designed for 25mph connection to and from the mainline; and the capacity study has been validated by Network Rail on this basis
	A rail terminal should be built on the A14	This would be in addition as it would serve a different market
	There is no capacity on the rail line	Network Rail are completely supportive of the development of HNRFI having undertaken its own independent review of capacity, including allowing for existing planned growth in passenger traffic. The terminal can operate a maximum of 3 trains and hour with a maximum of two via Leicester (with only 1 during the morning peak and 2 in the evening peak). Passenger services are protected and indeed, it has been assumed the Coventry-Leicester service will also be added. The Environmental Statement Appendix 3.1: Rail Operations Report (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-131)
	Croft Quarry is a strategic site for Aggregate Industries UK Limited. The Quarry is located on the Birmingham - Peterborough railway line. The Quarry has an active rail connection to facilitate our quarrying and restoration activities. The Quarry has a remaining life of 20y to complete mineral extraction and restoration via the importation of inert waste material via rail. Rail connection and freight capacity is essential in the implementation of our	Croft Quarry has a recent planning consent and there is capacity to run its required 3-4 trains per day as and when and if it needs to.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>planning permission. We require capacity for 3-4 trains a day for the importation of inert restoration materials. Any loss in rail freight capacity due to the development of Hinckley Rail Freight Interchange will detrimentally impact our ability to fulfil our planning obligations and restoration. The new Hinckley Rail Freight Interchange should protect freight requirements of existing permitted development.</p>	
	<p>There are several rail issues that do not appear to have been considered such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction of the line with the Midland Main Line just south of Leicester (at Wigston) is already heavily congested. • The impact of long slow freight trains crossing the East Coast Main Line (near Peterborough), or the Midland Main Line (Leicester) or West Coast Main Line (Nuneaton) 	<p>This line and its connections to the East Coast Main Line, Midland Main Line and the West Coast Main Line all form part of Network Rails Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic freight Route, designed for the traffic and routes HNRFI will serve.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed for 25mph connection to and from the mainline; and the capacity study has been validated by Network Rail on this basis. They would not normally stand before entering the site.</p> <p>Network Rail have undertaken their own review of the Rail Report capacity study and have confirmed there is capacity for 2 trains per hour through Wigston Junction North to serve HNRFI, except for the morning and afternoon peaks. There is only 1 between 7:00 and 10:00 and 2 between 16:00 and 19:00</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</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of long slow trains on the level crossing in the village of Narborough. • The time taken for freight trains to slow and stand before entering the site. • The impact of the gradient of the line at the site where the development is proposed on the time taken to enter and leave the site. 	<p>– 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 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p>
	<p>There are regular problems on the Birmingham to Leicester line with low bridge damage on the Rugby Road, Hinckley and the A5 which means periodically the line will be closed, rendering it inefficient.</p>	<p>The A5 bridge is currently subject to a S106 agreement with a third party and the respective planning and highway authorities, proposals are to provide better clearance for vehicles over 4.8m.</p>
	<p>Several years ago, Croft Quarry submitted a proposal to use the Leicester/Nuneaton line to use for removing most of the stones, and this was rejected due to insufficient capacity on the line.</p>	<p>Croft Quarry has a recent planning consent and there is capacity to run its required 3-4 trains per day as and when and if it needs to.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Spilt between import and export trains is not mentioned		It will effectively be 50/50 capacity with returning containers. The size of the Midlands import trade at Q1 2022 was £65.2bn. Its export trade was £46.8bn. Manufactured goods were by far the most important trade, at £50.5bn import and £41.2bn export, ideal for HNRFI. This is set out in the Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) para 5.12 – 5.14
The number of trains per day mentioned is between 4 and 16. Each of these is approximately 50 containers of 40 ft, or a larger number of 20 ft containers. This is between 200 and 800 containers. If these are to be then shipped out by truck, with 4000 truckloads per days it means that only between 5% and 20% of the site will be based on rail use (hardly an accurate name for a rail freight interchange). How will the remaining 5% to 95% (or possibly higher if the L.G.V. traffic is considered) of the site be used? Is it likely to be similar to the areas off the A5 near Lutterworth and Rugby/Daventry? Are we to have definitive information on this?		The assessment of the maximum number of HGV's that would use the highway to access businesses off-site is contained in ES Chapter 8 ref 6.1.8 APP 117 and 6.2.8.1 part 4 of 20 APP 141 Trip Generation Addendum Based on other SRFI's that expectation is that 30% of the containers would stay on-site delivered to occupiers; and 70% would be used to serve businesses within a c20 mile radius.
Shortage of freight train drivers		The Train Operating Companies have been investing in train drivers.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	No Local end user, therefore substantial journeys by road	Maritime, the selected terminal operator, has identified its own customer base already in the local area that will be suitable to use HNRFI. The expectation is that the core businesses will all be within 20 miles of HNRFI, with c30% of the volumes based on site from occupiers at HNRFI
	Rail Freight Interchanges need to be spread out	The spread of rail freight interchanges is driven by the market demand for suitable logistic services, which relate to the route and volume of the transport need; situated at the most efficient location, ideally where other activities can take place. HNRFI is driven by the volume of freight moving in and out of the Midlands, the type of freight with high volumes of imports and exports; and crucially, its ability to serve this very efficiently due to its immediate connection on to Network Rail's Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Freight Route.
	What happened to HS2 Toton development of rail hub and EMA rail hub these are both relatively close to Leicester why are they not been exploited since they are already in situ.	The Toton site has been partly repurposed to provide a rail-based car transportation terminal for Toyota. The East Midlands Gateway scheme has been fully developed in only 6 years, with all the occupiers using the rail terminal, which itself is currently being expanded. These locations serve different market areas to HNRFI
Landscape		
	Will destroy countryside / landscape	It is acknowledged that the development will result in the loss of agricultural fields, trees and hedgerows and the land will change from countryside to a logistics park with public open space. However, the proposals include 20ha of woodland planting, 22ha of meadow and scrub planting and around 600 individual trees within the logistics park itself. This is as described in the Landscape ES Chapter (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120)

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Detrimental to Burbage Common	<p>The development has no direct impact on Burbage Common. It is acknowledged there will be a loss of amenity whilst gaining access to Burbage Common via local roads, footpaths and bridleways. The proposals have been designed to mitigate for this loss through the enhancement of 22ha of agricultural land adjacent to the common which provides additional accessible natural green space for the public to enjoy, the additional layers of vegetation providing further separation between the Country Park and the proposals. The proposed landscape mitigation is shown on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304).</p>	
Loss of productive agricultural land	<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>	
Impacts on the public footpaths	<p>The likely effects on the local network of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) is presented in the Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference: 6.2.11.2, APP-192). While a level of adverse effects on the local network of footpaths is noted, the report finds that the proposed mitigation package would be proportionate in relation to the proposed development.</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>	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Height of buildings and container storage is a concern and eyesore		The principles of proposed mitigation are outlined in the mitigation and enhancement section at paragraph 11.134 – 11.137 of the ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120). These include the revised building heights, which have been reviewed since the public consultation period. Maximum built height parameters have been reduced by 2-5m, which represents a 7-18% reduction in maximum building height parameter.
Inadequate landscaping		The applied design principles have been outlined in the mitigation and enhancement section of the ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120). The landscape proposals include 20ha of woodland planting, 22ha of meadow and scrub planting and around 600 individual trees within the logistics park itself which aim to soften the visual effects of the proposed development on the local landscape. While it is acknowledged that the overall size and scale of the proposed development would be a considerable addition within the local landscape, the proposed landscape mitigation - as shown on the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.20, APP-304) - has been developed to create additional amenity space and provide strategic planning for visual screening and biodiversity benefits.
A thoroughfare through the Common will destroy the SSSI and environment		The Common will not be affected. The link road is located to the north of Burbage Common and Woods Country Park and a new area of publicly accessible open space with meadow, scrub and woodland planting will separate it from the existing common and country park area.
Not happy about development on Burbage Common		The development is located to the east of the Common, with a proposed 22ha parkland area creating a buffer between Burbage Common and the developed area of the site. The proposed development has no direct impact on Burbage Common.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Destruction of woodland, some of the only remaining fragments of Hinckley Forest which dates back to Medieval times and they are still managed by traditional methods.</p>	<p>No ancient woodland as identified within the Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) is to be removed as part of the proposals. Area of identified ancient woodland exist off-site, whereby they will be buffered from development in line with Natural England's and the Forestry Commission's standing advice.</p>
	<p>Plans appear to have considered existing bridle route requirements but not taken the opportunity to introduce new circular walking/running/cycling gravel paths through new boundary screen planting</p>	<p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), new routes are proposed within the green corridors around the outside of the site.</p>
	<p>As a horse rider the bridleways around this area are wonderful and frequently used by horses and dog walkers alike. There are a few trains but it is in large a quiet area for people to enjoy. The rail hub will massively change this making it unsafe due to the noise from the rail station adding to the risk to riders and horses spooking. Where will these bridleways be diverted and will they be safe to ride on.</p>	<p>The likely effects on the local network of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) is presented in the Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference: 6.2.11.2, APP-192). 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. A bridleway is proposed around the boundaries of the site set within a green corridor up to 70m with only one road crossing point including a pegasus crossing with roadside coralls is proposed to create a safe place for riders to cross on this route. This will give good access to Burbage Common and Woods without the need to ride on a public highway for over a mile as is currently the case on Burbage Common Road. Furthermore a bridleway underpass is included under the A47 link road north of the railway line to provide access from U52 to Burbage Common (see Highways Plan Sheet-1 of 4) (document reference: 2.4A, APP-022).</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Massive warehouse would detrimentally impact views from Barwell</p>	<p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment includes assessment of views from Barwell where significant effects have been identified based on the assessment of receptors from PVP25 and 26. (see Figure– 11.21 - document reference: 6.3.11.21, APP-305) and ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120).</p>
	<p>The road leading from Elmesthorpe village to the farm will also be destroyed. As well as giving the village access to Burbage Common it is also used by numerous people who keep horses at the stable yards in Elmesthorpe. Without it they will be deprived of safe access to the common to exercise their horses. There is nowhere else in the area without having to negotiate busy main roads. They will be obliged to ride through the new warehouse complex with the dangers caused by large lorries and noise creating hazards that spook horses and lead to accidents.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the site will change from countryside to a logistics park with public open space, changing the existing network of footpaths, roads and bridleways. As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), a bridleway is proposed around the boundaries of the site set within a green corridor up to 70m wide with only one road crossing point including a pegasus crossing with roadside coralls is proposed to create a safe place for horses to cross on this route.</p>
	<p>Damage to an AONB</p>	<p>The site does not lie within or in the context of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	Will be detrimental to the Ancient Woodland	The proposals ensure that a buffer of at least 50m is provided for most of the areas of ancient woodland and woodland within the SSSI. There is one pinch point area to the north of Freeholt Wood, where there would be engineering works up to a 25m offset, but the distance to the hard surface of the road has been kept to a 35m offset. All works are well outside the root protection zone for the ancient woodland. During construction protective fencing would be provided with dust and acoustic screening to limit impact. Buffer to include a native planted ecotone with trees, shrubs and meadow grassland.
	Negative impact on views	It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative views, as noted in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120). These will be considered by the Inspector in the decision-making process, alongside the benefits of the scheme.
	Inadequate proposals for screening development from properties adjacent to the site, no consideration made to make a large green space and bunding between the warehouse units and adjacent properties. Other developments such as Kegworth have been surrounded by large green areas to conceal and soften and to distance its core operational area from surrounding residents	<p>It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative landscape and visual receptors, as noted in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: APP-120).</p> <p>The illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: APP-304) and illustrative Landscape Sections (document reference: 6.3.11.17 and 6.3.11.18, APP-301 and APP-302) show the proposed landscape mitigation.</p> <p>The mitigation and enhancement principles in ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120) can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall green and blue open space accounts for 28% of the Main HNRFI Site; - The Western Amenity Area extends to approximately 22ha; and

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maximum built height parameters have been reduced by 2-5m, which represents a 7-18% reduction in maximum building height parameter. <p>As identified in paragraph 11.123 of ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120), corridors up to 70m in places would provide broad natural green ways on the site's boundaries.</p>
Loss of over 18km of hedgerows and hundreds of mature trees.		<p>The arboricultural impact assessment (document reference: 6.2.11.4, APP-194) details the trees, group of trees and hedgerows to be lost or affected due to the development. Of 898 items surveyed, 356 will be lost and 32 affected, leaving 510 unaffected. To mitigate for these losses, around 20,000 new trees will be planted across the areas of new woodland planting and around 600 individual trees will be planted as street trees and amenity trees within the working logistics park. As per paragraph 12.151 of the Ecology and Biodiversity chapter (document reference: 6.2.12, APP-121), the Proposed Development has been designed to incorporate the hedgerow network and minimise its fragmentation where possible, particularly around the perimeters. It is acknowledged in the assessment that the direct loss and fragmentation of the existing hedgerow network is considered to be of high magnitude and extent, with appropriate mitigation proposed on that basis. Currently the net gain calculations show a 7.12% net in hedgerow habitat gain, before any local or off-site solutions have been implemented. Future iterations of the Net Gain metric will ensure a 10% net gain in hedgerow units will be achieved (as secured by Requirement 30).</p>
Object to the loss of Burbage Common Road and the long rerouting		<p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), a bridleway is proposed around the boundaries of the site set within a green corridor up to 70m wide with only one road crossing. A pegasus crossing with roadside coralls is proposed to create a safe place for horses to cross on this route. This will give good access to Burbage Common and Woods without the need to ride on a public highway for over a mile.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	Will destroy the view from Barwell	It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative views, as noted in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: 6.1.11. APP-120).
	Landscaping will take years to mature and will not be beneficial	<p>The illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference: APP-304) and illustrative Landscape Sections (document reference: 6.3.11.17 and 6.3.11.18, APP-301 and APP-302) show the proposed landscape mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed landscape mitigation would mature over time and would result in a softening of visual effects of the scheme.</p>
	The proposed rerouting of footpath T89 onto the B581 needs to be reconsidered as it results in pedestrians crossing the B581 on a blind bend.	The redline includes the junction of Bostock Close and Station Road including facilitating a safe crossing point – see Highways Plan Sheet 2 of 8 (document reference: 2.4B, APP-023)
	The data used by Tritax on public footpaths is inaccurate as it was gathered pre-Covid, and use has increased significantly	Footpath use survey information was collected in 2019 and 2021. The increase in user numbers between 2019 and 2021 is considered to reflect pre and post pandemic trends.
	Reports that state that footpaths are unused or blocked by Tritax are incorrect	A condition survey of the footpaths and bridleways in the area was undertaken at a specific moment in time to give an indication of use and where improvements might be made. The reported information was correct at the time the survey was undertaken. It is acknowledged that

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>footpath conditions change over time and seasonally due to weather and crop cycles and any reported obstructions may have been cleared.</p>
	<p>Tritax has merely pushed footpaths to the development boundaries, resulting in them running alongside either the M69 or the railway line – visually unattractive and subject to traffic fumes and noise</p>	<p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), there would be several new routes proposed around and through the site.</p>
	<p>Replacement footpaths should be in place before HNRFI development starts to allow continued access to Burbage Common from Elmesthorpe</p>	<p>The new and diverted footpath and bridleway routes will be delivered during the enabling works to ensure continuous safe access to Burbage Common.</p>
	<p>In rerouting and closing footpaths Tritax have taken the least cost options resulting in additional mileage for the walker merely to continue his journey whereas additional rail bridges would avoid this, there is little evidence of the claimed investment and improvements and additional facilities</p>	<p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), a bridleway is proposed around the boundaries of the site set within a green corridor up to 70m wide with only one road crossing including a 57olossa crossing with roadside coralls is proposed to create a safe place for horses to cross on this route. This will give good access to Burbage Common and Woods without the need to ride on a public highway for over a mile as is currently the case on Burbage Common Road. Use of bridges and underpasses have been explored by the design team with both options having logistical and safety restraints and/or resulting in further loss/impact on woodland and trees.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Visual changes in the village not clear as the viewpoints provided are quite irrelevant, unrealistic and misleading. Images from the local park (Roundhills Park) in the middle of the village, areas regularly used by the villagers and other similar relevant viewpoints, such as from residences on Burbage Common Road would have more accurately reflected in colossal changes.</p>	<p>The assessed viewpoint locations were agreed with the relevant local authorities via a consultation process. The assessment is in line with the methodology provided at Annex 1 of the Landscape and Visual Baseline, provided in Appendix 11.1 (document reference: APP-191) of ES Chapter 11 (document reference: APP- 6.1.11, APP-120)., which is in line with best practice guidance. Additional viewpoints were added following public consultation including a view from Roundhills Park which is represented as Photo viewpoint (PVP) 50 in Figure 11.16 (document reference: 6.3.11.16, APP-300).</p>
<p>Needs to be below and in the ground</p>		<p>This option was not considered as the cost and environmental impact of siting the warehouses below ground would outweigh the benefits of the scheme.</p>
<p>The Year 15 visuals are not realistic and are misrepresentative of the impact. They are taken from a low level and from significant distance away, unless existing natural tree-lines serve a purpose in shrouding the development</p>		<p>The assessed viewpoint locations were agreed with the relevant local authorities via a consultation process. The photography is in line with the methodology provided at Annex 1 of the Landscape and Visual Baseline, provided in Appendix 11.1 (document reference: 6.2.11.1, APP-191) of ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120), which is in line with best practice guidance.</p> <p>A methodology for the Photomontages produced is contained within Annex 5 of the Landscape and Visual Baseline (document reference: 6.3.11.1, APP-285). A description of the vegetation growth rates used in the Year 15 Views is provided at paragraph 1.201 of the Landscape and Visual Baseline with examples of selected species given in Table 1.10</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Vital that a safe bridle path is always available from the horse livery business as hack horse to the common on a regular basis</p>	<p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 - Public Rights of Way Strategy (document reference: 6.3.11.4, APP-298), a bridleway is proposed around the boundaries of the site set within a green corridor up to 70m wide with only one road crossing point. A pegasus crossing with roadside coralls is proposed to create a safe place for horses to cross on this route. This will give good access to Burbage Common and Woods without the need to ride on a public highway for over a mile as is currently the case on Burbage Common Road. Use of bridges and underpasses have been explored by the design team with both options having logistical and safety restraints and/or resulting in further loss/impact on woodland and trees</p>
	<p>Plans show the bridleway diversion alongside the M69 and the site to J2 which would cause a problem for horses to cross over. You are providing a pelican crossing; this is unacceptable and dangerous. A bridge or an underpass is the only other means for horses to cross safely. This has already been adopted on the A47 bypass</p>	<p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.3.11.14, APP-298), a bridleway is proposed around the boundaries of the site set within a green corridor up to 70m wide with only one road crossing point. A pegasus crossing with roadside coralls is proposed to create a safe place for horses to cross on this route. This will give good access to Burbage Common and Woods without the need to ride on a public highway for over a mile as is currently the case on Burbage Common Road. Use of bridges and underpasses have been explored by the design team with both options having logistical and safety restraints and/or resulting in further loss/impact on woodland and trees.</p>
	<p>Our home looks out over countryside and farmland that the development is proposed to be built on so will have a direct view of a logistics park. Due to the height of the land relative to the property, would be adversely affected by any lighting on the site. Raised at the consultation but they</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative views, as noted in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: APP-120). While residential receptors were considered in the development of the proposed landscape mitigation, specific private views are not considered as per the defined methodology provided at Annex 1 of the Landscape and Visual Baseline in Appendix 11.1 (document reference: 6.2.11.1, APP-191) of ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120), which is in line with best practice guidance.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>didn't seem to care and even told us that they wouldn't consider using mature trees instead of saplings to screen the site as it would cost more.</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 plan to close the public footpath T89 at the rail track and for walkers to walk along Bostock and across station road , whilst this may seem a trivial point, this will increase foot fall in the close and past my house</p>	<p>The likely effects on the local network of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) is presented in the Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference 6.2.11.2, APP-192). The condition survey indicated that T89 was used infrequently and any increase in footfall along Bostock Close is likely to be low, especially given that this is currently an option for walkers at the present time.</p>
	<p>The re-routing of the footpaths to Burbage Common will mean that in order to access Burbage Common or the Elmesthorpe Plantation we will have to walk along the new bridlepath , which will sandwich us between the industrial estate and the M69 – not really an attractive option , definitely not tranquil and serene and with nervous animals such as dogs or horses will certainly not be enjoyable.</p>	<p>The likely effects on the local network of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) is presented in the Public Rights of Way Appraisal (document reference: 6.2.11.2, 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.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Building colour schemes is important, suggest that the building is coloured green like the Oakland ones in Bardon</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>It is proposed that the right of way across the railway line at the bottom of the Hinckley Golf Course will be closed and it is expected that walkers will use the bridge between housing along Foresters Road. However, there is currently no public footpath between the bottom of the golf course and this bridge which walkers are then expected to use and even if one was introduced this would involve a diversion of at least a half a mile. This closure makes it impossible for walkers to use the right of way into Burbage Woods via Hinckley Golf Course. The proposal to close this 'foot-crossing' of the railway should be rejected, therefore, and a footbridge at this point be mandated to ensure continuity of public rights of way. It is also proposed to close several other right of way crossings of the rail line which enables walkers to re-cross</p>	<p>The level crossing is being replaced by a footbridge at this point (PRoW U8/1 to the south of Hinckley Golf Course) so there will be no requirement to walk further than currently. This is illustrated at Inset 1 on Figure 11.15 (document reference: 6.3.11.15, APP- 299).</p> <p>The closure of the level crossings serving U17 and T89 are necessary for safety reasons and will be a benefit for users. The alternative crossing point at U17 requires a short diversion and will provide a safe route over an existing bridge. Good signage marking the new route will limit any rail or farm trespass and prevent conflict with farm activities.</p> <p>The diverted route serving T89 will take users off a level rail crossing with poorly maintained access (broken stiles and barriers along the route) on to a footway with a signalled road crossing to benefit users' safety.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>the railway further upline towards Leicester. These are close to the small road bridge on Burbage Common Road and near to the Upper Common car park. These closures will prevent pedestrians from walking out from the Common into the fields leading to the western borders of Elmesthorpe. When I pursued this with the developers, I was told that instead I would need to walk the whole of the southern perimeter and then the eastern perimeter of the proposed site, (the latter has a very narrow path squeezed between the industrial estate and motorway) then along the whole of the site's northern perimeter to a new footbridge further along the line! These rights of way need footbridges and the routings of the network of footpaths that currently cross the proposed site need better pedestrian - friendly solutions to ensure that walkers are neither inconvenienced nor restricted as they move through and from the Common to the surrounding villages.</p>	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Air Quality		
Increased pollution	<p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Modelled concentrations have been compared against the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (Document Reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p>	
I presume all vehicles whether Train or Lorries will be Electric as the Emissions from this transport will be at an unacceptable level if the Hub is to go ahead	<p>Defra guidance provides screening criteria for both stationary and moving diesel trains. Rail emissions were considered in accordance with Defra guidance and it was determined that the HNRFI would not exceed any of the screening criteria and the impact on local air quality from rail emissions as a result of the HNRFI once operational are not significant, as stated in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Lorries were modelled as part of the air quality assessment as provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) which predicted no significant impacts from road traffic with regard to air quality.</p>	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Will have a negative impact on air quality	<p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Modelled concentrations have been compared against the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p>	
Dust pollution	<p>A construction dust impact assessment has been completed and mitigation measures have been provided in accordance with the latest guidance, in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118)</p>	
Odour pollution	<p>By nature, the operation of the development does not introduce any new sources of odour into the study area and therefore an assessment of impacts associated with odour emissions was not required. Any odour which may be associated with the construction phase will be mitigated through the implementation of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and as such, an assessment was not undertaken. No concerns regarding odour were raised in the Scoping Response and so no further assessment on odour emissions was undertaken.</p>	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Exhaust fumes from shunting trains, forklift trucks and haulage roads crawling in traffic jams	<p>Defra guidance provides screening criteria for both stationary and moving diesel trains. Rail emissions were considered in accordance with Defra guidance and it was determined that the HNRFI would not exceed any of screening criteria and the impact on local air quality from rail emissions as a result of the HNRFI once operational are not significant, as provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Vehicles associated with the development were modelled as part of the air quality assessment as provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) which predicted no significant impacts from road traffic with regard to air quality. The modelling included slow down at junctions as appropriate.</p>	
Area renowned for the distinctiveness of its local weather - particularly fog and mist - which will exacerbate air quality issues	<p>The air quality assessment provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) predicted no significant impacts with regard to air quality across the whole study area. The air quality modelling assessment utilises sequential hourly meteorological data representative of the local area in accordance with the latest guidance and methodologies.</p>	
Air quality from static traffic at Narborough Crossing	<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 analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Network Rail is satisfied that sufficient capacity</p>	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>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. Network Rail have agreed that there is adequate capacity at the cross roads..”</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>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>
Pollution from diesel trains		<p>Defra guidance provides screening criteria for both stationary and moving diesel trains. Rail emissions were considered in accordance with Defra guidance and it was determined that the HNRFI would not exceed any of screening criteria and the impact on local air quality from rail emissions as a result of the HNRFI once operational are not significant, as provided in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118)</p>
Concerned about air quality for asthmatics		<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>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p>
Increased pollution		<p>The latest version (2022) of the Defra Technical and Policy guidance has been used in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). Modelled concentrations have been compared against the current relevant air quality objectives for England.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the HNRFI has been considered at nearby receptor locations.</p> <p>No significant changes in pollutant concentrations were predicted at the modelled individual receptor locations across the whole study area, for both the construction year and operational year, as detailed in the air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p>
Planning		
Green belt		<p>No part of the main DCO site or the land required for the A47 Link Road lies within the Green Belt.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Hinckley already has considerable greenfield development</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that green field land has been developed in accordance with grants of planning permission for both housing and employment development. In identifying a 'compelling need' for SRFIs, the Government states in the National Planning Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) at paragraph 2.53:</p> <p>'The Government's vision for transport is for a low carbon sustainable transport system that is an engine for economic growth but is also safer and improves the quality of life in our communities. The Government therefore believes it is important to facilitate the development of the intermodal rail freight industry. The transfer of freight from road to rail has an important part to play in a low carbon economy and in helping to address climate change'.</p> <p>At NPSNN 4.84 the Governments states:</p> <p>'Because the vast majority of freight in the UK is moved by road, proposed new rail freight interchanges should have good road access as this will allow rail to effectively compete with, and work alongside, road freight to achieve a modal shift to rail. Due to these requirements, it may be that countryside locations are required for SRFIs'.</p> <p>The LAs accept that a SRFI cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas.</p>
	<p>No consideration of extra services needed schools, dentists, doctors.</p>	<p>Planning obligations may lawfully only demand provision for infrastructure – physical and social – which satisfies the tests at Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy 2010, as amended. The tests are:</p> <p>(a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>(b) Directly related to the development, and</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>(c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>The provision of extra services such as schools, dentists, doctors, healthcare would fail all the statutory tests. Such facilities may, in principle, be sought from new housing development.</p> <p>The proposed development does not include any residential development, and will not directly alter associated amenities, facilities or services. Facilities and services are accessed from an individual's place of residence rather than employment.</p>
Already have massive expansion of industrial estates in the local area		<p>HNRFI is a strategic rail freight interchange as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project which is required in the national interest to improve national networks. The Local Authorities acknowledge the need for a SRFI within Leicestershire based on research commissioned by the Leicester and Leicestershire local authorities. The expansion of existing industrial estates and consents that have been granted for new logistics development are road-based facilities.</p>
Impacts on the rural community		<p>It is acknowledged that by reason of the form and scale of HNRFI, there will necessarily be some residual impacts. The Environment Statement has considered the impact of HNRFI from a wide range of environmental and technical considerations. It is considered that, with mitigation, the impacts have been minimised. Nevertheless, it is accepted that the surrounding community will necessarily be aware of the presence of HNRFI and the new transport infrastructure, in their daily lives.</p>
Lack of information at the consultation stage		<p>The Applicant has undertaken extensive pre-application consultation, including two informal consultations and a statutory consultation. Consultation has taken place in accordance with the</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>provisions of a Statement of Community Consultation. The consultation process has extended over several years and has included information available on a HNRFI website. The Applicant does not accept that there has been a lack of information at the consultation stage of the project. The applicant has made it clear, that the transport impacts of the development have not been agreed with the Highway Authorities, at the consultation events.</p>
Greenfield site		<p>It is acknowledged that green field land has been developed in accordance with grants of planning permission for both housing and employment development. In identifying a 'compelling need' for SRFIs, the Government states (NPSNN 2.53):</p> <p>'The Government's vision for transport is for a low carbon sustainable transport system that is an engine for economic growth but is also safer and improves the quality of life in our communities. The Government therefore believes it is important to facilitate the development of the intermodal rail freight industry. The transfer of freight from road to rail has an important part to play in a low carbon economy and in helping to address climate change'.</p> <p>At NPS 4.84 the Governments states:</p> <p>'Because the vast majority of freight in the UK is moved by road, proposed new rail freight interchanges should have good road access as this will allow rail to effectively compete with, and work alongside, road freight to achieve a modal shift to rail. Due to these requirements, it may be that countryside locations are required for SRFIs'.</p> <p>The LAs accept that a SRFI cannot be accommodated within existing built-up areas.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Crime		<p>HNRFI will be operated on a 24/365 basis. The rail port will be provided with its own security post to manage the movement of vehicles into and out of the rail port. Typically, individual occupiers will install security measures to control the movement of traffic and people within their premises. The provision of HNRFI will not cause an increase in criminal activity within the surrounding area.</p>
Is it needed?		<p>The NPSNN sets out a ‘compelling need’ for an expanded network of SRFIs: ‘Well connected and high performing networks with sufficient capacity are vital to meet the countries long-term needs and support a prosperous economy’. (NPSNN 2.1) ‘There is a critical need to improve the national networks to address road congestion and crowding on the railways to provide safe, expeditious and resilient networks that better support social and economic activity and to provide a transport network that is capable of stimulating and supporting economic growth’ (NPSNN 2.2).</p> <p>The Government states (NPSNN 2:53):</p> <p>‘The Government's vision for transport is for a low carbon sustainable transport system that is an engine for economic growth but is also safer and improves the quality of life in our communities. The Government therefore believes it is important to facilitate the development of the intermodal rail freight industry. The transfer of freight from road to rail has an important part to play in a low carbon economy and in helping to address climate change’.</p> <p>BDC/HBCC accept the need for a SRFI within Leicestershire. The Market Needs Assessment (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) explains the local business market which HNRFI will serve; distinct to the markets served by other SFRIs.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>The project will prevent use of Burbage Common by way of traffic, pollution and security issues</p>	<p>The impact of HNRFI on Burbage Common has been considered in the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has demonstrated that HNRFI will not have a serious adverse impact upon the enjoyment of Burbage Common. The proposals include provision for 22 hectares of Public Open Space adjoining the Common.</p>
	<p>No confirmation that the Planning Inspectorate will attend the site personally</p>	<p>The Planning Inspectorate have undertaken unaccompanied site visits and published notes of the nature of these visits.</p>
	<p>The NRFI will influence various companies to commission the construction of super-sized distribution warehouses eating into swathes of countryside</p>	<p>HNRFI as a strategic rail freight interchange will accommodate an intermodal rail freight port and warehousing development. The fundamental objective in its delivery is to encourage investment on the site by companies who will use the rail port for the movement of goods – particularly in the receipt of goods from the country/ports.</p>
	<p>The recently developed ‘travellers’ site would be destroyed.</p>	<p>The impact of the development upon nearby gypsy and traveller sites and a mobile home site have been considered in the Environmental Statement. Mitigation measures are proposed to minimise the impact of the development.</p>
	<p>Disappointed that Leicestershire does not have protected greenbelt, unlike Warwickshire which seems to be able to use that status to push industrial type developments into Leicestershire, which has no such protections.</p>	<p>Parts of Warwickshire are covered by the West Midlands Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl. The planning authorities in Leicestershire have not advanced a justification for a Green Belt around Leicester.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>A recent case locally in Hinckley and Bosworth Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/20/3260227 Land off Sketchley Lane, Burbage, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 3HU regarding the development of warehouses and houses on agricultural land was rejected by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State on the grounds that 'The appeal site lies within the countryside and I have found that the proposed development would result in substantial harm to its intrinsic value and open character. Notwithstanding its contribution to economic growth, I find that the proposal would conflict with SADMDPD Policy DM4.'</p>	<p>The development referred to under appeal decision APP/K2420/W/20/3260227 was determined pursuant to the provision of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The development comprised mixed use and did not constitute a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. The Planning Inspector's 'planning balance' on this application has no bearing upon the decision taking for this application, for a Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008.</p>
	<p>Villages will lose their identity</p>	<p>It is acknowledged in the NPSNN that there is a limit on the extent to which an SRFI can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area (NPSNN 4.36). The form and scale of the SRFI will necessarily have a spatial and visual impact for local residents in going about their day to day lives. These residual impacts will not lead to villages losing their identity. The free-standing character of villages will remain.</p>
	<p>Living on the crossroad area of Ashby Road we would require a full structural survey</p>	<p>Where works are required to a highway, then such works will be undertaken pursuant to the Agreement under S278 of the Highways Act. HGV traffic routing is to be controlled by a HGV</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	and any damage or subsidence would be the responsibility and at the cost of Tritax	Route Management Plan (doc (Requirement 19) (document reference: 17.4, APP-362). The works to the junction are within the highway envelope and will need to be carried out by a competent contractor. Subsidence is highly unlikely in this scenario
	Possibility of subsidence caused as a result of the project.	These fears are misguided. Where works are required to a highway, then such works will be undertaken pursuant to the Agreement under S278 of the Highways Act. HGV traffic routing is to be controlled by a HGV Route Management Plan (document reference: 17.4, APP-362) (Requirement 19).
	Structural integrity of local properties may be disrupted.	These fears are misguided. Where works are required to a highway, then such works will be undertaken pursuant to the Agreement under S278 of the Highways Act. HGV traffic routing is to be controlled by a HGV Route Management Plan (document reference: 17.4, APP-362) (Requirement 19).
	Concerns raised during consultation have not been listened to	The Applicant has provided a comprehensive response to the comments made by the public that were raised during the statutory consultation of HNRFI. All comments have been considered, where in the Opinion, the Applicant – changes have been considered appropriate - these have been made. A consultation exercise is not an exercise where a developer is required to acquiesce to all comments made.
	Impact on local house pricing	The Planning system in the UK does not operate on the basis that a developer is responsible for any alleged diminution in property values as a consequence of a development proceeding. Conversely, any enhancement in property values as a consequence of new development, is not recoverable to the developer. If a development consent order is granted for HNRFI, it will be

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		made on the basis the impacts of the development are outweighed by the benefits in the overall national interest.
Defibrillator units should be provided		The Health and Safety (First Aid/Regulations 1981) requires employers to ensure the provision of such equipment and facilities as are adequate and appropriate in the circumstances for enabling first aid to be rendered to employees, if they are injured or become ill at work. There is no legal bar to employers making a defibrillator available in the workplace if the assessment of first aid needs indicates such equipment is required. Such provision lies with the individual occupiers of HNRFI.
Other sites are, or would be, preferential.		<p>The Government is committed by reason of ‘compelling need’ to deliver an ‘extended network’ of SRFIs (NPS 2.56). Given the locational requirements for a SRFI (near to the business markets they will serve and linked to key supply chains, with good rail and road access) the number of locations will be limited. It is for developers to bring forward sites. A developer is not burdened with having to demonstrate the chosen site is the best site within some geographic area. Rather the consideration is whether the selected site is appropriate when assessed primarily against the provision of the policy guidance the NPS – NN.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this consideration, the Applicant does consider this site is the best site in Leicestershire and indeed a very high performing location for a SRFI within the country.</p>
Lack of information about local apprenticeships		The Applicant is in discussion with the Local Authorities for the preparation of the framework for a Skills and Training Programme. The Applicant will encourage the establishment of apprenticeships during the construction and operational stages of HNRFI.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Overdevelopment		The statement 'overdevelopment' is easily said but sets out no substance. The design of HNRFI is considered to be an efficient and effective use of land for the establishment of a SRFI within a suitably landscaped setting.
Will there be a weight restriction on Leicester Road? Lighting needs to be improved on roads feeding the development. Will A5 bridge be included in planning?		The impact of HNRFI does not justify the imposition of a weight restriction on Leicester Road. The lighting Strategy Development (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132-134) describes the lighting installation proposed for the Link Road. No additional lighting is proposed on roads feeding the development. The traffic impacts of HNRFI do not justify a requirement for improvements to the Dodwell Bridge on the A5.
I do not believe that this development meets the criteria for being a nationally significant infrastructure project under the terms of the Planning Act (2008) and the associated national 'Policy Statement for National Networks' (December 2014) ('NPS'). I therefore also believe that it should not fall under the planning processes contained within that Act and associated guidance. In my view the proposed rail freight interchange is a huge speculative road-based logistics warehousing development onto which a rail port has been added as a means of avoiding local planning mechanisms		Section 26 of the Planning Act 2008 defines Rail Freight Interchanges. HNRFI is of a scale and design that satisfies the criteria attached S26. As such, the determination of an application for development consent proceeds as a NSIP.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	The development will swamp Elmesthorpe village	It is acknowledged that HNRFI is located close to the village of Elmesthorpe. The design of HNRFI, including the provision of structural planting, will ensure that the form and character of Elmesthorpe is satisfactorily safeguarded.
	There are brownfield sites in other parts of the country to use	The genesis for the site search by the Applicant was the findings of the research undertaken by Leicestershire Planning Authorities, which concluded in 2014, a substantial need for rail related warehousing development. The LAs accept that this need cannot be located within an existing urban area. The Government is committed to an expanded network of SRFIs. The Applicant is not required to undertake some form of sequential test for potentially suitable brownfield sites across the country.
Noise		
	Increased heavy traffic will affect the sleeping patterns of residents	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 in Environmental Statement - Chapter 10 - Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119).
	Noise from HGVs	As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.2.12.3, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated HGV loading/unloading activities and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels from the development will be reduced and significant adverse noise effects from HGVs are unlikely.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Noise pollution		As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119), noise associated with the operational phase of proposed development has been considered at nearby receptors, which has included noise associated with fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels are predicted to fall below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level at all nearby receptors in the assessments undertaken.
The noise coming from the constant 24hrs operation will be unbearable when one can already hear the noise coming from the A47 around Earl Shilton.		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. When considering operational noise associated with HGV loading/unloading activities and SRFI operations, the worst-case increase in noise is predicted to be +1.7dB. To put this into context, this level of change is considered marginal and would barely be perceptible to the human ear, with changes of 3dB considered to be only just perceptible under conditions 'in the field' (i.e. in practical or 'real world' conditions). This relates to noise that is continuous and similar in nature to the existing noise, however using the rating level, rather than the specific provides a reasonable proxy for this.
Noise and vibration from trains particularly at night		The trains using the line are not dependant on the HNRFI being brought forward and the capacity and running of trains will be managed by third parties. Notwithstanding this, it was agreed through the scoping report that vibration associated with off-site rail movements and service yard activities was scoped out of the assessment due to the distance between the activities and nearest receptors and the location of the existing rail line between the proposed development and receptors. Therefore, it is considered that vibration associated with the proposed development is unlikely to be significant at nearby receptors.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Currently hear trains passing and their warning horns, especially at night in warmer periods when we have our windows open, this is not an intrusion as it is an occasional drone noise and these services stop later in the evening. Rail freight operations are noisy, there is 'clanking and banging' from trains compressing and stretching and the engine noise of a train pulling a large load is also a magnitude higher than a passing commuter train at constant speed. Loading and unloading is a lot of metal on metal sharp intrusive sound, there would be no chance of sleeping through that kind of incidental, high pitch noise intrusion.</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 from SRFI operations will be reduced and significant adverse noise effects are unlikely.</p>
	<p>In the summer, residents would not be able to have windows open due to noise intrusion.</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 fixed plant and break-out noise from units, HGV loading/unloading activities, SRFI operations, additional train movements, the A47 link road and additional road traffic. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, operational noise levels will be reduced and are predicted to be below the current ambient noise levels as measured during the baseline noise survey at nearby receptors. Therefore, it is considered that residents could continue to open their windows.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Running 7 days a week 24/7 would provide no respite or quiet time</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119) the assessment has considered a worst-case 1-hour period (i.e., when operations are considered to be at their noisiest) during the daytime (0700-2300) and worst case 15m period (2300-0700), as required by the pertinent guidance. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, significant adverse noise effects from onsite operations are unlikely.</p> <p>As the assessment considers the worst-case periods during the daytime and night-time, it follows that noise during all other periods of the daytime and night-time are also unlikely to result in significant adverse noise effects.</p>
	<p>Landscaping proposed would be ineffectual in deflecting any sound as the background Dbs in the area of Hinckley affected is very low and sound deflection by using landscaping is ineffective for the type of noise this development will cause.</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: APP-119), the noise model takes account of the existing topography around the site and the proposed topography within the site. The 3D acoustic model does assess the effect of any screening or absorption provided by development landscaping and any features of the existing landscape surrounding the site.</p>
	<p>Noise that can be recorded from the M69 now with current traffic levels is 80 db so this will only get worse with increased HGV traffic, commuter traffic and rail traffic to the proposed site.</p>	<p>An assessment has been undertaken which considers HGV traffic, commuter traffic and additional trains. The results of the assessment indicate that with mitigation in place, noise levels from the development will be reduced and significant adverse noise effects from these sources are unlikely.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Vibration and the structural integrity of people's properties</p>	<p>Ground borne vibration propagates over a significantly lower distance when compared with airborne noise. Therefore, nearby receptors would need to be particularly close to transport sources for significant effects to be experienced.</p> <p>It was agreed through the scoping report that operational vibration associated with the A47 link road did not warrant consideration on this basis. Vibration associated with off-site rail movements and service yard activities was also scoped out of the assessment due to the distance between the activities and nearest receptors and the location of the existing rail line between the proposed development and receptors. Therefore, it is considered that vibration associated with the proposed development is unlikely to be significant at nearby receptors.</p>
	<p>No noise and vibration collection points have been defined near our property despite being the largest residential area that is closest to the railway line and HNRFI and therefore the impact is unknown or mitigated against.</p>	<p>At the outset of the project, consultation was undertaken with the Environmental Health Departments at Blaby District Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to agree the methodology and assessment criteria to be used. Noise and vibration measurements have been undertaken following agreement with the Environmental Health Departments and are considered representative of receptors surrounding the site.</p>
	<p>The impact of the additional train movements and vibration upon my 19th century Grade II listed property have been totally ignored.</p>	<p>An assessment has been undertaken which considers the additional trains at the closest nearby receptors where it has been determined that noise from the development is unlikely to result in significant adverse noise effects from train movements.</p> <p>It was agreed through the scoping report (document reference: 6.2.6.1, APP-135) that vibration associated with off-site rail movements and service yard activities was also scoped out of the assessment due to the distance between the activities and nearest receptors and the location of</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>the existing rail line between the proposed development and receptors. Therefore, it is considered that vibration associated with the proposed development is unlikely to be significant at nearby receptors.</p>
	<p>Understand that trains may have to queue near my property to access HNRFI resulting in extended periods of noise and vibration</p>	<p>Speed is a determining factor in the noise level produced by a train (i.e., a lower speed results in a lower noise level). Therefore, a train that is moving slowly along the line will produce a lower noise level than one that is passing through at speed.</p> <p>It was agreed through the scoping report that vibration associated with off-site rail movements was scoped out of the assessment due to the location of the existing rail line between the proposed development and receptors. Therefore, it is considered that vibration associated with the proposed development is unlikely to be significant at nearby receptors.</p>
	<p>Noise from the freight will affect sleep</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 from SRFI operations will be reduced and significant adverse noise effects are unlikely.</p>
	<p>I live directly next to the train line, the vibration from trains already shakes the house, with more frequent trains this</p>	<p>The trains using the line are not dependant on the HNRFI being brought forward and the capacity and running of trains will be managed by third parties. Notwithstanding this, it was agreed through the scoping report that vibration associated with off-site rail movements and service</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	would significantly increase should this go ahead.	yard activities was scoped out of the assessment due to the distance between the activities and nearest receptors and the location of the existing rail line between the proposed development and receptors. Therefore, it is considered that vibration associated with the proposed development is unlikely to be significant at nearby receptors.
Health		
	Will have a negative impact on the quiet enjoyment of Burbage Common, which is important for mental health	<p>All tangible changes in environmental and socio-economic conditions with the potential to influence public health, including noise 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. Potential changes in noise are not of a magnitude, nature or exposure to impact upon mental health.</p> <p>A Health and Equality Briefing Note has been provided to aid navigation of the DCO and summarise how and where health has been addressed.</p>
	Will be negative to residents' well-being and everyday lives.	<p>Quality of life and wellbeing are influenced by tangible and intangible factors, and modified further by subjective values that vary at an individual level and change in priority for an individual depending on stage of life.</p> <p>All tangible changes in environmental and socio-economic conditions with the potential to influence health and wellbeing 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. The more subjective and intangible aspects that cannot be quantified or assessed, have been captured through engagement and applied to inform and refine the application.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>A Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference: 6.2.7.1, APP-137) has been provided to aid navigation of the DCO and summarise how and where health has been addressed.</p>
Public health risks for residents		<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 provided to aid navigation of the DCO and summarise how and where health has been addressed.</p>
The build time will have a negative impact on the users of Burbage Common		<p>Both the construction and operation phases have been assessed and addressed through the regulatory assessment process. This includes an agreed scope and focus of technical assessments covering all tangible change in environmental and socio-economic conditions.</p>
What is your research on the impact of special needs families on the community and your proposal for bringing inclusivity to the area?		<p>Both the construction and operation phases have been assessed and addressed through the regulatory assessment process. This includes an agreed scope and focus of technical assessments covering all tangible change in environmental and socio-economic conditions, with embodied design and appropriate mitigation to remove, manage and address any significant impact or disruption to local communities and users of amenity areas.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Impacts on peoples mental health due to construction, operational noise, traffic, pollution, loss of countryside and the view.</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. This includes the assessment of construction and operational noise, emissions to air, traffic, access and accessibility, the impact on countryside and visual impacts.</p> <p>A Health and Equality Briefing Note has been provided to aid navigation of the DCO and summarise how and where health has been addressed.</p>
	<p>Health impact from depletion of air quality at construction and operation a concern</p>	<p>The potential impact of air quality on health has been assessed and addressed through the regulatory planning process through recognised assessment protocols set to objective thresholds protective of the environment and health. While sufficient for the regulatory requirements, it is appreciated that residual concerns exist, particularly for non-threshold pollutants. For this reason, a supplementary Quantitative Exposure Response Assessment is included in the health and equality briefing note to set potential risk into context. The assessment demonstrates that the proposed facility will remain within objective thresholds protective of health, and the absolute change in concentration and exposure is orders of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any change in local public health.</p>
	<p>Midlands already one of the worst places in country for respiratory diseases like asthma and in parts of the country children are</p>	<p>The potential impact of air quality on health has been assessed and addressed through the regulatory planning process through recognised assessment protocols set to objective thresholds protective of the environment and health. While sufficient for the regulatory requirements, it is appreciated that residual concerns exist, particularly for non-threshold</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>being killed by poor air quality so can't inflict this on local residents</p>	<p>pollutants. For this reason, a supplementary Quantitative Exposure Response Assessment is included in the health and equality briefing note to set potential risk into context. The assessment demonstrates that the proposed facility will remain within objective thresholds protective of health, and the absolute change in concentration and exposure is orders of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any change in local public health.</p>
	<p>The pollution is already an issue due to the M69 and this will get much worse. There is a cluster of childhood and adult cancers in Elmesthorpe and Stoney Stanton, in one close in Elmesthorpe there are 20 houses and there have been 4 childhood cancers and 6 adults</p>	<p>The potential impact of air quality on health has been assessed and addressed through the regulatory planning process through recognised assessment protocols set to objective thresholds protective of the environment and health. While sufficient for the regulatory requirements, it is appreciated that residual concerns exist, particularly for non-threshold pollutants. For this reason, a supplementary Quantitative Exposure Response Assessment is included in the health and equality briefing note to set potential risk into context. The assessment demonstrates that the proposed facility will remain within objective thresholds protective of health, and the absolute change in concentration and exposure is orders of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any change in local public health.</p>
	<p>There is a cluster of childhood and adult cancers in Elmesthorpe and Stoney Stanton. In one Close in Elmesthorpe there are 20 houses and there have been 4 childhood cancers and 6 adult</p>	<p>The potential impact of air quality on health has been assessed and addressed through the regulatory planning process through recognised assessment protocols set to objective thresholds protective of the environment and health. While sufficient for the regulatory requirements, it is appreciated that residual concerns exist, particularly for non-threshold pollutants. For this reason, a supplementary Quantitative Exposure Response Assessment is included in the health and equality briefing note to set potential risk into context. The assessment demonstrates that the proposed facility will remain within objective thresholds protective of health, and the absolute change in concentration and exposure is orders of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any change in local public health.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Flood and Hydrology		
Added stress on Leicestershire health services; dentists, hospitals, doctors.	The proposed application does not include residential development that might facilitate natural population growth or alter local health care capacity. The area is a net exporter of construction staff, and can accommodate much of the construction activities, not only retaining the socio-economic benefit locally, but reducing associated changes in public services (where staff do not relocate with dependents, and they retain the use of their existing public services).	
Flooding risks have not been properly considered	The applicant's consultant has liaised with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority on matters of flood risk and surface water through the NSIP process to ensure that their requirements are met, and best practice is followed. The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority have both confirmed that they are comfortable with the Proposed Scheme.	
Flooding on the Soar will increase in storm conditions	As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209) and the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210), the Proposed Scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure which will intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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.	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Enormous amount of water run-off from the huge roofs and tarmac areas will make that area of Burbage Common too boggy to be passable / usable by visitors to the common and may even cause flooding in the area</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 intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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>Attenuation ponds appear woefully inadequate in relation to the size of the Warehouses and amount of hardstanding proposed.</p>	<p>As set out in the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210), the attenuated surface water storage provided within the development will be designed to accommodate the runoff from the 1 in 100-year storm including an allowance for future climate change, in accordance with local and national requirements.</p>
	<p>Evident from existing site topography that exceedance of the ponds, in particular the pond adjacent to Unit 04 will result in direct flooding of the neighbouring property of Langton Farm and adjacent surrounding land.</p>	<p>As set out in the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210) The surface water storage tanks and ponds will be designed to accommodate the 1 in 100-year storm including an allowance for future climate change, in accordance with local and national requirements. The stored storm water will be released to the surrounding watercourse network at the equivalent greenfield (pre-development) annual average discharge rate. Any exceedance flows from more extreme storm events will be directed towards these watercourses in accordance with best practice.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Fields within development boundary currently flood frequently including flooding along Burbage Common Road, area already at high risk of pluvial flooding as evidenced by the Stoney Stanton flooding of properties during February 2020. Clear no natural catchment management has been considered and the potential impact of this flood risk has not been assessed or mitigated.</p>	<p>As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209), the flooding within the Main HNRFI Site is a product of runoff from within the site itself and its inability to drain into the ground or into the downstream watercourses quickly enough. To address this on-site risk, new surface water drainage infrastructure is proposed which will store storm water falling on the development within a combination of ponds and tanks. With the rainfall intercepted, the flood risk to the Main HNRFI Site will be reduced to an acceptable level. To confirm, the Main HNRFI Site does not seek to discharge surface water towards Stoney Stanton.</p>
	<p>No acceptance of any responsibility in relation to flood alleviation measures required, the EA would not carry this.</p>	<p>The applicant's consultant has liaised with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority on matters of flood risk and surface water through the NSIP process to ensure that their requirements are met, and best practice is followed. The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority have both confirmed that they are comfortable with the Proposed Scheme. As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209) and the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210), the Proposed Scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure which will intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Site lies on higher ground in an area already subject to flooding and slopes down towards the Fosse villages. Concreting over such a large area is likely to lead to excessive runoff into the villages below the site, which will inevitably lead to flooding of residential properties.</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 flooding within the Main HNRFI Site is a product of runoff from within the site itself and its inability to drain into the ground or into the downstream watercourses quickly enough. To address this on-site risk, new surface water drainage infrastructure is proposed which will store storm water falling on the development within a combination of ponds and tanks. With the rainfall intercepted, the flood risk to the Main HNRFI Site will be reduced to an acceptable level. The stored storm water will be released to the surrounding watercourse network at the equivalent greenfield (pre-development) annual average discharge rate. This will ensure that under normal rainfall conditions there is no increase in the rate of water leaving the site and therefore no impact on the downstream catchment. In larger storm events this will represent a reduction in the peak flow leaving the development, offering downstream betterment.</p>
	<p>Concerned about waterlogging form disruption of natural springs.</p>	<p>Intrusive site investigations have been undertaken which have identified groundwater at over 3m below ground level. Some shallower localised groundwater was also encountered, but this is a product of impeded drainage conditions brought about by the cohesive underlying geology. The cohesive geology means that there is not a significant groundwater reservoir or flow pathway that could be negatively impacted by the development. Where the shallow groundwater is encountered during construction, it can be safely addressed through localised dewatering. The waterlogging is a product of runoff from within the site itself and its inability to drain into the ground or into the downstream watercourses quickly enough. To address this on-site risk, new surface water drainage infrastructure is proposed which will store storm water falling on the development within a combination of ponds and tanks. With the rainfall intercepted, the flood risk to the Main HNRFI Site will be reduced to an acceptable level.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Considering the effect on the existing groundwater regime where a considerable new roof area would lead to rainwater being discharged into drainage systems rather than soak into the ground locally, this might result in a lowering of the groundwater level in the main park area of Burbage Common. This could have long term effects on plant growth and wildlife activity in the area</p>	<p>The site is underlain by cohesive geology which impedes the ability for rainwater to soak into the ground. The low permeability means that there is not a significant groundwater reservoir or groundwater flow pathway that could be negatively impacted by the development.</p>
	<p>The area already suffers from flooding on Burbage Common Road and Station Road Elmhurst on a regular basis. Stoney Stanton has already been affected and houses flooded. A planned crematorium on the edge of the village has not been able to continue for these very reasons.</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 intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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>Water quality, what will be done to ensure that phosphates do not enter the water network impacting water health in local streams</p>	<p>Foul water from the development is to be drained separately from surface water runoff and directed to the local public sewer network. The surface water drainage strategy will include a treatment facility to remove pollutants from surface water runoff before it is discharged from</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		the development. These may include permeable paving, swales, detention basins, silt traps, and oil separators.
No information regarding the survey on planning of attenuation lakes which are not sufficient for the size of the site		An outline surface water drainage strategy was submitted with the application (Hinckley NRFI ES Appendix 14.2 Sustainable Drainage Statement). (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210) The surface water storage tanks and ponds will be designed to accommodate the 1 in 100-year storm including an allowance for future climate change, in accordance with local and national requirements.
Burbage Common Road is known to flood as is the area around this, the base of the bridge on B581 at the Bostock Close side is also known to flood		As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209) and the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210), the Proposed Scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure which will intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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.
Drainage is very poor in Burbage Common the development will make it worse		As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209) and the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210), the Proposed Scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure which will intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		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.
Local streams will have increased run off and could lead to flooding into close by properties.		As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference: 6.2.14.1, APP-209) and the Sustainable Drainage Statement (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210), the Proposed Scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure which will intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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.
Highgate Lodge Farm, Stoney Stanton. drainage concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on our fields to the east of the M69 and the outflow from the site onto our fields to the west of the M69. Some of our land to the east of the M69 drains under the M69 into the same watercourse that is proposed to use for the drainage of the site. There does not seem to be much detail about the ongoing operation and maintenance plans for the subterranean tanks or the attenuation		The Proposed Scheme will not include the outfall to the watercourse from the fields to the east to the M69. A large proportion of the Main HNRFI site currently drains to the watercourse in question, and the Proposed Scheme proposes to maintain this arrangement. The Proposed Scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure which will intercept and store storm water falling on the development. 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 watercourse. In larger storm events this will represent a reduction in the peak flow leaving the development, offering downstream betterment. An outline surface water drainage strategy was submitted with the application (document reference: 6.2.14.2, APP-210) Hinckley NRFI ES Appendix 14.2

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>lakes. Extremely concerned that insufficient information has been made available regarding how the applicant intends to monitor and maintain the scheme. Experience of the construction of the M69 showed what might seem to have been a small error on their part, had extensive impact on the productivity of our land.</p>	<p>Sustainable Drainage Statement), which outlines the potential operational and maintenance requirements of the surface water drainage infrastructure.</p>
<p>Drainage</p>		
<p>The sewage system cannot cope</p>		<p>Any upgrade works in the public sewer network would be the responsibility of Severn Trent Water to provide. Any necessary works would be undertaken in conjunction with the applicant to minimise works off site, where possible.</p>
<p>Currently the land needed for this project has allocated areas of land which carries our sewage system and septic tank pipes. The landowner is refusing to allow us to inspect, repair, renew or replace this system as is stated on our deeds. Any work or areas which have this system working within has to be maintained to avoid</p>		<p>The applicant is aware of the access issues and the proposals will ensure that the drainage can be delivered as well as the ability to grant access over the land.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	damage by the landowners and allow us to have access when needed at all times.	
Market Need		
	There is extensive unoccupied warehousing within a 15 mile radius	
	Unused warehousing facilities at both of those and Magna Park Lutterworth and Coventry Airport	<p>Both the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 and the 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. . This level of shortfall between demand and supply clearly evidences a large scale and strategic site such as the HNRFI is needed.</p>
	I am perplexed by the reference to the hub possibly being used for the automotive	The Rt Hon Dr Luke Evans MP for Hinckley & Bosworth spoke on the importance of the Automotive Industry for his constituents and indeed the Country, in the House of Commons on

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>industry. There is no major automotive industry locally.</p>	<p>Wednesday 12th July 2023 (see Hansard. Automotive Industry Volume 736: debated on Wednesday 12 July 2023, rising to speak at 2:00 (column 378 - 384).</p> <p>This was an important speech and recognised several key points which go to the heart of the Applicants proposed scheme. It recognises that little locally is understood of the work of Horiba MIRA, which he described as <i>“the Silicon Valley of the automotive industry”, “the Google complex of anything to do with the car industry”</i>. As the automotive industry is going through a period of huge technological change to meet the NetZero challenge, Horiba MIRA has been invested in significantly with its own Enterprise Zone, to encourage research and development.</p> <p>The Rt Hon Dr Luke Evans MP also explained the success of Triumph Motorcycles. <i>“I am very proud to have Triumph Motorcycles’ headquarters in my patch, creating over 1,000 jobs. In the last three years, it has broken records for the number of bikes it has sold, which has gone up by 30% across the world. All across America and into Latin America, it is breaking into the industry and the market. That means high-end innovative jobs designed and manufactured right here in my constituency.”</i></p> <p>In addition to other companies mentioned, he also referenced Caterpillar <i>“The final jewel in the crown is Caterpillar, which last year made £59 billion worth of sales worldwide. The company, which has 1,000 people working in Desford in my constituency, is looking at making green hydrogen-fuelled electric tractors, forklift trucks, dumper trucks—you name it. I have had the pleasure of sitting there and driving Caterpillar vehicles in Arizona remotely. That is the sort of innovation that we can do. Caterpillar is sourcing its manufacturing right here in Desford, and has been for 70 years.”</i></p> <p>The automotive manufacturing sector is highly complex and dependent on strong global supply chains for importing parts and exporting parts and completed products. As more businesses look for resilience in their supply chains, and as the current technology changes significantly alter suppliers and their supply chains, so the opportunity arises to create ‘hubs’ of excellence.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>For South West Leicestershire (Growth Area 5) in the Leicester & Leicestershire Economic Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan 2014, this effectively identified the potential to grow the automotive and defence sectors through the development of spin off technologies from the research at Horiba MIRA, in an area where the expertise already existed; and the fact that the new Felixstowe to Nuneaton section of the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North Strategic Rail Freight Line had then just been completed (late 2012), but went straight through Leicestershire, without providing any direct benefit.</p> <p>The automotive sector is particularly strong throughout the Midlands and the Liverpool City Region. A business based at HNRFI would have the opportunity to use rail for exports and imports using containers through the deep sea and short sea-ports to and from international markets, as well as to and from Liverpool City Region; and even locally in the future to any OEMs with a direct rail link and significant volumes; or by Electric HGVs given the relatively short distances involved to local OEMs, such as Triumph and Caterpillar.</p> <p>The Rt Hon Dr Luke Evans MP in his speech to the House of Commons, also made the point:</p> <p><i>"I mention all this to highlight some of what is going on in my small area of Leicestershire. People choose the UK because of the skillsets we have, the tech environment we create, the regulation we have in place and our stability in the global market. That is why they come here. Does that mean we should shut up shop, because we have done enough? No, of course not. It is important to make sure that there are signposts and avenues so that people know where to invest. When I speak to the likes of the Midlands Engine, which is looking for ways to drive investment in the 11 million people in its area, among the questions that come up are: where should businesses go, and how do they connect with Government?"</i></p> <p>Over the last 8 years the Applicant has worked in good faith to propose and design HNRFI as the answer to that question, in the area that will benefit the Rt Hon Member and adjoining</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Members' constituents, to a planning agenda which provides the greenest logistics chains, in a region that has no coast – practically everything must be moved by road or rail.</p> <p>The need for the Scheme has now been agreed by the local authorities concerned in their Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant.</p>
So much logistics already in the area. Why is there a need for more.		<p>Both the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 and the 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>
Light		
Light pollution		<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>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Any new development should be specified an Environmental Zone (ranging from E0 'protected environment e.g., UNESCO starlight reserve, to E4 'High district brightness e.g., City Centre). For each Environmental Zone the ILP recommends maximum values of light parameters for the control of obtrusive light. The Site has been considered to fall within Environmental Zone E2 'Low district brightness' e.g., sparsely inhabited rural area. The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to 134) states that the development must not exceed the maximum values for environmental Zone E2.</p> <p>The Applicant will also provide a Technical Note for Lighting which will contain further guidance, information, and quantitative 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 Environmental Zone E2 post-curfew conditions. This Technical Note is intended to provide additional information to supplement the original Lighting Strategy as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process with the relevant consultees. This Technical Note shall be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p> <p>In accordance with dDCO Requirement 31, each phase of the authorised development shall not be occupied until a scheme for all permanent lighting in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy.</p>
Light pollution destroying the night sky		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

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>to meet the specific criteria in terms of obtrusive light to meet the applicable standards and guidance.</p> <p>Any new development should be specified an Environmental Zone (ranging from E0 'protected environment e.g., UNESCO starlight reserve, to E4 'High district brightness e.g., City Centre). For each Environmental Zone the ILP recommends maximum values of light parameters for the control of obtrusive light. The Site has been considered to fall within Environmental Zone E2 'Low district brightness' e.g., sparsely inhabited rural area. The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134) states that the development must not exceed the maximum values for environmental Zone E2.</p> <p>The Applicant will also provide a Technical Note for Lighting which will contain further guidance, information, and quantitative 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 Environmental Zone E2 post-curfew conditions. This Technical Note is intended to provide additional information to supplement the original Lighting Strategy as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process with the relevant consultees. This Technical Note shall be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p>
<p>Area is rural, little light pollution currently with tall buildings proposed and light generally used in these developments would make our residential area like daytime 24 hours per day, 7 days a week without respite.</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>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>The development will be illuminated in line with the applicable recommendations for operational external areas including for the, safety and security. The lighting design will ensure that any obtrusive light is within the limits of the applicable ILP lighting guides for all sensitive receptor which includes residential properties. This has been stated in the Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134)</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 Environmental Zone E2 post-curfew conditions. This Technical Note is intended to provide additional information to supplement the original Lighting Strategy as part of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) process with the relevant consultees. This Technical Note shall be appended to the BDC SoCG and submitted at Deadline 2 (24/10/2023).</p> <p>In accordance with dDCO Requirement 31, each phase of the authorised development shall not be occupied until a scheme for all permanent lighting in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy.</p>
<p>Developer asked if lights were switched off outside operational hours 07.00-23.00, no response provided, therefore assume that no plans for operations to be considerate to local residents</p>		<p>The ILP Guidance notes that only lighting required for safety and security will be operational between the hours of 23:00 and 07:00 At this stage the requirements of specific end users are not known but where lighting is not required within the post-curfew period it will be proposed to be to the reduced level defined by the guidance or turned off where not required for safety and security.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Socioeconomics		
Jobs created will exceed the number of unemployed locally	<p>Although unemployment levels are low in the Study Area, there are still approximately 46,100 unemployed people. 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, compared to England average of 35%. Therefore, the Study Area has a higher proportion of JSA Claimants in construction and building and woodworking trades than England.</p>	
Use Magna Park	<p>Magna Park is not rail linked. Suggestions have been made in representations to reinstate the old Grand Central Line between Leicester and Rugby, running through Magna Park, but this is no longer possible as developments have been built in several places on the old route. An alternative was proposed by a rail enthusiast, running from Rugby to the south of Magna Park and connecting to the mainline to the west of Narborough Station.</p> <p>In both cases the underlying concept was to create a Northampton - Rugby - Leicester passenger service, with rail freight also using the line. The problem with both proposals is that they are simply not viable. There is not enough demand for passenger use. Magna Park is fully consented and there is insufficient funding, either private or public, to afford such a significant scheme.</p>	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>From a rail freight perspective, Lutterworth/ Magna Park would be difficult to access for traffic from the north and north-west, as it would need to use the already congested Rugby station, through which DIRFT and Northampton Gateway are and will be serviced.</p> <p>Unlike HNRFI, it could not act as a rail hub linking and consolidating rail freight routes from different ports and end destinations. Connecting the new line to the west of Narborough Station would mean additional passenger stopping trains which cause the longest level crossing down times. HNRFI will act as part of a network of SRFI's each serving a high concentration of users, some, such as HNRFI and DIRFT providing complimentary noncompeting services to locations such as Magna Park. There is no public infrastructure funding being applied to the HNRFI project, it is entirely private investment, including all the mitigations.</p>
Where would staff be recruited from		<p>As shown in Figure 7.1 of the 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. These local authorities include Blaby, Charnwood, Coventry, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth, Leicester City, North Warwickshire, North West Leicestershire, Nuneaton and Bedworth, Oadby and Wigston, Rugby and Tamworth.</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 provided in Appendix 4 (document reference 6.2.8.1.4). 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. This includes the local</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>authorities of Blaby, Charnwood, Coventry, East Staffordshire, Erewash, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth, Leicester, Melton, North Warwickshire, North-West Leicestershire, Nuneaton and Bedworth, Oadby and Wigston, Rugby, South Derbyshire, and Tamworth.</p> <p>The evolving Employment and Skills Plan will ensure that the effects of construction and operational employment are captured locally as anticipated and will detail the availability of a local labour supply.</p>
Little unemployment in the midlands		<p>Although unemployment levels are low in the Study Area, there are still approximately 46,100 unemployed people. 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, compared to the England average of 35%. Therefore, the Study Area has a higher proportion of JSA Claimants in construction and building and woodworking trades than England.</p>
Jobs will be low paid		<p>The I&L sector is subject to a number of misconceptions about average pay levels. Data from the ONS shows that wages are above average at +£4,600 for manufacturing, and +£4,900 for logistics, which equates to £30,358 and £30,700 for manufacturing and logistics respectively (UK average is £25,780). Again, the logistics component of the sector is performing above average, with wages between 2019 and 2020 having increased more than in other sectors (+6% growth</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		in logistics compared to +4%), which is important in the current inflationary environment. In addition, entry-level jobs in logistics are relatively well-paid, with median annual pay being 47% higher than across jobs in the same occupational category.
Magna Park have to bus workers in as they can't fill jobs locally		Although unemployment levels are low in the Study Area, there are still approximately 46,100 unemployed people. 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.
Loss of the dog day care facility		The potential socio-economic effects to the businesses in the Study Area that could be affected by the HNRFI are assessed in Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effect (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116). The owner of the dog day care facility is a landowner for the main HNRFI site. Landowners would gain financially from the sale of the land which could be reinvested in replacement holdings if available.
Loss of Woodhouse farm shop		The potential socio-economic effects to the businesses in the Study Area that could be affected by the HNRFI are assessed in Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116) The owner of Woodhouse farm shop is a landowner for the main HNRFI site. Landowners would gain financially from the sale of the land which could be reinvested in replacement holdings if available.
Burbage Common Café may have reduced footfall		Access will still be provided to Burbage Common Café.

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>In favour, will help growth and maintenance of local business</p>	<p>The HNRFI will help the LLEP area maintain its competitive advantage in the logistics sector by allocating activities where they are more optimally located. The HNRFI is estimated to safeguard between 2,100 and 2,600 jobs in the LLEP area by relocating logistics activities to a more sustainable location and built environment. The relocation of logistics companies to the HNRFI will help ensure the long-term sustainability of those businesses and the jobs they support.</p> <p>The construction of the Proposed Development could also facilitate the growth of the local construction industry, thus enabling firms to expand and potentially take on new employees.</p>
	<p>Understand golden triangle in terms of logistics, however there are also areas of the country that are hugely under invested in, with far higher levels of unemployment, which would benefit far more than Leicestershire</p>	<p>Although unemployment levels are low in the Study Area, there are still approximately 46,100 unemployed people. 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>Estimated future demand is 2.5 times higher than current and known available supply. The Applicant considers this a matter of fact based on the evidence detailed in document reference APP-358. This level of shortfall between demand and supply clearly evidences a large scale and strategic site such as the HNRFI is needed.</p>
	<p>Staff will not be able to afford houses and will have to commute in</p>	<p>Please refer to the large Study Area presented in Figure 7.3 and stated at Paragraph 7.17 of Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116. The Study Area used for the operational employment comprises 16 local authorities based on the modelled HNRFI Employee Trips.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>Insufficient housing, local amenities and infrastructure to support an increase in the local population of this scale.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Study Area presented in Figure 7.3 and stated at Paragraph 7.17 of Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116). The Study Area used for the operational employment comprises 16 local authorities based on the modelled HNRFI Employee Trips, and therefore the impact is not limited to the immediate local authorities of Hinckley and Bosworth and Blaby. Infrastructure is provided at the point of residence rather than the point of employment.</p> <p>In terms of construction workers, according to the APS in March 2022, there were 52,300 residents in the construction study area employed in construction, and approximately 51,700 construction employees that work in the Study Area. This shows that there are more residents employed in the construction sector than there are jobs in the sector, indicating that the Study Area is a net exporter of construction workers. Therefore, the addition of 740 net additional construction jobs will likely be met by the existing local workforce. Consequently, this will have a negligible impact on demand for housing resulting in a neutral effect.</p>
	<p>Unemployment not high enough in the area to provide the necessary workforce and could risk taking people away from other essential work.</p>	<p>Although unemployment levels are low in the Study Area, there are still approximately 46,100 unemployed people. 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, compared to England average of</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>35%. Therefore, the Study Area has a higher proportion of JSA Claimants in construction and building and woodworking trades than England.</p> <p>The assessment of employment during operation also considers the displacement of jobs elsewhere. Displacement is where the proposed activity could displace another activity in the target area, thereby reducing its additionality. To understand which displacement rate could be considered appropriate, a review of the share of obsolete stock relative to the overall PMA was undertaken. Obsolete stock (40 years old plus) is considered to be a reasonable indicator for understanding the level of displacement the HNRFI may cause. This is based on the assumptions that employees working in older and poorer quality facilities may be particularly attracted to working in better conditions (modern, high-quality facilities), such as the new premises located in the HNRFI, including those particularly attracted to working for larger national and international companies that typically cover a wide range of well-paid jobs that enable career progression. This indicated that 19% of stock will become obsolete by the time that the HNRFI becomes operational in 2032, accounting for future growth in inventory, and existing stock that would be refurbished each year. Further displacement guidance from the Department for Business Innovation and Skills was reviewed, which concluded that inward investment projects tend to result in a median displacement of 28% at the regional level. This suggests that using the HCA's ready reckoner of 'low' displacement of 25% is the most appropriate for this analysis. While displacement is discounted from the additionality of employment effects, its impact in this instance is positive, as it is helping the LLEP area maintain its competitive advantage in the logistics sector by allocating activities where they are more optimally located. The HNRFI is estimated to safeguard between 2,100 and 2,600 jobs in the LLEP area by relocating logistics activities to a more sustainable location and built environment. The relocation of logistics companies to the HNRFI will help ensure the long-term sustainability of those businesses and the jobs they support.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Will provide long term socio-economic benefits to the area	<p>The HNRFI is estimated to support 740 net additional construction jobs per annum over a 10-year construction period, and during operation generate between 10-400 and 12,900 additional FTE jobs.</p> <p>The HNRFI will help the LLEP area maintain its competitive advantage in the logistics sector by allocating activities where they are more optimally located. The HNRFI is estimated to safeguard 2,100-2,600 jobs in the LLEP area by relocating logistics activities to a more sustainable location and built environment. The relocation of logistics companies to the HNRFI will help ensure the long-term sustainability of those businesses and the jobs they support.</p>	
Lack of information about local apprenticeship opportunities	The evolving Employment and Skills Plan will detail local apprenticeship opportunities.	
Question job created number, suggest this number is clarified as suspicion is that it includes temporary / construction jobs and also possibly a large percentage of existing employed people transferring from Magna Park	The assessment of employment during construction and operation phase has been undertaken in a separate section of the Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116). As part of the assessment the displacement of jobs elsewhere has been considered. Displacement is where the proposed activity could displace another activity in the target area, thereby reducing its additionality.	
CPO		
Lack of clarity and open-ness regarding compulsory purchase order of residential properties	There will be no Compulsory acquisition of residential properties, a number of residential properties in local villages were identified through the Applicant's land referencing process as	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		having potential subsoil interests in the adjoining highway. These properties were subsequently written to, to provide a description of what a sub-soil interest is.
The centre of Sapcote being compulsory purchased		The centre of Sapcote will not be compulsorily acquired.
Heritage		
The development will destroy Woodhouse Farm, which was built in about 1710 and is of local historical importance since it was the home of the Fowke family and housed a well-known museum in the Georgian period.		The impact of the HNRFI on Woodhouse Farm and the proposed mitigation in response to the loss of this locally important building is set out in Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122). Mitigation in the form of a programme of building recording will be implemented as a DCO Requirement to record the identified historic buildings within the DCO Main Site prior to construction.
Will impose significantly on the setting of the Fosse villages which are historic quarrying villages retaining much of their historical buildings. 'Blacksmith's Cottage in Sapcote which is situated within the DCO area, is the original 'blacksmith's forge and still retains the mounting block. It is the main reason for the narrow footpath and 'S' bend in the centre of the village. Tritax		Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122) includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact upon the historic environment, including the setting of surrounding heritage including relevant historic buildings in the surrounding settlements. In terms of ' Blacksmith's Cottage in Sapcote, this is identified as a non-designated local heritage asset in the Sapcote Neighbourhood Plan and is not identified as a sensitive receptor in Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122). The building is not within the DCO Site but is located adjacent to proposed Offsite Highways Works Ref B4 (B4669 Sapcote Road/Hinckley Road). As set out on Figure 3.3 (document reference: 6.3.3.3, APP-232), the proposed works at B4 adjacent ' Blacksmith's Cottage comprise kerb realignment to improve the

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>have failed to explain how this will be impacted by footpath widening.</p>	<p>layout of the existing crossroads. These works would be contained to the highway and would have no impact on the cottage.</p>
	<p>Aston Flamville has conservation village status</p>	<p>The impact of the Proposed Development on Aston Flamville Conservation Area is assessed in paragraphs 13.197 to 13.198 of Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122). The assessment identifies a negligible adverse effect on the conservation area, that is not significant.</p>
	<p>In Sapcote there is an early Bronze age occupation site that was discovered here and a Roman Villa and Bath House dating from 1st Century AD.–From 12th – 14th century the village was the home of the powerful Basset family</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the historical background of Sapcote. The known archaeological baseline of the DCO Site and a surrounding study area is included in the Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference 6.1.13, APP-122) and Appendix 13.1 – Archaeological Assessment (document reference: 6.2.13.1, APP-201).</p>
	<p>Building heights will detract from the conservation area</p>	<p>The potential impact of the Proposed Development on surrounding conservation areas is assessed in Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122). The only conservation area assessed as receiving an impact is the Aston Flamville Conservation Area. The assessment identifies that the presence of the distant built form of the proposed development in the DCO Main Site will result in limited change to the setting of the conservation area and a negligible adverse effect on the conservation area overall, that is not significant.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>The development has significance to an archaeologist, this part of England was the heart of the Civil War in the 17th Century.</p>	<p>The known archaeological baseline of the DCO Site and a surrounding study area and the impact on archaeological assets is included in the Cultural Heritage ES Chapter 13 (document reference: 6.1.13, APP-122) and Appendix 13.1 – Archaeological Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.1, APP-201).</p>
Climate		
	<p>Sources of carbon emissions from this proposed development, which are listed below, may outweigh the gains of the rail transport:</p> <p>Construction activities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earth moving • Lifting • Construction worker's transport <p>Operational activities including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service operations such as maintenance, deliveries and staff sustenance • Transfer of loads from rail to heavy goods vehicles (HGV) • Heating and lighting • Transport for 8,400 staff 	<p>It is considered that "Rail transport has a crucial role to play in delivering significant reductions in pollution and congestion. Tonne for tonne, rail freight produces 70% less CO2 than road freight, up to fifteen times lower NOx emissions and nearly 90% lower PM10 emissions. It also has de-congestion benefits – depending on its load, each freight train can remove between 43 and 77 HGVs from the road." [para 2.37] (Draft National Policy Statement for National Networks, March 2023). It has been determined that HNRFI will result in a saving of approximately 83 million HGV miles per annum, Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) sets out, irrespective of the benefits of the modal shift of freight, a methodology for understanding the carbon footprint of the scheme (including its construction, its energy consumption, its operational traffic and associated mitigation measures.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>In a time of environmental crisis, using greenfields for developments of this magnitude flies in the face of the climate emergency we are facing.</p>	<p>NPS-NN paragraph 4.8 refers to a 'judgment of viability'. An illustration of a Government intervention is investment in the Strategic Rail Freight network. The Market Needs Assessment for (Rail Freight Market Demand and supply (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) refers to the interventions by Government to 'grow rail freight' (section 3) and the intervention by the Network Rail to gauge clear the strategic rail freight network – including Nuneaton to Felixstowe railway to W10.</p> <p>Blaby District and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough have acknowledged the need for a SRFI within Leicestershire and accept that the scale and locational requirements for an SRFI cannot be accommodated within an existing urban area. On this basis, land beyond existing settlements is identified as open countryside in development plans, an open countryside location is required to meet the agreed need for the provision of a SRFI.</p> <p>The provision of the SRFI also aligns with the Department of Transport Rail Freight Strategy (2016) which describes the significant reduction in GHG emissions that comes from a modal shift of freight from road to rail.</p>
<p>Will increase CO2 emissions Not proposed to be a zero carbon / carbon neutral development</p>		<p>It is entirely reasonable and responsible to expect that the scheme proposals are designed to limit and reduce GHG emissions. HNRFI supports the Government's policy framework for rail freight expansion. HNRFI supports the UK Government's objectives It is considered that "Rail transport has a crucial role to play in delivering significant reductions in pollution and congestion. Tonne for tonne, rail freight produces 70% less CO2 than road freight, up to fifteen times lower NOx emissions and nearly 90% lower PM10 emissions. It also has de-congestion benefits – depending on its load, each freight train can remove between 43 and 77 HGVs from the road." [para 2.37] (Draft National Policy Statement for National Networks, March 2023). It has been determined that HNRFI will result in a saving of approximately 83 million HGV miles annum</p> <p>Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change. Environmental Statement - Chapter 18 - Energy and</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Climate Change (document reference 6.1.18, APP-127) sets out, irrespective of the benefits of the modal shift of freight, a methodology for understanding the carbon footprint of the scheme (including its construction, its energy consumption, its operational traffic) and associated mitigation measures. The scheme proposes to be Net Zero in construction with power requirements for its operation being largely generated on site using solar PV.</p>
<p>What carbon reduction benefit is being achieved and how is it being calculated.</p>		<p>It is considered that "Rail transport has a crucial role to play in delivering significant reductions in pollution and congestion. Tonne for tonne, rail freight produces 70% less CO2 than road freight, up to fifteen times lower NOx emissions and nearly 90% lower PM10 emissions.³⁹ It also has de-congestion benefits – depending on its load, each freight train can remove between 43 and 77 HGVs from the road." [para 2.37] (Draft National Policy Statement for National Networks, March 2023). It has been determined that HNRFI will result in a saving of approximately 83 million HGV miles annum. Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change. Environmental Statement - Chapter 18 - Energy and Climate Change (document reference 6.1.18, APP-127) sets out, irrespective of the benefits of the modal shift of freight, a methodology for understanding the carbon footprint of the scheme (including its construction, its energy consumption, its operational traffic) and associated mitigation measures. The scheme proposes to be Net Zero in construction with power requirements for its operation being largely generated on site using solar PV.</p>
<p>Grassland such as this area acts as a carbon sink. Building this interchange will increase the carbon footprint of the area massively as well as removing a natural carbon sink as suggested.</p>		<p>The site predominantly comprises land used in arable farming. It involves activities such as ploughing, planting, fertilising, and harvesting. While arable agriculture is used for growing crops, it does have a negative effects on the ability of the land to act as a carbon sink beyond a short period of crop yield. Any sequestration of CO2 into the ground via crop is reversed when soils are worked re-releasing CO2, and contributing to greenhouse gas emissions, excluding the emissions associated with the farming practices themselves.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>The proposed development will incorporate a significant amount of landscaping and tree planting which will remain more stable over the lifetime of the development for more consistent sequestration of CO2. However, due to the difficulty in quantifying such a benefit, this is excluded from the carbon footprint assessment described in Environmental Statement - Chapter 18 - Energy and Climate Change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127), as is any disbenefit associated with the existing undeveloped site due to its arable farming use.</p>
<p>The present proposal contains no information on net zero targets</p>		<p>As part of the Embodied Carbon Report (document reference: 6.2.18.2, APP-218) the Applicant has set a clear target to achieve net-zero carbon in construction.</p> <p>Within Table 18.22 of Environmental Statement - Chapter 18 - Energy and Climate Change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) a residual amount of carbon is assessed following implementation of a number of mitigation measures. This is a conservative assessment as it does not factor in the overarching benefit of the scheme contributing to a modal shift of freight from road to rail and is likely that further carbon reductions will be made through detailed design of various phases of the scheme. However, the assessment provides a worst case indication of a residual amount that would require off-setting to deliver Net Zero when fully built and operational. In selecting offsetting schemes, the Applicant will prioritise those that align with internationally recognised standards, such as the UK Green Building Councils of which the Applicant is a member. These schemes offer rigorous methodologies for calculating emissions reductions and have robust mechanisms to ensure the integrity and permanence of offset projects. Furthermore, The Applicant is committed to supporting projects within the UK to maximise local benefits and contribute to the country's sustainable development. By investing in UK-based offset projects, the Applicant aims to support initiatives that deliver broader environmental, social, and economic co-benefits to local communities.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>I don't believe this development will contribute sufficiently to help achieve the aim of cutting greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% by 2050</p>	<p>It is considered that "Rail transport has a crucial role to play in delivering significant reductions in pollution and congestion. Tonne for tonne, rail freight produces 70% less CO2 than road freight, up to fifteen times lower NOx emissions and nearly 90% lower PM10 emissions. It also has de-congestion benefits – depending on its load, each freight train can remove between 43 and 77 HGVs from the road." [para 2.37] (Draft National Policy Statement for National Networks, March 2023). It has been determined that HNRFI will result in a saving of approximately 83 million HGV miles per annum (Chapter 18 – Energy and Climate Change.) (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127).</p> <p>Chapter 18- Energy and Climate Change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) sets out mitigation to ensure that HNRFI minimises vulnerability and provides resilience to climate change . Headline commitments to limiting the effects of HNRFI on climate change include which includes a commitment to Net Zero in construction, as well as on site solar power generation.</p>
	<p>Would like to see the measurements of the current carbon collection of the site, the potential carbon collection of the site when used for agriculture and measurements of an apparently net carbon neutral site when HGV traffic, workforce traffic, gas power plant and other associated activities are taken into account. The current figures quoted for a net carbon neutral site are fictitious, whimsical and misleading</p>	<p>Chapter 18 (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) sets out the robust methodology for assessing the site's impact on GHGs and climate change. This includes an assessment of traffic emissions and other impacts and associated mitigation: Gas powered plant is not the energy strategy for the site which will be largely self sufficient with large scale on-site power generation from roof mounted solar PV. The site will deliver Net Zero in Construction under the UK Green Building Council Framework.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>No modelling or information on the gas fired plant</p>	<p>The HNRFI will include a new back-up 5MW CHP unit with an effective combined stack.</p> <p>Emissions data was provided for the proposed unit and model input information utilised in the assessment is detailed in Table 9.4 of the air quality ES Chapter (document reference 6.1.9, APP-118). The CHP unit is proposed for back-up purposes only, should the PV array fail or a shortage in Grid supply is identified.</p> <p>A detailed operational phase energy centre emissions assessment was undertaken using the dispersion model ADMS-5, to consider the impact of emissions associated with the proposed back-up CHP on local air quality (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118). The predicted concentrations of NO₂ with the proposed back-up CHP in operation are below the current relevant annual mean NO₂ air quality objective at all receptors considered in the assessment (document reference 6.1.9, APP-118). The emissions associated with the back-up CHP are not predicted to lead to any exceedances of the annual mean NO₂ air quality objective. The impact of the proposed back-up CHP on annual mean NO₂ concentrations is 'negligible' in accordance with IAQM and EPUK guidance, which is 'not significant' (document reference 6.1.9, APP-118).</p> <p>In addition, a sensitivity test was undertaken to consider the impact of an abnormal load, where the CHP plant was operated for 30% of the hours in a calendar year.</p> <p>Requirement 29 controls the use of the back-up CHP to no more than 30% of the hours in a calendar year.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>If buildings of this size are necessary and justified, would it be possible for the builders/investors to make the huge roofing areas and some south facing walls, solar farms?</p>	<p>Solar PV will be installed on 100% of the useable roof space of the logistics buildings. It is limited only by the available roof areas, with areas also being provided for rooflights. The PV provision exceeds the areas required by BREEAM Excellent by a factor of several times. Any residual energy will be stored in batteries for times when generation is low.</p> <p>The energy infrastructure design approach is inherently future-proofed, being adaptable to facilitate energy sharing across the site using a site-wide microgrid and provision for a heat main and the deployment of technologies that are currently unproven or uneconomic, such as large-scale electricity storage.</p>
	<p>This development is encouraging more climate damaging imports</p>	<p>The UK does not produce all of the goods that it requires and therefore there is need to import goods. Government policy has sought to make the movement of goods as sustainable as possible by promoting the movement from road to rail.</p> <p>These proposals are in response to the Governments policy to deliver 'Nationally Significant' rail infrastructure projects. In May 2015 the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP) published Logistics & Distribution Sector Growth Action Plan 6 which states on page 16 under the heading Rail Interchange:</p> <p>'The LLSDDS researched the baseline position, key challenges and plans for growth within the LLEP area and established that the development of new, commercially attractive sites directly served by rail is of upmost importance for Leicestershire to remain one of the strategic locations for Logistics and Distribution. Currently Leicester and Leicestershire remain the 'location of choice' for national distribution centres (NDCs) and regional distribution centres (RDCs) with an estimated 7:3 ratio between the two. This ratio is significant as it demonstrates that the Southeast Midlands, of which Leicestershire is part, is a favoured location for national</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		distribution operations due to its central location and that a driver can take inbound and / or outbound cargo from both deep-sea and Dover Straits ports within a shift' (original emphasis).
Utilities		
Question whether there is enough electrical infrastructure in place to support the development		Adequate electrical infrastructure can be provided and will be supplemented by the on-site renewable energy.
Other		
Want to understand the impact on my horse I keep at Langton Farm The equestrian area will be heavily disrupted		<p>The operation of Langton Farm is not proposed to be altered as a result of the development.</p> <p>As shown on the Public Rights of Way Strategy, Figure 11.14 (document reference: 6.2.11.4, APP-194), while some existing routes would be stopped up as a result of the proposed development, there would be new bridleways created connecting to the local network.</p> <p>The effect of HNRFI on adjacent equestrian businesses and horse riders has been assessed in paragraphs 7.261-7.267 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116) with minor adverse effects anticipated on both receptors.</p>
Poor consultation staff and materials, leading consultation form, insufficient hard copies		Staff at the consultation events made best endeavours to engage with attendees to assist in explaining the proposals. Detailed information boards as well as hard copies of the community explanation document were available at the events. The consultation form asked closed

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>questions as well as allowing respondents to provide comments. At one event unfortunately a number of hard copies of the questionnaire were removed by an attendee. Attendees were advised how they could complete the questionnaire online and paper and pens were provided to those who wished to provide a written copy of their responses at the event.</p>
	<p>We don't know whether the proposed site is intended to handle hazardous materials, or other materials that have the potential to cause damage to the local environment.</p>	<p>It is not proposed that the site would handle hazardous materials or other materials that have the potential to cause damage to the local environment.</p>
<p>Soils and Ground</p>		
	<p>The soil from this development should not be removed off site as this would cause major transport problems and mess the road during this operation.</p>	<p>Cut and fill calculations have sought to minimise the need for off-site movement of soil. Calculations of construction traffic have been based on best estimates from similar SRFI sites. The applicant has sought to identify a worst case when infrastructure and site activities coincide within the first two years of construction.</p>
	<p><u>Gazeley UK Limited (GLP) (Gazeley UK Limited (GLP))</u></p> <p>Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (the Project). This relevant representation is submitted by Gazeley UK Limited, part of the GLP group (GLP), in respect of the Project which will require the acquisition of</p>	<p>As explained in the Applicant's Updated Responses to the ExA's Initial Commentary on Drafting of dDCO (question 22) (Appendix C to the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions) (document reference: [18.1.3]), this helpful clarification from Gazeley in relation to the Cross in Hand roundabout has been addressed through an update to the DCO (document reference: 3.1A) and highway plans (document reference: 2.4H) submitted on 11 September 2023 confirming</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>GLP's land and/or rights at A5/A4303/Lutterworth Road/Coal Pit Lane Junction (Cross in Hand). GLP is also the owner of Magna Park Lutterworth which incorporates developments known as Magna Park North and Magna Park South. GLP have two observations on the transport assessment submitted with the Project. These are set out in further detail below.</p> <p>1. Improvement works to the A5/A4303/Lutterworth Road/Coal Pit Lane Junction (Cross in Hand) The Transport Assessment and Highways Plans Sheet 8 of 8 (Document 2.4H Sheet 8D) states the improvements to the Cross in Hand Roundabout will be delivered by GLP as part of the Magna Park Lutterworth development. This is not correct. Had Magna Park South been delivered in isolation then there would have been a requirement to make some minor improvements at the junction. Highways England in their attached response dated 24 October 2017 confirmed that should GLP deliver Magna Park North and the new roundabout on the A5 this would avoid the need for any improvements at the Cross in Hand roundabout. GLP are currently</p>	<p>that the Applicant will undertake the proposed works at the Cross in Hand, which were previously identified for third-party delivery.</p> <p>In terms of Gibbett Lane roundabout, the existing junction and NH 2019 design proposals for signalisation (taken from the Lutterworth East application for which a funding contribution was being sought) were both tested. The existing model (indicated in Table 8-28) shows an impact on Gibbett Lane and the A5. Further test using the signalised layout as shown Figure 8-2 (Table 8-29), which was proposed by National Highways, indicated a minor improvement in practical reserve capacity across all arms above the future baseline. Paragraph 8-99 states “the proposed development and infrastructure would have a small beneficial impact on the operation of the junction” for the signalled layout, not a marginal reduction in traffic flows.</p> <p>The signalised layout as mentioned above was under design by National Highways in the pre submission stages that had incorporated the signal layout as modelled in Table 8.29 and the further mitigation works for the Lutterworth East development. We were advised by National Highways that the Lutterworth East off site works could not be guaranteed at the time of the uncertainty log v8 being signed off and therefore the Lutterworth East works were removed from all modelling.</p> <p>NH confirmed in a meeting on the 24th of July 2023 that the NH signalised design proposals were no longer being taken forward in that form as they were not suitable for future growth and they have improved designs and were seeking funding.</p> <p>With this in mind, we are currently reviewing the existing priority roundabout to determine whether any mitigation is required to inform any funding requested.</p>

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>delivering both Magna Park North and South and the new roundabout on the A5 has been implemented. It is therefore unclear how any future mitigation to the Cross in Hand Roundabout will be funded given it will not be GLP providing these improvements. 2. Gibbet Lane A5 / A426 Junction The transport assessment reviewed the impact of the Project on Gibbet Lane Junction. The results showed a negligible impact at Gibbet Lane Junction as it was operating over capacity. The results did, however, show a detrimental impact at Gibbet Lane Junction taking into account the Ratio of Flow to capacity (RFC) figures for 'Without Development' and 'With Development'. Please see Table 8-28 Junction 26 LINSIG Capacity Assessments. GLP are therefore concerned that the capacity assessment of the existing layout at Gibbet Lane Junction indicates the Project will have a detrimental impact on the junction, but no mitigation is proposed. GLP also note the modelling summary indicates a modest increase in traffic at Cross in Hand Roundabout as a result of the Project, but a marginal reduction at Gibbet Lane Junction which seems unrealistic</p>	

Theme	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>based on the information in the transport assessment. Accordingly, GLP registers as an Interested Party and requests to be kept informed of the Examination milestones. GLP would also welcome engagement from the Applicant in relation to the above matters.</p>	