

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Development Consent Order

Project reference TR050007

Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [Part 3 of 4 LCC]

Document reference: 18.4

Revision: 01

24 October 2023

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
Regulation 5(2)(q)

Leicestershire County Council (LCC)

This document provides the Applicant’s response to the points raised in the Local Impact Report prepared and submitted by Leicestershire County Council (LCC) at Deadline 1 and subsequently published by PINS. The matter raised is summarised and the Applicant’s response is then provided in the following table. It is noted that LCC raise matters that have previously been addressed. In the interests of assisting the ExA undertake the Examination of the Application efficiently, where the same or similar points are raised in multiple instances, the Applicant does not repeat the same response. Where the same point has been made in previous submissions, e.g. Relevant Representations, the Applicant refers back to its previous responses, rather than repeating these again here (document reference 18.2).

<u>Response Number</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>Applicants Response</u>
	Access Infrastructure	
1	<p>LCC notes that there is a discontinuous 3m footway/cycleway requiring pedestrians and cyclists to continually cross the road, not always with designated crossing provision.</p> <p>LCC notes that APP-011 does appear to include for a pegasus crossing and a toucan crossing but questions how these facilities link with footway/cycleway provision. LCC notes that the drawing does not include for connections to existing provision on the B4668 Leicester Road, creating gaps in pedestrian and cycle provision for employees drawn from the villages of Barwell, Earl Shilton and Elmesthorpe.</p>	<p>The Applicant has requested meetings to discuss Design specific items on the LCC highway, including those raised here, on numerous occasions, most recently by email on 13/10/23.</p> <p>It is correct that there are 3m wide footway/cycleways along the length of the A47 link road with a pegasus crossing proposed at the southern end to provide a crossing point for the diverted bridleway and a toucan crossing provided in the vicinity of the bus stop proposed on the link road (document reference 2.2D, APP-011). The footway/cycleway provision links with the existing shared footway/cycleway on the northern side of the B4668 (with a connection between existing and proposed facilities noted on 2.2A, APP-008). An uncontrolled crossing point is provided at the splitter island to the west of the proposed roundabout on the B4668.</p>

<u>Response Number</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>Applicants Response</u>
		<p>In order to demonstrate the pedestrian and cycle provision more clearly, the applicant proposes to produce a series of larger scale plans for consultation with the Local Highway Authority’s design team for Deadline 3. The same information can be seen by zooming in on the pdf versions previously supplied.</p>
2	<p>LCC states that the proposed design as shown on APP-011 does not appear to include any improvements to walking and cycling provision or any safe controlled crossing points across the existing and proposed slip roads.</p> <p>In addition, LCC state that there are no walking and cycling improvements included to the west to encourage employees from Hinckley and Burbage to walk or cycle to the site.</p>	<p>Discussed with LCC on 13/10/23 for review on linkages over Junction 2.</p> <p>As part of the works to the J2 roundabout it is proposed to incorporate improved crossing points over the existing north facing slip roads and general footway improvements to the J2 circulatory. These improvements are listed as opportunities 10 and 11 in the WCHAR assessment report (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-154), and the revised footways including links from J2 to the A47 link road are shown on the highway plans (document reference: 2.2D, APP-011). In order to demonstrate the pedestrian and cycle provision more clearly, the applicant proposes to produce a series of larger scale plans for consultation with the Local Highway Authority’s design team.</p> <p>As there is no footway or cycleway provision on the south side of the junction at present and no connecting walking or cycling route along the south side of the B4669, there are no proposals to provide crossing facilities over the new slip roads.</p>

	Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data	
3	LCC state that the appraisal of PIC in the Transport Assessment (APP-138) appears incomplete and does not appear to inform the access and mitigation strategy, especially for vulnerable users.	Additional PIC reporting shared with LHAs wc 16/10/23 and submitted at Deadline 2 (document reference: 6.2.8.1B)
	Strategic modelling	
4	LCC questions discrepancies in job numbers quoted in Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects document (APP-116) states at paragraph 7.223. LCC states that these bring in to question the validity of the submitted transport evidence and consequent environmental assessment parameters under the Rochdale Envelope.	The Applicant explained at the Preliminary Meeting (PM) that these figures were internally consistent. There are no discrepancies and the assessment parameters under the Rochdale envelope are robust. LCC were present at the PM. [Post hearing submission ISH1 and CAH1 Appendix A Employee numbers and trip generation note (document reference: 18.1.1, REP1-018). d
5	LCC note that TWG were not made aware that the development proposals were to include a lorry park to the west of the proposed A47 link road. The IP states that the lorry park and its associated traffic movements did not form part of the strategic or local modelling exercise as can be seen from the agreed Forecast Modelling Brief (APP-145). LCC therefore questions the comparability of the 5 sites on this basis, none of which appear to include for assessment of a lorry park.	The lorry park has been shown on masterplan drawings since prior to the Statutory Consultation and was formally consulted on as part of the Statutory Consultation January to April 2022 and was referenced in the PEIR document. The Applicant has advised LCC that there is no traffic generation associated with the lorry park. Its function is to allow HGVs to wait within the site to access the railport or unit at the appropriate time.
6	LCC notes that in October 2021, LCC LHA formally signed off version 8 of the uncertainty log (APP148). LCC notes that in March 2023 it was resolved to grant planning permission to a significant employment development, This Padge Hall Farm (21/01191/HYB), which takes access directly	To be discussed further with LHAs. Uncertainty Log v8 was signed off at the time of modelling. A sensitivity test using National Highways VISSIM is likely.

	<p>from the A5 at Hinckley and has not been considered as committed.</p> <p>LCC notes that this development is fundamental for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation strategy includes for the lowering of the A5 under the Nutts Lane railway bridge. Once delivered, this will allow high sided HGV traffic to use this section of the A5. During the Padge Hall Farm application process it was identified that this could increase HGV traffic on this stretch of the A5 by as much as 20%. This additional HGV traffic has not been accounted for in the modelling exercise. • Mitigation at the A5 Longshoot/Dodwells junction (part of the LCC, NH and WCC network). This has not been accounted for in either the strategic or local modelling. • Development is assessed to have an impact at M69 J1 (in addition to attracting high sided HGVs to the A5) that has also not been accounted for in either the strategic or local modelling. 	<p>Padge Hall Farm was approved post submission of the HNRFI DCO and is still subject to S106 sign off.</p> <p>The PRTM model cannot differentiate between high-sided vehicles and lower. HGVs are standard sizes. The A47 link Road was intended to provide an alternative route for high sided HGVs to avoid Nutts Lane Bridge.</p> <p>Protocol was not established prior to submission, or it wasn't communicated by NH. PRTM 2.2 was a re-run of the modelling precisely because the 2.1 version required RIS schemes in this location to be removed, further delaying the agreement process.</p>
7	<p>LCC notes that the HGV Route Management and Strategy document (APP-362) was developed after the trip distribution (APP-142) and Forecast Modelling brief (APP-145) were agreed. Hence, LCC notes that the modelling does not take account of the HGV Route Management and Strategy. LCC concludes to state that the strategic impact of the HGV Route Management Strategy remains unknown and is not reflected in either the strategic or local model outputs.</p>	<p>This is an 'undesirable' route within the HGV routing strategy which has been agreed to be clarified in the next iteration of the HGV routing strategy to be submitted at Deadline 3. It is not restricted.</p>

	Strategic model outputs	
8	LCC notes that the strategic model outputs as presented in the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138) and the Forecast Modelling (APP-148) assess three different scenarios: “without development”, “without development with scheme” (i.e. access infrastructure), and “with development”. LCC states that the access infrastructure would only be delivered in a scenario that includes the on-site development proposals, the true impact of the development can only be identified by comparing the “without development” to the “with development” scenarios.	Noted. The ‘with infrastructure without development’ scenario was agreed with LCC to enable isolation of the effects of the new infrastructure on background traffic, which is significant. All the assessment work has been done on the ‘without development’ and ‘with development’ scenarios.
	LCC reviewed the strategic model outputs and raised the following comments in August 2022:	
9	The significant and detrimental impact on the LRN brought about by development impact and congestion at M1 J21/M69 J3.	This is addressed within Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1A, REP1-011) and previous meetings with NH and LCC. It remains an area of disagreement.
10	The modelling outputs confirm LCC LHA understanding that M1 J21/M69 J3 operates significantly over capacity in the base and do minimum scenarios i.e., without development. The introduction of the proposed development of national importance at the adjacent M69 J2 understandably assigns a significant proportion of trips to the SRN.	This has been an existing problem on the network for a number of years. There have been no planned upgrades at the junction to address underlying capacity issues on the J21 roundabout itself.
11	The impact of this, on a network already exceeding capacity, is re-assignment of existing trips currently using the SRN onto the LRN. Consequently, the modelling only shows a limited impact on the M69 J2 to M1 J21/M69 J3. Indeed, Table 8-6 of the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138) suggests that in the am peak hour with development there will be a reduction in traffic using the M1 J21.	The LCC PRTM 2.2 model has been used throughout, and was fully agreed with the LCC team. It is a strategic assignment model which diverts traffic from areas of high congestion. The consequential diversion impacts on the LRN have been fully quantified and mitigation proposed where the development and proposed access infrastructure have a material impact.

12	LCC do not consider this output to be reasonable on the basis that all highway users do not benefit from perfect knowledge of the network, nor do all users make their preferred route choice based on distance and time i.e., some drivers will choose to use the SRN regardless of congestion, as this is a preferred route compared to less suitable rural local roads.	The LCC PRTM model was agreed to be the most appropriate future forecast model to understand impacts on the wider network. It has been used on multiple large scale strategic projects. The outputs are the best idea of future impacts and adhere to DfT TAG protocols.
13	This modelling information was provided to the TWG in more detail than appears to have been formally submitted with the application, including zoomable volume/capacity plots which cover the entire Aol of the development.	Following a meeting with LCC on 13/10/23 it was agreed that extracts from the zoomable outputs be shared at Deadline 3. The file sizes for the documents are extremely large, hence will not be submitted in their entirety.
14	LCC LHA, NH and WCC suggested that the development be modelled in an unconstrained scenario to establish exactly what development traffic would use the M69 J2 to M1 J21/M69 J3 if it wasn't constrained in its capacity. Following this unconstrained assessment, a true picture of actual demand could be established and an associated scheme of mitigation designed to accommodate the identified development demand i.e., only mitigate against the impact of the development, not address an existing problem.	The modelling of an unconstrained network defeats the purpose of modelling the junction in the assignment model in the first place. It represents a hypothetical scenario in which impacts of the development are not mapped onto real world congestion and infrastructure limitations. The existing constraints at J21 are very specific to the underbridges of the M1 which limit capacity to expand. Such an expansion would be a very significant undertaking for any single project and disproportionate to the forecast impacts of HNRFI.
15	LCC LHA went on to advise that this mitigation scheme could then be included in a "with mitigation" model run. This would demonstrate if the traffic displaced onto the LRN as a consequence of the existing capacity constraints at M1 J21/M69 J3 could be attracted back to the SRN in line with the NPSNN paragraph 5.213.	The impact on the LRN and the subsequent mitigation is based on diverted traffic and is a worst case. What is not noted by LCC is that traffic congestion is significantly relieved around Hinckley and new infrastructure does pull traffic away from the LRN to SRN. This is most evident south of M69 Junction 2.
	BWB acknowledged that this modelling could be undertaken but declined to carry out the exercise.	

16	<p>The proposed access infrastructure operates over capacity upon implementation. For example, the new link road access roundabout junction with the B4668 Leicester Road is predicted to operate over capacity in the 2036 with development scenarios in both the am and pm peak. This can be seen in Figure 3.19 and Figure 3.21 of the Forecast Modelling (APP-148).</p>	<p>This is not borne out by the capacity assessments shown in Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1A, REP1-011) Table 8-5 The Forecast modelling is used to provide initial flows with refinement through the capacity modelling.</p>
	<p>Sapcote village impact</p>	
17	<p>LCC notes that Two-way flows through Sapcote village appear to double on the B4669 Leicester Road, referring to Section 3.3 of the Forecast Modelling (APP-148).</p> <p>LCC notes that the TWG have been provided with a more detailed select link analysis of the village impact by BWB, although this information does not appear to form part of the formal submission. Therefore, LCC concludes that the severity of the impact cannot be identified</p>	<p>The select link analysis is included with the PRTM2.2 Forecasting Report Figure 3.12 The ES and TA has focused on the mitigation of increased traffic in Sapcote, which is primarily driven by local traffic as evidenced in the figures mentioned above. Further clarification on traffic flow figures will be submitted at Deadline 4</p>
18	<p>LCC noted that the B4669 is severely constrained in terms of its width in a number of locations, particularly between its junctions with Buckwell Road and Sharnford Road. LCC states that no further assessment of this sensitive part of the LRN has been undertaken.</p>	<p>Measures to address the existing layout at the junction of Church Street and Sharnford Road have been put forward to improve the definition of the highway edge, improve crossing facilities within the constraints of the highway boundary. This is significantly constrained by the presence of properties abutting the back of footway. Means of assessment are to be discussed further with LCC Highways.</p>
19	<p>LCC notes that the Forecast Modelling Brief in February 2021 (APP-145) included how the Aol of the development would be determined. The criteria are set out at Section 6 and follow an industry standard approach.</p>	<p>A more onerous criteria was used to assess the network and the impacts in the forecast future years. This included everything above 85% VoC, Change in VoC of 1% and Flow Change of 3%.</p>

	LCC notes at paragraph 7.39 of the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138) an alternative non-standard approach has been adopted.	This is compared with above 85% VoC, a change in VoC of 5% and more than 30 vehicles, which was featured in the brief agreed with LCC. This did not pick up the junctions expected for review.
20	LCC states that the combinations of criteria do not appear to have been consistently applied. They state that Twhere there is a development impact on the LRN it may not have been identified nor tested, and therefore the mitigation strategy identified may not be comprehensive.	The assessment criteria are more onerous than that within the Model Brief to cover junctions in more detail. 55 junctions were reviewed, which included the 45 recommended by LCC.
21	LCC states that it cannot conclude that significant impacts from the development on the transport network can be mitigated in line with the NPPF paragraph 110.	A consistency check has been applied and amended in the Deadline 1 submission Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1 A, REP1-011) (Revision 8)
22	LCC states that only 21 junctions have been assessed in detail at Table 8-10 in the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138). LCC also note that some junctions and arms have been incorrectly labelled and do not marry with the description in the Table.	The assessment criteria is more onerous than that within the Model Brief to cover junctions in more detail. 55 junctions were reviewed, which included the 45 recommended by LCC. The labelling has been amended in the Deadline 1 submission Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1A, REP1-011) (Revision 8)
	LCC notes the following junction specific errors:	
23	Junction 4: A5 Watling Street/A47 Longshoot and Junction 14: A5/B4666/A47 – The TWG have requested a VISSIM model assessment of this junction in line with the modelling protocol for the A5 as agreed by LCC LHA, NH and WCC	This has been amended in the Deadline 1 submission Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1A, REP1-011) (Revision 8)
24	Junction 5: Rugby Road/Brookside; Junction 9: A47/B582 Desford Road; Junction 30: A5/Higham Lane/Nuneaton Lane – all junction assessments missing from Transport Assessment	This has been amended in the Deadline 1 submission Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1A, REP1-011) (Revision 8)

25	<p>Junction 26: A5/A426/Gibbet Lane – the assumption in the Transport Assessment is in correct. NH do not have a committed scheme at this junction. Therefore, the impact of the development has been incorrectly modelled. In addition, BWB have been requested by LCC LHA, NH and WCC to model the junction in the NH VISSIM model. To date this modelling has not been provided.</p>	<p>Further meeting to discuss with NH, LCC, WCC arranged.</p> <p>The Applicant’s team had modelled a version of the junction included within planning documents and within the original VISSIM model. A further review had taken place on the existing layout.</p> <p>The VISSIM model covered an extensive area which the HNRFI scheme did not directly impact. The validation of multiple additional junctions was deemed excessive for the purposes of assessing the impact at Gibbet Lane. A Junctions 10 model and a LinSig model were performed to understand the capacity constraints.</p>
26	<p>Junction 38: New Road/Long Street/Broughton Road – the Transport Assessment identifies an unmitigated impact at this junction in the centre of the village of Stoney Stanton.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment provides summary information and narrative on this junction.</p>
27	<p>LCC note that despite requests from the HAs and LPAs no detailed VISSIM assessment of M1 J21/M69 J3 has been submitted, noting that it is fundamental to the safe and appropriate functioning of the LRN and SRN, and the development proposals as a whole. LCC notes that in November 2019 Hydrock acting on behalf of DB Symmetry carried out a scoping exercise for a VISSIM assessment of M1 J21/M69 J3 using an existing model.</p>	<p>A VISSIM of J21 is a significant undertaking, when PRTM outputs were received, a model of this size and complexity was not deemed appropriate for the impact the development has. The only previous mention of a VISSIM was in a TWG meeting (CHECK DATE), it was established then that the existing model was neither validated nor approved for use by NH.</p>

	Rail impacts and the LRN	
28	LCC states that the Narborough level crossing barrier down time (2.5 minutes in the pm peak) as detailed in Forecast Modelling Brief (APP-145) will have an impact on all users of the LRN and specifically pedestrians and cyclists who will face delays and difficulties navigating a stepped footbridge. Users with mobility issues are also noted.	This is incorrect. Up to ten trains per day each way will service the rail freight terminal and pass through Narborough Crossing. The ExA have asked for additional information based on current operations to confirm the barrier downtime at Narborough Crossing. The Applicant confirms that there will be additional downtime, as set out in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment Report part 16 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-154) and other users who are unable to use the footbridge would be expected to wait until it is safe to cross the railway.
29	LCC do not consider that the impact of the additional downtime on traffic has been adequately assessed. Reference is made to an assessment of this impact by adjustment of signal timings in PRTM. LCC refer to a VISSIM model of the crossing and local area and have suggested this be used by the Applicant. The IP notes that no mitigation proposals have been included within the application submission.	The VISSIM model held by LCC is out of date and for peak hours only. As established in the Transport Assessment, the peak hour impacts on barrier downtime are minimal and have been factored into the PRTM, which was signed off by the TWG.
30	LCC states that it remains unclear what impact the development proposals will have in respect of capacity on the rail network and wider aspirations to re-introduce passenger rail services between Coventry and Leicester reducing impacts on the LRN and SRN as promoted by Midlands Connect contrary to paragraph 5.213 of the NPSNN.	Network Rail have reviewed the rail capacity and confirmed there is capacity to operate the HNRFI proposed traffic in addition the proposed passenger enhancements. HNRFI can only operate a maximum of two trains an hour to the east; and a maximum of three trains an hour overall. There is therefore ample capacity to develop further passenger services. HNRFI will also not restrict the proposed freight movements in and out of Croft, at 3-4 per day.
31	LCC notes that the recent Government announcement regarding the curtailment of High Speed 2 at Birmingham and the introduction of Network North gives rise to questions as to whether there will	Capacity on the WCML south will benefit from the movement of fast passenger services onto HS2 as far as Handsacre. The Government announcement also committed to improving the

	<p>be sufficient capacity on the network to serve additional strategic rail freight As the NPSNN envisages (para 1.7): LCC states that this NPS sets out the Government's policy for development of the road and rail networks and strategic rail freight interchanges, taking into account the capacity and connectivity that will be delivered through HS2.</p>	<p>Trans-Pennine route which will accommodate freight. This will provide an alternative route from Felixstowe and London Gateway to Manchester and Scotland, via the ECML at Peterborough. This will reduce demand for movements through Leicester to Nuneaton as well as the WCML going north.</p> <p>The freight and the passenger industry are engaged with the DfT and Government to see investment in solutions that will ensure there is adequate connectivity between the North and the Midlands, as well as to and from the major deep-sea ports, required for global connectivity. HS2 2a and 2b would not have provided additional capacity south of Manchester until c2041.</p> <p>Releasing HS2 funding to enhance the national rail network to achieve growth sooner is clearly a policy decision covering both freight and passenger services, not one to the exclusion of the other. The investment in Ely on the Felixstowe to the Midlands and the North is clear evidence of the Government's intent to see rail freight grow.</p>
32	<p>LCC notes that new proposals for the East Midlands include increased rail capacity by increasing the number of trains between Birmingham and Leicester from two to four per hour (which will itself increase the amount that Narborough crossing is closed).</p>	<p>See Rule 17 letter response (document reference: REP1-002)</p>

	Mitigation strategy and proposals	
33	<p>LCC states that of the 54 junctions considered within the Transport Assessment (APP-138), the Applicant is proposing schemes of mitigation at six junctions on the LRN and one junction on the SRN.</p> <p>LCC notes their disagreement with the Applicant’s approach to mitigation and states that the scheme should mitigate its impacts on M1 J21/M69 J3 referring again to an absence of modelling data. LCC notes that the focus of mitigation appears to be on road infrastructure, and not on sustainable access and transport, contrary to the NPPF paragraphs 104, 110 and 112 and NPSNN paragraph 5.213.</p>	<p>See previous response on M1 J21 M69 J3.</p> <p>Sustainable transport provision is considered in the application and a strategy has been submitted with the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The nature of the site requires significant infrastructure upgrades in the form of southern slip roads and a link road at M69 Junction 2 to enable development and background traffic to better use the SRN which accords with NPSNN.</p>
34	<p>LCC refers to paragraph 8.23 of the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138), this position is accepted but suggests that the traffic that is displaced is local traffic. LCC argues that this is not the case as demonstrated in the Forecast Modelling (APP-148). LCC notes that local displacement is not supported by select link analysis outputs from PRTM which would identify the origin and destination of these trips.</p>	<p>There is a significant displacement of LRN traffic to the SRN as evidenced in the figures quoted from (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-138). These are primarily to the south of junction 2 as demand for the route is satisfied by the new slip roads. To the north congestion leads to constraints at M1 J21 M69 J3 though Table 8.6 has the absolute figures for the increases forecast. These are more evident for HGVs than general traffic.</p>
35	<p>LCC reports that the details of the off-site mitigation proposals are shown on Highways Plans (APP028 and APP-029). LCC notes that the drawings have been supplied at such a scale (1:2500) that makes design checking extremely difficult and not in line with the basic requirements as set out in the LHDG.</p>	<p>As agreed in a meeting with LCC on 12/10/23 larger scale plans will be provided at Deadline 3.</p>
36	<p>LCC states that basic design information appears to be missing from the submission including topographical surveys, vehicle tracking, highway boundary information, signal equipment etc. LCC states that they are unclear if this package of mitigation can</p>	<p>The highway plans that we have provided are in line with other DCOs which were provided on OS plans. Given that there are areas of private land, we are currently not able to undertake a full topographic survey in all areas (particularly Work No 17) but the</p>

	be delivered to adopted design standards within the constraints of the red line boundary.	<p>Applicant will provide a signage strategy for Work No. 17 to demonstrate our proposals and illustrate the reasoning behind the proposed land acquisitions.</p> <p>Vehicle Tracking is not always provided for Stage 1 RSA's, and have not previously been requested by LCC. However, these will be provided for the development accesses, link road and off-site mitigation.</p>
37	In the absence of a Stage 1 RSA and Designer's Response for any of the mitigation proposals, LCC states that they are unable to confirm that the proposals will be safe for all users and mitigate against the impacts of the development in accordance with the NPSNN paragraph 5.213 and paragraph 110 of the NPPF.	<p>RSA briefs yet to be agreed with LCC and NH. An interim RSA commissioned 13/10/23 with agreement to follow (no HA sign off). This is due to the LHAs refusing to agree the mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The Brief has been updated with note of the collision data TN, HGV tracking drawings, updated plans (TA) and provision of the Highway Works Plans and PROW plans for the auditor pack as well as a description of works on the diverted PROW.</p>
38	LCC states that due to the lack of basic design information, outstanding RSA's, queries on survey data etc, no detailed checks of the supporting junction capacity models have been undertaken.	Noted
39	LCC states that no strategic modelling of the mitigation proposals has been undertaken by the Applicant to demonstrate that the impact of the development will be mitigated, i.e., a modelling scenario of with development plus mitigation.	Mitigation is proposed based on the PRTM outputs and a further cycle of modelling is not planned.
40	LCC refers to the agreed uncertainty log included for a committed scheme at Junction 3: B4114 Coventry Road/B581 Broughton Road (Mill on the Soar) junction. LCC notes that despite the	The traffic associated with the committed development at Junction 3: B4114/B581 is accounted for within the agreed uncertainty log and therefore within the outputs of the PRTM

	<p>inclusion of this committed scheme in the strategic modelling, the outputs demonstrate that it would operate over capacity with the development.</p> <p>LCC does not understand why an alternative scheme of mitigation has been proposed that removes widening to the Coventry Road (east) arm of the junction on the basis that the development to which this committed scheme is attached is located on Coventry Road (east) and any traffic wishing to use the proposed development access infrastructure would continue to travel through this junction. LCC note that it is likely that additional traffic would be drawn through this junction as acknowledged in paragraph 5.104 of the Transport Assessment (APP-138).</p>	<p>model. As noted in the Transport Assessment (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-138) Table 8-14 the scheme shown on the highway plans fully mitigates the impact of the development at this junction. It is not the case that the outputs from the capacity modelling, when access infrastructure is included, show the junction operating over capacity. The Applicant is considering whether a revision to the DCO documentation is required to clarify the reference to the committed development's mitigation works.</p>
41	<p>LCC states that proposals for mitigation in the village of Sapcote do not appear to relate to the identified impact i.e., predicted doubling of vehicular traffic. LCC then notes that whilst it is proposed to control the routing of HGV traffic to/from the development, general HGV traffic will not be controlled and its impacts on the residents of Sapcote remain unknown.</p>	<p>Mitigation in Sapcote is to address perceived safety issues for pedestrians as identified through the ES. Traffic drawn through the village is primarily local as demonstrated in Figure XX of the Forecast Modelling Report. The B4669 is a fully metalled adopted highway with no weight restrictions, third party HGV traffic cannot be fully removed from this part of the network.</p>
42	<p>LCC notes that the proposals are limited to a gateway feature and associated road markings, a zebra crossing and associated relocation of a bus stop, and some seating and planters. LCC believes that no evidence appears to have been presented to suggest that there is a speeding issue to the east of the village to justify the proposed gateway feature.</p>	<p>The works proposed are intended to improve safety in the village and is based on significant feedback received through consultation.</p>
43	<p>LCC have stated that in the absence of a detailed drawing of a scale that can be checked, and a supporting RSA, it is not possible for LCC LHA to determine whether the proposed zebra crossing is deliverable. LCC note that based on local knowledge this is proposed to be in a part of the village with restricted forward</p>	<p>Large scale drawings to be provided at Deadline 3.</p>

	visibility from the east, heavy footfall, and in a location where available carriageway and footway widths are restricted.	
	HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy	
44	LCC state that the HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (APP362) has not been tested as it was produced following strategic modelling.	The HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy was submitted with the Application on 17 March 2023. This is a living plan/strategy which is also the subject of Requirement 19 of the dDCO. It is designed to manage and control HGV routing in consultation with LCC. It is effectively mitigation of the effects that were assessed through strategic modelling.
45	LCC notes that the “undesirable” routes identified in the Strategy have not been agreed with the HA’s, and this is acknowledged in paragraph 5.14 of the document. LCC refers to the term undesirable which suggests that routes can still be used by development HGV traffic. LCC reports that at paragraph 6.3 the Strategy states “a package of encouragement measures” will assist in formalising HGV movements and this does not provide assurance that HGV routeing to/from the site will be effectively monitored and enforced against a strict routeing plan.	There are clear restricted routes proposed within the plan, these are to be controlled with cameras and private enforcement measures controlled by site management staff. Undesirable routes are to be communicated by occupiers, but will not be proscribed.
46	LCC notes that the draft DCO (APP-085), contains a proposed Requirement to implement the HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (APP-362). LCC questions how the Strategy could be discharged as it acknowledges that it remains subject to further discussions and amendments. LCC notes that the Strategy uses phrases like “could”, “to be agreed”, “details of implementation will be subject to approval”.	Discussed on 12/10/23 to be updated with agreement as far as possible ahead of the decision notice.
47	LCC notes that monitoring and enforcement of the Strategy is intended to be included within tenancy agreements with future occupiers of the development, however, LCC argues that the only	This will be under the control of site management.

	control appears to be the loosely worded Requirement as set out above that relates to a Strategy under development.	
48	<p>LCC notes that the Strategy (paragraph 5.34) places onus on LCC and WCC to investigate breaches and reports that this is not something that has been discussed with the HAs. LCC is unclear what legal powers of investigation and enforcement the HAs hold, and no resource is proposed to be provided to assist. LCC notes that whilst the Strategy used at Redditch Gateway has frequently been referenced LCC has questioned deliverability, enforcement, implications in respect of GDPR, and the legality of ANPR cameras for private enforcement on the public highway.</p> <p>LCC notes that the Document does not provide these answers, nor does it appear to include for a robust, implementable, enforceable Strategy.</p>	The strategy focuses breaches on the site management and not LCC or WCC. GDPR requirements will be similar to the Redditch Gateway Scheme which is operational- details had been shared with LCC pre submission with limited legal comments received. The Strategy is to be developed further ahead of Deadline 4.
49	as set out at paragraph 8.5 of the Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (APP-159). LCC notes that there is no commitment in the DCO (APP-085) or the s106 Heads of Terms (APP-351) to a Travel Plan Coordinator post to support the Strategy. The Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (APP-159) states at paragraph 8.3 “the Site Wide Travel Plan Co-ordinator will be in post from the start of construction on the site for a period of 5 years after first occupation of the last unit occupied”, therefore LCC question how the Strategy will be co-ordinated and monitored in perpetuity.	This is to be amended to be in perpetuity as agreed in meeting on 12/10/23
	Public Rights of Way Strategy (PRoW)	
50	LCC believes that the development proposals will have a significant impact on PRoW both during construction and operation. LCC notes that there has been very limited	It is acknowledged that the proposed development would result in a change to the local network of footpaths. The proposals would provide new, safe routes including broad natural green

	engagement on PRow despite requests, documented through formal responses. LCC note that PRow has not been discussed at the TWG because of it being dealt with by a different consultant to the other highway and transport aspects of the scheme.	ways within which a shared use bridleway would be routed providing off-road access to Burbage Common and Country Park from Burbage Common Road North. Within the centre of the site permissive shared footpath/cycleways would be routed alongside the main internal road system within broad tree-lined avenues with verges.
51	<p>LCC notes that the Applicant team did approach LCC LHA in August 2023 to discuss the proposed Strategy (APP-192). LCC LHA advised the Applicant that there was no evidence submitted in the application to demonstrate that the PRow proposals are deliverable.</p> <p>LCC notes that APP-298 and APP-299 simply show coloured lines on a plan to indicate proposed PRow. LCC states that there appears to be no supporting evidence to demonstrate that PRow along these alignments are deliverable in accordance with the design requirements set out in the LHDG i.e. details of widths, surfacing, gradients, fencing etc. to demonstrate these routes would be safe and appropriate.</p>	The PRow Appraisal and Strategy is provided at Appendix 6.2.11.2. As per paragraph 1.98, <i>“Whilst there is a notable closure of routes within the Main HNRFI Site, loss of amenity on diverted routes, and reduced amenity, particularly during the construction period on PRow beyond the Order Limits, the overall PRow Strategy which includes a 22ha extension of IOS adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park is considered to provide a proportionate mitigation package.”</i>
	IP specific comments on the proposed strategy include:	
52	<i>PRoW - U52</i> No details have been provided within the application of the proposed A47 link road underpass making it unclear if this will provide sufficient clearance for equestrian users, and indeed how attractive this underpass may be to use. LCC note that from the submitted drawing (APP-022) it is also unclear given significant level differences if this PRow can connect to the A47 link road footway provision.	Details of the proposed development and associated footpath and bridleway links are to be confirmed at the detailed design stage.

53	<p><i>PRoW – V35/1</i> LCC have suggested that this PRoW could be stopped up inside of the red line boundary where duplicated by the proposed bridleway i.e., between M69 J2 and roundabout 3 as shown on APP-298. The Applicant disagrees on this point. Should the PRoW remain, LCC LHA is concerned that users will be channelled against acoustic barriers ranging in height from 4-6 metres as shown on APP-279.</p>	<p>The PRoW Appraisal and Strategy is provided at Appendix 11.2 (document reference: 6.2.11.2, APP-192). Table 1.4 provides an evaluation of the potential impacts during construction and Operation.</p>
54	<p><i>PRoW – U17</i> The proposed PRoW diversion in this location to facilitate removal of the existing level crossing as shown on APP-299 would take users on a route of approximately 440m compared to the existing 20m. The proposed route includes use of the existing footbridge to Thorney Fields Farm. LCC LHA have queried ownership and future maintenance of this structure. LCC states that no details have been provided, and in the absence of a risk assessment it remains unclear if this is a safe and appropriate alternative.</p>	<p>The PRoW Appraisal and Strategy is provided at Appendix 6.2.11.2. Table 1.4 provides an evaluation of the potential impacts during construction and Operation.</p>
55	<p><i>PRoW – T89/1</i> The proposed PRoW diversion in this location is shown on APP-299. The alternative provision to facilitate removal of the existing level crossing would direct users over the existing road bridge over the railway line on the B581 where the width of the existing footway is restricted. LCC notes that an RSA for the proposal has been requested and to date no response has been provided.</p>	<p>The PRoW Appraisal and Strategy is provided at Appendix 11.2 (document reference: 6.2.11.2, APP-192). Table 1.4 provides an evaluation of the potential impacts during construction and Operation.</p>
56	<p><i>PRoW – V23 & U50</i> LCC is unclear how the alternative provision for these routes will connect to the footway of the A47 link road given level differences between the PRoW, the link road, and considering the constraints of maintaining the existing private</p>	<p>The PRoW Appraisal and Strategy is provided at Appendix 11.2 6.2.11.2. Table 1.4 provides an evaluation of the potential impacts during construction and Operation.</p>

	access to Bridge Farm. LCC has requested details of this proposal, to date these have not been forthcoming.	
57	<p><i>PRoW – U8</i> The proposed PRoW diversion in this location is shown on APP-299. The alternative provision to facilitate removal of the existing level crossing includes for a new footbridge. However, LCC notes that no details of the footbridge design appear to have been provided in the application submission. LCC are therefore unclear if this footbridge will provide access for all users including those that are mobility impaired i.e., be ramped contrary to NPPF paragraph 112 (b). LCC argues that given reference to the construction of the footbridge in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-359) only refers to steps, it is assumed that unfortunately this is not the case.</p>	<p>The PRoW Appraisal and Strategy is provided at Appendix 6.2.11.2. Table 1.4 provides an evaluation of the potential impacts during construction and Operation.</p> <p>Detailed design information would be provided at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The bridge is proposed to be a Network</p>
58	LCC have have requested details of future maintenance of this structure, noting that this will not be adopted by LCC and Network Rail in their Relevant Representation to this application have stated the same. LCC states that as details of the structure have not been provided LCC remain unclear if the restricted access to this location as identified by the red line boundary will allow for the structure to be installed.	Maintenance information would be provided at the detailed design stage.
	Construction impacts	
59	<p>LCC notes limited details in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-359) and Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (APP-364).</p> <p>Specifically, LCC note that details of construction traffic routing and monitoring and enforcement are extremely limited, and details in respect of access from the LRN, haul roads, compounds,</p>	The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (APP-359) and the Construction Traffic Management Plan (APP-364) as noted within the documents will be further developed once the appointment of the ‘Principal Contractor’ (PC) for the project has been confirmed and a detailed construction programme has been developed.

	contractor parking, methods to prevent detritus being deposited on the public highway etc. have not been provided. Furthermore, LCC notes that limited details provided do not appear to cross-reference with the Illustrative Phasing and Works Plans (APP-050 – APP-055).	Details in respect of access from the LRN, haul roads, compounds, contractor parking, methods to prevent detritus being deposited on the public highway etc are included within the Access and Traffic Management section of the CEMP (document reference: 17.1, APP-359)
60	Whilst LCC accept that further information would be available following appointment of a Principal Contractor, commitments to providing this information are limited. For example, LCC can find no details of the proposed routeing of construction traffic with the exception of the construction of the M69 slip roads, and no commitment to this information being provided in either the DCO (APP-085) or the s106 Heads of Terms (APP-351).	As detailed within the Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference: 17.6 APP- 364) The site access to the main HNRFI site will be via main site access point off M69 Junction 2 and will utilise the existing direct access from the Strategic Road Network (SRN) M69 Junction 2 Slip Roads. Requirement 24 secures a detailed construction traffic management plan for each phase of the development.
61	LCC notes concerns regarding the proposal for routeing of construction traffic to construct the slip roads includes for U-turning HGV traffic at M1 J21/M69 J3. LCC notes that whilst the CTMP (APP364) states at paragraph 1.94 that it will be necessary to impose restrictions on construction movements in the network peak hours, there is no commitment to doing so. In support, LCC notes that requirement 16 at page 54 of the DCO (APP-085) states that construction works will take place between 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday with no reference to restrictions on peak hour movements. LCC is unclear what additional impact this U-turning construction traffic may have on	A further review of the comparison between construction and full operational flows is to be carried out ahead of Deadline 3.

	the displacement of traffic onto the LRN, or indeed any associated impacts on highway safety.	
62	LCC is unclear how the Applicant proposes to construct the A47 link road access and where construction vehicles are proposed to route. LCC note that no reference appears to have been made to construction traffic routing and management for the construction of off-site mitigation works.	As noted within The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (document reference: 17.1, APP-359) and the Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference: 17.6, APP-364) detail that the A47 Link Road will be built from the access from Junction 2 with a short-term temporary access acting as a haul road is to be provided off the B4668 for abutment works to the proposed new rail bridge and for the purposes of demolition of the existing Burbage Common Road rail bridge. This will be developed alongside the S278 works for the new access roundabout on the B4668. The haul road will be for the sole use of any development/infrastructure works to be carried out on the north side of the railway.
	Framework Site Wide Travel Plan and Sustainable Transport Strategy	
63	LCC notes that submitted Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (APP-159) appears to be very limited in content and lacks commitments to the measures identified, incentives to encourage modal shift, monitoring and penalties. LCC is unclear to how the modal shift target of 10% reduction in single occupancy car trips (paragraph 3.7) will be achieved.	Further detail is to be developed ahead of Deadline 4 as agreed with LCC 12/10/23
64	LCC argues that no improvements to the existing network to facilitate walking and cycling access are proposed, in clear contrast to the requirements set out in the NPPF paragraph 110.	Further detail is to be developed ahead of Deadline 4 as agreed with LCC 12/10/23

65	LCC note that some information in the documents appears to be out of date including reference to the Leicester City E-bike scheme which ceased in February 2023, In addition, there are other omissions e.g., reference to EV charging and parking.	Further detail is to be developed ahead of Deadline 4 as agreed with LCC 12/10/23
66	LCC notes that the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan (APP-153) includes for a Bus Strategy at section 7 and this relies on the X6 Leicester to Coventry service being diverted to serve the site. LCC notes that this service operates with limited stops outside of the City boundaries on a frequency and timetable not conducive to shift working patterns. LCC states that details of capacity of the existing service have not been provided and it is unclear if this service was utilised if single deck buses would need to be replaced with double deck buses. LCC further note that no discussions have taken place with the operator since April 2022	Further detail is to be developed ahead of Deadline 4 as agreed with LCC 12/10/23
67	LCC notes that the s106 Heads of Terms (APP-351) includes for a contribution of £500,000 to LCC for provision of the suggested diverted and enhanced service for a limited period of 5 years. LCC notes that this is not something that LCC LHA have requested. LCC notes that the service is limited so it should be stopped, it would provide little benefit to County residents. LCC refer the applicant to liaise with LCiC in this regard.	Further detail is to be developed ahead of Deadline 4 as agreed with LCC 12/10/23
68	LCC notes that the Bus Strategy relies on a Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) proposal for serving surrounding villages, a trial funded by the Department for Transport. LCC notes that funding for this service is due to expire in July 2025 i.e., in advance of the modelled opening year of the development of 2026 and there is no guarantee that the service will continue after this trial period	The DRT service funded by the development will be independent from the Trial. The DRT is proposed to align with working patterns providing a 'Many to One' style demand service to surrounding towns and villages under served by existing public transport.

	as has been the experience elsewhere in the County. LCC does not consider that DRT is the most effective provision for an employment site operating on fixed shift working patterns. LCC concludes to state that there appears to be no commitment to providing a DRT service in either the DCO (APP-085) or the s106 Heads of Terms (APP-351).	
69	LCC notes that no update to information on existing bus services as set out in paragraphs 4.20-4.29 of the Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (APP-159) appears to have been made since October 2022. LCC states that some of the services listed have seen timetable and/or routeing changes, and others have been subsequently withdrawn and cannot be relied upon.	Further detail is to be developed ahead of Deadline 4 as agreed with LCC 12/10/23
70	LCC states that a sensitivity test of the proposed modal split based on employee origins identified by a gravity model assessment will require the Applicant to re-consider the appropriateness of the proposed Bus Strategy to ensure that it meets the needs of prospective future employees and the policies as set out in the NPSNN paragraph 5.205 and NPPF paragraph 110.	Further detail is to be developed ahead of Deadline 4 as agreed with LCC 12/10/23
	Public Health	
71	LCC refers to the Health and Equality Briefing note, appended to the Environmental Statement (APP-137) and notes the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCC notes that due to the size and nature of the development and location in close proximity to populations experiencing health inequalities is for a full standalone HIA is requested. Noting that a full HIA may have helped to identify potential negative health effects 	The LCC LIR covers Public Health in Section B of the LIR. LCC acknowledge how both a dedicated health chapter and standalone Health Impact Assessment (HIA) were scoped out, and acknowledge the Health and Equality Briefing Note to aid in signposting and communicating how and where health was inherently assessed and addressed through each of the technical disciplines during the DCO process. While they are generally supportive of this approach, the core issue is that a voluntary, non-regulatory required HIA was not undertaken, and it is

	<p>during the construction phase as well as identify potential health considerations for the operational phase of the project including impact on the use of Burbage Common and likely impacts on traffic flow and air quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCC notes that the Leicestershire 2022-2032 Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS) and the Leicestershire Health Inequalities Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA 2023) have not been considered in the assessment. LCC provided key local facts from these documents. • LCC note that a consultation with Aston Firs residents was undertaken by the Applicant but not included within the APP-137. • LCC notes potential impacts on the residents of Narborough and Littlethorpe due to the impact of the freight trains and increased barrier down time at Narborough Level Crossing (situated within Blaby District). LCC notes that the level crossing does not currently provide step-free access, therefore, making it inaccessible to people with disabilities or pushchairs. LCC also notes a risk of community severance and impact to local traffic flow. LCC notes that ambulance response between Narborough Ambulance Station to incidents in Littlethorpe and surrounding areas may be delayed and LCC notes that the study area included in APP-137 does not clearly include these areas. • LCC request that negligible impacts reported in ES Chapter 9 (Air quality) require ongoing monitoring. • LCC notes that the Community Fund identified for the project should be apportioned with direct input from the local community and informed by the JHWS and JSNA. 	<p>believed it may have yielded alternative assessment findings to the agreed scope of the regulatory assessment process.</p> <p>The LCC LIR does not however, provide a HIA of its own, does not indicate any gaps in the assessment, and does not present any evidence to question or contradict that already provided.</p> <p>The only additional items offered in the LCC LIR include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional health baseline extract from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, confirming and reinforcing that provided in the Health and Equality Briefing Note (Para 1.58-1.76 of Volume 2: Environmental Statement Appendix 7.1: Health and Equality Briefing Note) (document reference: 6.2.7.1, APP-137). • Commentary on vulnerable population groups and relative sensitivity, of which are addressed through each of the individual technical disciplines in their respective receptor sensitivity section to gauge significance as per EIA regulation. • Accessibility is raised as a health concern, particularly in relation to delay from rail crossing and community severance, of which, amongst other impacts, are already assessed and addressed in the transport assessment (Chapter 8 of the ES and the supporting appendices) (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117), and further assessed by Blaby District Council in their Deadline 1 Written Response (Appendix 4, Narborough Social, Health & Wellbeing Impact Report (Iceni)), that concludes:
--	--	--

<p>LCC notes that the following mitigation is sought from the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality, noise, dust and lighting are monitored on a regular and ongoing basis throughout construction and operation in locations resided by vulnerable groups and wider local communities to ensure air quality does not diminish, and noise, dust and lighting levels increase to unacceptable levels as advised by Environmental Health. • Financial support provided for GP support/ out-reach youth workers for children and young people in Earl Shilton and Barwell to help ensure health inequalities do not widen. • Active travel provision by foot or cycle to, from and across the site is enhanced for all identified vulnerable groups, with severance of existing routes avoided wherever possible. • Financial support to the Multi-Agency Traveller Unit (MATU, or successor) to assist with advice to the Gypsy and Travellers community at Aston Firs to help ensure health inequalities do not widen and they have a clear, trusted channel to express concerns. • Sufficient advance notification provided for local communities of forthcoming disruptions (including utilities) and diversions to lessen the impact on daily living. • Improvements to accessibility at Narborough Train Station step-free alternatives to crossing barrier to reduce disruption for disabled residents in accessing key services and local amenities. 	<p>“that the increased downtime of the barrier at Narborough Crossing is not considered to have an overall material impact on quality of life of residents”.</p> <p>Mitigation is requested, but none of the requests are supported by any evidence of a significant impact; or have already been addressed through the DCO, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of air, noise and lighting for vulnerable groups during both construction and operation to levels advised by Environmental Health have been requested. However, no significant impact has been identified by LCC, and vulnerable groups vary geographically and change over time. On this basis, the mitigation is not specific, is not supported, and devoid of a receptor. Should a significant residual impact be identified, appropriate mitigation would be justified. • Financial support is requested for GP support / out reach youth workers for children and young people and more generally to help close the existing inequality gap. This is not geared to any impact, directly attributable to what is proposed, where neither construction nor operation will change local health care. The area is a net exporter of construction staff, and will utilise local employment, and the development does not propose housing that might alter population net gain or alter health care demand. Instead the mitigation seeks to address existing barriers to socio-economic benefit uptake, of which given the significant socio-economic benefit the project would
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of impacts to traffic flow due to increased barrier downtime and work with the emergency services to ensure response time is not compromised as a result of more frequent barrier downtime. 	<p>deliver, it is agreed important and addressed within the socio-economic mitigation (Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange, Skills and Training Framework).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active travel provision is requested to improve physical activity. This is agreed, which is why it is included in Section 8.315 of Chapter 8 of the ES (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117) (Framework Travel Plan and Smarter Travel Measures). • Financial support to the Multi-Agency Traveller Unit (MATU) is requested to assist with advice to the Gypsy and Travellers community to help ensure existing health inequalities do not widen, but no evidence of an impact has been supported or even suggested for construction or operational activities. • Sufficient advanced notification has been requested for particularly disruptive construction activities. This is a reasonable and a fairly standard commitment in all DCO CEMP. • Step free crossing at the Narborough station to aid mobility impaired individuals has been requested. However the intermittent, temporary, short lived delay (2.5 minutes for each of the three additional crossings per
--	--	--

		<p>day) is not sufficient to result in any health impact or rationalise claims of community severance or inequality, and does not justify lift access that would likely take longer than the individual rail crossing event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analysis of the impacts to traffic flow due to increased barrier downtime is requested. Yet this is already included in Chapter 8 Transport Assessment, and no evidence has been presented to contradict or contest it. However, it should be noted that further evidence is to be presented in response to Rule 17 Letter. <p>In summary the LIR does not identify any assessment gaps, does not provide any new information that might contradict or challenge the DCO and does not provide a HIA with any evidence of a significant health impact.</p> <p>With regard to ‘blue light services’ including ambulance services, the standard practice for a level crossing if not alternatively routed by a control centre, would be to overtake queuing vehicles and wait at the barrier to be the first to cross on opening.</p>
	Net Zero / Sustainability	
	Key Environmental Policies and Commitments	
72	LCC outlined their Key Environmental Policies and Commitments to becoming a net zero council. LCC also notes that the Local Nature Recovery Strategy to ensure resilience to the effects of climate change.	Noted and commended

	Issues and Impacts	
73	<p>LCC has concerns over the impact of HNFRI on Leicestershire’s emissions. LCC cite that the Leicestershire baseline in 2019 demonstrates the county emits 4.87 MtCO₂e (million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalence), with transport contributing 40% of emissions. LCC notes that the development of HNFRI, adds almost 5% of emissions to the county’s territorial emissions – that would otherwise not have existed (due to growth of logistics) or have occurred elsewhere in the UK via other means.</p> <p>LCC reports concerns over both the ongoing emissions associated with the site but also the emissions associated with its long-term construction, which in some instances have not been fully accounted for and mitigated against. LCC states that this has a negative impact upon the council’s net zero commitments and will increase the emissions associated with the transport sector, which is already the county’s biggest contributor and hardest to decarbonise.</p>	<p>GHG cannot be disaggregated to a local level as the atmosphere with respect to impacting on climate change is a single global receptor. The IEMA methodology set out in the ES uses the climate change committee (Dec 21) 6th Carbon budget as the benchmark for impact and relative to the carbon budget the impact is found to be non-significant.</p> <p>Table 18.22 of the ES Chapter for Energy and Climate change (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127), sets potential residual GHG emissions from the scheme. However it should be noted that this assessment of residual emissions has been carried out in a very conservative and precautionary manner and does not include for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The reduction of CO₂ from the modal shift in freight from road to rail (described as generating 76% less CO₂ from freight in DoT 2016 Rail Freight Strategy) - The likely increase in grid supply from renewable sources over the lifetime of the development. - The likely reduction in emissions from newer operational vehicle technology over the life time of the development. - The likely electrification of rail and/or CO₂ improvements to engine technology over the life time of the development. <p>This conservative approach to the assessment is reasonable for the outline nature of the application. We would expect to refine the assessment and improve on residual emissions through the production of GHG reduction plans (para 18.290) as each phase of development progresses to detailed design.</p>

74	LCC states that where HNRFI could have a positive impact on Leicestershire net zero journey, for example local on-site solar power generation and low carbon heating solutions (e.g., ground source heat pumps), these have not been maximised for their potential that could help support Leicestershire’s ambitions and the local area and communities.	100% of the available roof space has been applied to the site’s PV generation capacity. This together with battery storage, air source heat pumps form the basis of the power and heat demand for the site in normal operation. Resilience features are proposed in the scheme such as a grid connection for adverse peaks in demand and a CHP for emergency backup in the event of a failure.
75	LCC states that where the development looks to offset emissions, Leicestershire people and communities are not currently set to necessarily benefit due to prioritising UK offsetting projects and not those local to the development. LCC strongly recommends reducing emissions as far as possible at their source in the first instance, where offsetting is used, this would have a greater benefit to locals impacted by the development or take place within the county boundary to help contribute to Leicestershire net zero ambitions through Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry carbon sequestration.	It is acknowledged that some contribution to an off-setting scheme may be required if at detailed design residual emissions cannot be fully mitigated at source. All options should be considered, but we concur that a county scheme that enhanced the local environment would maximise the community/amenity benefits to the area.
76	LCC notes a need for the site to implement adaptation measure to help combat the effects of rising temperatures and heatwaves in locations that would be most affected, such as office locations. LCC reports that without this adaptation, Leicestershire people and businesses operating within the site could be at greater risk to climate change impacts associated with overheating and heat stress	We agree that the effects of climate change are real and we increasingly need to incorporate resilience and adaptation considerations into our development designs. The ES and appendix 18.8 (document reference: 6.2.18.8, APP-224) considered typical mitigation measures for climate resilience. More detailed specification of such measures will form part of subsequent design stages as each phase of development comes forward.

	Flood Risk	
77	LCC notes that this topic is considered by chapter 14 of the ES (Surface water and Flood Risk) and 3.1 3.1 HNRFI Draft Development Consent Order and in its role as LLFA, is satisfied that the works proposed are sufficient to mitigate any surface water run-off and can be discharged as set out in the DCO.	Noted and agreed
	Economy	
78	LCC notes that there is potential for the creation of a large number of jobs in the delivery of the scheme and in personnel required by end users, but also in the opportunities provided to the local supply chain for related goods and services.	Noted and agreed.
79	LCC notes that whilst there is potential for significant benefit for the local economy through employment opportunities, skills development and the supply of goods and services, as outlined below, the application does not give sufficient detail or clarity to provide reassurance that the local community will be able to fully capitalise on these opportunities.	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed of the draft SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.
	Employment	
80	LCC notes that the ES estimates 4,611 construction jobs (direct employment) will be generated over the 10-year build period, but does not profile the volumes over this period, nor the particular skills required at each stage, instead using an average figure of 461 jobs per annum. LCC then states that this does not enable local agencies to consider availability of skilled personnel at periods of peak activity or to put in place programmes (such as retraining of ex forces personnel or a tailored inward investment campaign) to meet likely requirements through local resources.	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed of the draft SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.

81	LCC notes that following completion, onsite employment is estimated to be between 8,400 and 10,400 workers once the site is fully occupied. LCC states that the range given is dependent on employment density levels (between 95 sqm and 77 sqm) based on predicted occupational split, However, it is noted that alternative employment figures of 8,000 workers are forecast in relation to traffic impacts and that the Applicant has been asked to provide additional clarification in this respect by the Examining Authority.	Further clarity has been provided in 18.1.1 Post Hearing Submission ISH1 and CAH1 [Appendix A Employee Numbers and Trip Generation Note] (document reference: 18.1.1, REP1-018)
82	LCC noted benefits associated with the investment in construction. Namely, the generation of considerable expenditure on construction materials, goods and other services that will be purchased from a wide range of suppliers. LCC note that this expenditure has far-ranging benefits both locally and further afield, as it filters down the construction supply chain and generates indirect effects. LCC confirms that employees working in construction of the Proposed Development will also spend their wages on goods and services, generating induced effects.	Noted and agreed.
83	LCC notes that these factors collectively amplify the initial investment in the proposed development, with an economic multiplier effect resulting in linked benefits in terms of expenditure on goods and services locally. LCC state that this will bring indirect employment and financial benefits for local individuals and firms involved in skilled construction trades and associated professions and could help to sustain employment within this sector across the local and wider economy.	
84	LCC state that the relationship between employment, health and wellbeing also needs to be further considered. LCC note that there is recognition that access to skills and qualifications delivers	Response to this matter is provided in paragraph 2.5 of 18.1.1 Post Hearing Submission ISH1 and CAH1 [Appendix A Employee

	health benefits, with unemployment and a lack of stable employment in contrast frequently leading to poor health, increased stress, illness and a reduction in personal and social esteem. LCC state that as a consequence, the creation of new employment opportunities, during and post-construction can be further considered beneficial to the local population.	Numbers and Trip Generation Note] (document reference: 18.1.1, REP1-018) Yes, income and employment are key determinants of health that have a profound influence on wider determinants that influence social, mental and physical health. The relationship is well known, and the benefit in this instance communicated within the Socio-Economic Assessment Chapter, as well as the Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference: 6.2.7.1, APP-137)
85	LCC states that the development should also stimulate the demand for locally available housing which could be supported by the proposed Barwell and Earl Shilton Sustainable Urban Extensions.	Noted
86	LCC states that the number of people who are claiming Job Seeker Allowance and Universal Credit gives an indication of the potential number of people who may be able to fill any low skilled vacancies both during construction and once the units are occupied. LCC note that currently, there are approximately 2,900 out of work universal credit claimants living in Blaby and Hinckley & Bosworth districts, a declining number, but higher than pre-Covid levels.	Noted
	Skills	
87	LCC note that in terms of education, skills and training, over 6% of LSOA in Hinckley and Bosworth district fall within the most deprived 10% nationally. LCC note that people from these wards may be attracted to both construction and warehouse/manufacturing positions leading to financial and health benefits for individuals and their families.	Noted and agreed.

88	LCC state that the number and type of jobs that will be created during the construction phase is unclear noting that there is no breakdown between construction phases and operational sections of the proposed development. LCC note that this information is crucial to assess if those skills are available locally and if not, to work with local FE colleges to put on relevant courses. LCC further note that there could be many specialist skills required to deliver the infrastructure and the buildings, which could lead to the appointed contractors bringing in companies from outside the area, rather than capitalising on local opportunities.	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed of the draft LCC SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.
89	LCC notes that information provided to date contains no timeline for the Construction phase making it difficult to predict future needs and work with the local colleges, for example, – South Leicestershire College which has a specialist construction unit on the Harrowbrook Industrial Estate in Hinckley.	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed of the draft LCC SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.
	Skills and Training Plan	
90	LCC states that the application contains no training strategy again making it difficult to predict training requirements. LCC acknowledges that a skills/training plan is now being drafted, but notes that if a strategy had been submitted by the Applicant this would have given greater weight to the training plan and reinforced its need.	A skills and training strategy is being discussed with the Local Authorities through S106 discussions. A requirement for a skill and training strategy was included in the dDCO submitted as part of the application however the Local Authorities preference is to include this in the S106 and work up a detailed strategy.
91	LCC states that 0% leakage has been assumed in the proposal; this is unrealistic given the current low unemployment rates and number of people who are currently on benefits in the local area. LCC notes that it is improbable to assume all vacancies can be filled locally, especially as there are so many similar sites in the	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed in the draft BDC SoCG in the Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects section submitted at Deadline 2.

	surrounding area including Magna Park, Hinckley Park, New Lubbesthorpe, DIRFT2 to name but a few. LCC states that for the East Midlands Gateway, a very comparable 700 acre SRFI, 25 miles to the north of the proposed Hinckley development, 25% was used in calculations.	
92	LCC notes that there is the issue that some of the warehouses when complete will offer 24 hour a day 3 shift working patterns which will distort the number of FTE jobs created.	It is unclear how this will distort the number of FTE jobs created.
93	LCC notes that the study area adopted for construction employment has been defined as a 30km radius from the main order limits. LCC notes that a 30 minute drive time would be more representative of good practice, particularly given that a drive time and gravity model was used in the Transport Assessment (ES Vol 2, Appendix 8.1).	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed DBC SoCG Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.
94	LCC states that there is no mention of utilising the local supply chain which could provide materials for the groundwork element including the railhead, construction of the warehouse units and utilising local labour through both groundworks and construction phases. LCC notes that these need to be dealt with at the procurement/tendering stage including, if possible, a minimum percentage of people employed from within a specified radius or drive time.	Opportunities for the local supply chain is being addressed through the skills and training plan.
	Housing	
95	LCC states that the Annual Population Survey Data from 2022 indicates a slightly higher number of workers in the construction sector within the study area (52,300) than jobs in the sector (51,700) and from this it is estimated that the 740 net additional construction jobs are likely to be met by the local workforce,	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed DBC SoCG Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.

	therefore creating a neutral effect on housing demand. LCC states that the above figures indicate a tight margin for recruiting roles locally and take no account of the particular skill sets or trades required, nor is there any profiling of requirement over the construction period, but it can be assumed that there will be periods of more intense activity and therefore labour requirement.	
96	LCC note that projections, based on 2017 HEDNA, indicate that operational demand for labour may not be met by the local workforce and there would be additional housing demand. LCC notes that the more recent Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HENA, April 2022, updated June 2022) would have been a more appropriate source of data..	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed DBC SoCG Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.
97	LCC note that there is an established and effective strategic planning partnership in Leicester and Leicestershire (established in 2015) which seeks to work collaboratively to understand and advise on strategic planning issues. LCC notes that the partnership forms the key mechanism through which evidence is commissioned to inform strategic planning issues, through which a non-statutory long-term vision for growth to 2050 has been prepared (the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan) and helps to demonstrate the statutory Duty to Co-operate for authorities in Leicester and Leicestershire.	Noted and agreed
98	LCC notes that in December 2020 the Government introduced the 'Cities and Urban Areas Uplift' to the Standard Method which raised the City of Leicester's local housing need (and that of 19 other cities and urban areas across England) by 35%. LCC states that the difference between Leicester City's local housing need	Noted and agreed

	and supply generates an unmet need for Leicester City of approximately 18,700 dwellings to 2036.	
99	LCC notes that the HENA also includes a methodology for arriving at an interim distribution of unmet need across the rest of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA to 2036. LCC states that all seven districts and boroughs in Leicestershire have an upwards adjustment for the scale of housing which takes into account the functional relationship to Leicester, supporting employment distribution and adjustments to support deliverability. LCC further state that this resulted in the publication of the Leicester and Leicestershire SoCG relating to Housing and Employment Land Needs (June 2022), which to date has been agreed by the City Council, County Council and five of the seven district authorities. Harborough District Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council have still to formally consider the Leicester and Leicestershire SoCG.	Response to this matter is provided under the draft SoCG Matters not Agreed Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.
100	LCC notes that the figures in the Leicester and Leicestershire SoCG will be tested through the respective local plan-making processes and sustainability appraisals to ensure the scales of growth are achievable.	Noted
101	LCC note that should the HNRFI be granted consent local authorities in Leicester and Leicestershire would need to consider whether the level of housing provision in the longer term would need to be increased. This consideration is likely to be informed by further updated evidence and would inform housing provision post 2036.	Response to this matter is provided in Matters not Agreed of the draft SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.

102	<p>LCC note the issue of affordability has not been addressed and without more detail of worker profiles, it is difficult to accurately assess this issue. LCC state that for the construction phase, data shows that the average wage in the construction sector is £35,065, lower than the UK average of £36,191 (Lightcast Report, data from 2021). LCC further state that over the last 12 months, the average selling price for a property within a 10-mile radius of Hinckley was £267,391 (Rightmove, 7 August 2023) noting that this is significantly lower than the UK average house price of £372,812 (Rightmove, June 2023). LCC state that whilst this may suggest that local housing is likely to be affordable, this remains dependent on the availability of particular skill sets locally, rather than migrant workers living locally whilst also supporting a house and family elsewhere.</p>	<p>Response to this matter is provided under RR-0134 of 18.2 Applicants Response to Relevant Representations (document reference: 18.2, REP1-026).</p>
103	<p>LCC notes that locally, the East Midlands Gateway, is a 700 acre development with 4.5m sq ft of logistics accommodation and a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange and that the nearby village of Kegworth (population 4,290 – Population Census 2021) has seen an increase in HMO applications, with 10 in the last two years. LCC report that this creates issues around access to services, noise and availability of parking. Whilst the increase in HMO cannot be directly related to the new logistics facility, it is thought to be a factor.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
104	<p>LCC concludes that the HNRFI brings benefits to the local economy should the application be successful, however, it is requested that much greater detail regarding the construction phase timings and requirements are provided at the earliest opportunity, and a clear commitment from the Applicant to support local individuals, companies and communities to gain</p>	<p>These matters are addressed above.</p>

	maximum benefit from the development is required. LCC notes that this commitment must also be reflected in the contractual arrangements with the principal contractor to ensure positive ongoing engagement.	
	Planning Obligations	
105	<p>LCC seek a number of s106 obligations based on the information submitted in support of the application to date. LCC note the following list of s106 contributions (indicative and subject to review as further information is provided and the Examination progresses), but also note that this list is not definitive, making reference to the above comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee travel packs to inform of and advocate for sustainable travel options (one pack per employee. Indicative cost £52.85/pack, or applicant can elect to provide their own with a minimum £500 admin checking fee); • Employee bus passes (one 6-month bus pass per employee – approx. £360-£510/pass depending on the bus operator); • Travel plan monitoring fee (indicative cost £11,337.50); • Provision of a travel plan co-ordinator/s; • Sustainable travel offer – £500,000 contribution towards the X6 service a matter of discussion between Tritax and Leicester City Council. Further consideration of DRT/alternative provision is required to serve the development based on evidence of employee locations and consideration of shift working patterns 	Noted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traffic Regulation Order's – restrictions (maximum 3 roads) £8,756 per Order, speed limit changes £9,392 per Order• Construction traffic routeing – on the basis that construction traffic routeing does not currently appear in the CEMP requirement• Permanent HGV routeing – defining ANPR monitoring, enforcement, and reporting	
--	--	--