

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 Written Representations [Part 2 of 4 Local Planning Authorities]

Document reference: 18.3

Revision: 01

24 October 2023

Planning Act 2008

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

This document provides the Applicant’s response to the points raised in the Written Representations prepared and submitted by Blaby District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, Leicestershire County Council and Warwickshire County Council at Deadline 1 and subsequently published by PINS. The representation is summarised and the Applicant’s response is then provided in the following table. It is noted that a number of the parties raise matters that have previously been addressed, or are duplicated in the LIRs. 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 has sought not repeat the same response. As far as possible, 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). Inevitably some duplication remains.

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Impacts and Benefits		
Blaby District Council	The Interested Party (IPs) opposes the Proposed Development, asserting far-reaching adverse environmental and social impacts it would cause in the local area. Whilst the Proposed Development will have benefits in terms of employment during the construction and operational phase, the LIR notes a wide range of significant negative impacts upon the natural and built environment that will occur as a result of the proposals. These include significant impacts associated with the traffic generated by the Proposed Development and major adverse visual impacts.	The Environmental Statement acknowledges a range of effects, some of which are beneficial e.g. economic benefits, which, being of greater than local scale, could be described as far reaching, and relief of traffic and improvements in air quality in Hinckley. The ES does not characterise the local effects as far reaching. There are several Major to Minor residual adverse effects on landscape and visual impact, which is to be expected for this type of development. There are also some moderate adverse effects in terms of traffic and transport in places, largely landscape as a consequence of the redistribution of traffic due to the new A47 link road. The overall effect on traffic and transport is considered to be beneficial to neutral, as the shift from road to rail is beneficial and the new infrastructure mitigates effects and provides a betterment. Moderate and greater than moderate effects are termed significant in EIA terms. These must be weighed in the balance against the positive benefits of the Proposed Development. If they do not outweigh the positive benefits then the NPS directs that the application should be approved.

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Consultation		
Blaby District Council	The IPs considers there are significant flaws and omissions within the Applicant’s assessment of some of these impacts. Some of these flaws and omissions derive from the inadequate pre-application consultation and engagement carried out by the Applicant which involved incomplete information, vague proposals and a refusal to engage in meaningful dialogue with BDC on concerns raised during the pre-application stage. Had the information requested by BDC and other local authorities been provided when requested, a number of the issues that are detailed in this Written Representation may have been addressed prior to submission of the Application.	The Applicant has set out its pre-application consultation with the IPs in detail in the Transport Position Statement and the Consultation Report. Extensive consultation was carried out over two rounds of informal consultation and statutory consultation. The application was accepted by PINS for examination having met the adequacy of consultation.
Blaby District Council	Does not meet the government’s net zero expectations	<p>BDC in their WR states that HNRFI does not meet the government’s net zero expectations, however later in their WR BDC ‘commend’ the Applicant for their commitment to net zero in construction.</p> <p>The Proposed Development has been designed in accordance with a net zero pathway and, as a National Rail Freight Interchange, would result in a transfer of freight from road to rail supporting the governments path to net zero.</p> <p>As agreed in item 6 of the draft SoCG with BDC the HNRFI will contribute to “achieving national targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions focussing new development in the most sustainable</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		locations and seeking site layout and sustainable design principles which reduce energy demand and increase efficiency.”
Blaby District Council	Does not have a sufficient transport strategy in place and consequently will cause significant adverse road network impacts, traffic delays and air pollution at junctions in village centres close to schools	Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan pt 15 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) Contains detail of DRT services and further sustainable transport provision this is to be read in tandem with The Framework Travel Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.2, APP-159) This is to be developed further ahead of Deadline 3. The EIA shows that there are no likely significant effects on air quality.
Requirements for a SRFI		
Blaby District Council	Does not meet the requirements for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) with rail-first priority	This matter is addressed in detail in the Deadline 1 submission Appendix A Highways position statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) and secured by requirement 10 of the dDCO.
Site Selection and Evolution- Need		
Blaby District Council	There are a network of existing and recently approved rail freight interchanges and distribution centres within the Midlands. Whilst the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20 (March 2014) highlights ‘South West Leicestershire’ as an option (Option 5), it is only a potential growth location and no specific projects are identified in terms of a SRFI. The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study (updated March 2022) recognises that the Hinckley NRFI site being promoted would meet the anticipated demand to 2041 for rail-served warehousing in	The applicant has responded to the is matter as part of RR-0474 and RR-1311 (document reference: 18.2, REP1-033).

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	Leicestershire, but it should be recognised that the Hinckley NRFI is only one option that could be taken forward	
Blaby District Council	The NPSNN requires that a significant element of the buildings on site to be rail connected from the outset. The proposals put forward by the Applicant do not meet this requirement.	<p>The phasing strategy for the delivery of the rail port is considered to comply with the NPSNN and the new draft National Networks National Policy Statement (March 2023) para 4.86 and provides an appropriate measure of flexibility in the development of HNRFI. The ability for rail connected buildings is designed in at the outset and will be built to market demand.</p> <p>The Planning Statement Rev 03 (document reference: 7.1, APP-347) states at paragraph 3.122, <i>‘The provision for Development Zone B to be ‘rail connected’ in addition to Development Zones D and E would allow for up to 355,629sq metres of logistics floorspace to be ‘rail connected’. This amounts to some 55% of the total ground floor floorspace of HNRFI. By way of illustration only, the approved SRFI at West Midlands Interchange allowed for development zones A1 and A2 (of that scheme) to be rail connected. This amounted to some 20% of the proposed ground floor floorspace.’</i></p> <p>The provision for a significant element of the buildings on site to be rail connected at the outset - i.e., when buildings are constructed pursuant to occupier demand is well satisfied in the proposals for HNRFI.</p>
	Requirement 10 (Rail) of the dDCO allows for 105,000 square metres of warehouse floorspace to be occupied prior to the completion of the rail freight	The matter of the phasing of the construction of the railport and DCO Requirement 10 is covered comprehensively in Deadline 1

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>terminal. To ensure compliance with the NPSNN BDC submits that Requirement 10 of the dDCO should be amended as follows:</p> <p>Rail (1) The rail terminal and any associated infrastructure capable of handling a minimum of four intermodal trains per day, including 775 28701959.1 7 metre length trains, must be constructed and available for use prior to the occupation of any of the warehousing.</p> <p>(2) No rail infrastructure may be removed which would impede the ability of the rail freight terminal to handle four intermodal trains per day unless otherwise agreed in writing by the relevant planning authority.</p>	<p>submission Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) .</p> <p>The Applicant has been working with Network Rail since March 2019 and in doing so has secured a joint understanding of the deliverability of the mainline connections to a level beyond that previously secured prior to a DCO decision (normally to GRIP2 (now ES2)). The Applicant is now working towards completing ES3, to assist an early start. Network Rail is satisfied that, on the basis of the development work undertaken to date, there are no rail obstacles to the development and taking into operational use of HNRFI.</p> <p>Network Rail has confirmed to the Applicant that it is confident that early connections can be delivered however the proposed DCO requirement provides flexibility and ensures that the development won't be stalled in the unlikely event of delays outside of the Applicant's control. The requirement also protects against the risk that while Network Rail agree that connections can be delivered early there is an element of risk that the relevant Network Rail teams may have to postpone work for the HNRFI connections if Network Rail teams or rail possessions are needed elsewhere on the line to deal with an emergency.</p> <p>The phasing strategy for the delivery of the rail port is considered to be in accordance with NPSNN and provides an appropriate measure of flexibility in the development of HNRFI. The ability for rail connected buildings is designed in at the outset and will be built to market demand.</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Blaby District Council	BDC acknowledges there are precedents for Development Consent Orders which allow a proportion of SRFI warehouse floorspace to be occupied prior to the final delivery and commissioning of the rail connection, and the revised draft NPSNN expressly recognises this may be appropriate in some cases (para. 4.86). However, BDC submits it is not appropriate in this case.	This matter is addressed in Appendix A Highways Position Statement issued at Deadline 1 (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033)
Blaby District Council	A SRFI must also have adequate links to the road network, in particular the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The Council is not currently content that the Scheme's access to the SRN is proven suitable, given the issues with the M1 Junction 21 noted in section 6 of this Written Representation	The mitigation scheme is designed to address the impacts of the development and its access infrastructure. Underlying existing issues have been analysed, but mitigation of these elements are not the responsibility of the DCO application. Further detail is provided within the ES Appendix (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-138-APP-158) (AS-016) Section 9 which outlines modelling and the mitigation response. Access infrastructure tested through the PRTM was also subject to agreement with the Transport Working Group.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	HBBC acknowledges The Council acknowledges that the published joint authority evidence base document ' <i>Warehousing and Logistics at Leicester and Leicestershire: managing growth and change</i> ' (April 2021) provides the basis for the applicant to demonstrate that there is an unmet quantum of need for a SRFI facility as the study identifies a shortfall of rail served sites in Leicestershire up to 2041; further, that from the mid 2020s a supply shortfall of rail served sites begins to emerge.	Noted and agreed. The Applicant cannot comment on an, as of yet, unpublished report.

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>However, it should be noted that the Leicester and Leicestershire Planning Authorities are currently conducting joint research into the potential apportionment of strategic distribution floorspace which may change the Council's position on need. This report is, however, not yet ready for publication, but it may be available prior to the conclusion of the DCO examination and become a material consideration in respect of need.</p>	
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>HBBC acknowledges that the applicant has undertaken a 'Market Needs Assessment' (document 16.1 – APP-357) which indicates that the location of the site is near to the business market it will serve and is well connected to key supply chain routes.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>HNRFI is dependent on the M69 for strategic access to the core market of Leicester but Junction 21 of the M1 is already over capacity with no mitigation proposal. This aspect of the needs case is questionable.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to this point through Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1 REP1-033)</p>
<p>Site Alternatives</p>		
<p>Blaby District Council Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>Not enough consideration of 1 – 3 (Brooksby, Syston Fosse Way Junction and Syston Barkby Lane). Whilst the options are all to the north of Leicester and do not accord locationally with the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20 (March 2014), or the options also do not correlate with the more recent Leicester</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.57 of the NPS acknowledges most intermodal freight interchanges are located in the Midlands and North of England. These are hub regions both for the strategic road and rail networks and the UK economy that these networks serve. These regions also enjoy direct rail access to a range of large ports through which containerised goods pass.</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>and Leicestershire Authorities Warehousing and Logistics in Leicester and Leicestershire: Managing growth and change (amended March 2022), it does not mean that such sites should not be considered. Not enough consideration of the alternative sites of Whetstone, Littlethorpe and Croft.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.83 – 4.89 of the NPS provide specific policy guidance on the assessment principles for SRFI, including their function, locational requirements and scale and design. This policy advice was taken into account in the Applicant’s assessment of locations and design options.</p> <p>At the outset, the Applicant’s strategic rail adviser Baker Rose Consulting examined in engineering terms the potential locations on the rail network in Leicestershire that might present opportunities for a SRFI in locations on or readily connectable to the F2N strategic rail freight route, using a combination of professional knowledge of the network, local knowledge, surveys, rail network maps and aerial photographs.</p> <p>Site options 1 to 3 were initially considered viable following this review. However, following full review options 1 to 3 were discounted for the following key reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 at Brooksby was discounted due its propensity to flood, its relatively poor access to the strategic highway network and its location outside of the identified LLEP Growth Areas. The site is also in conflict with the purpose of a countryside protection policy in the Charnwood Local Plan. Such a remote location would not meet occupier requirements for direct strategic road access, adding to road haulage operating costs and the associated environmental impacts.

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 Syston Junction was discounted in view of the site’s relative remoteness from the motorway network, its location outside a LLEP Growth Area and the adverse flood risk. • Option 3 at Barkby Lane was discounted in view of its poor road access, which would not suit occupier requirements, its proximity to housing and the restricted access to the existing railway. <p>Sites at Whetstone, Littlethorpe and Croft are all unsuitable and fall into flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment requires an outline of the main reasonable alternatives studies by the applicant and an indication of the main reasons for the applicant’s choice, taking into account the environmental effect (NPS paragraph 4.26). This requirement has been met in ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Evolution (document reference: 6.1.4, APP-113).</p>
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	HBBC does not disagree with the presumption that a SRFI would improve capacity on the network but is a site at Hinckley an optimal choice.	<p>The Market Needs Assessment (document reference 16.1, APP-357) has explained the ‘Market for Hinckley NRFI’ (paragraphs 6.6-6.16).</p> <p>Both the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 and HNRFI Logistics Demand and Supply Assessment (document reference: 16.2, APP-358) clearly establish the needs case for the HNRFI. This matter is being covered in the SoCG and the Applicant understands the parties position as agreeing that this need is identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study 2021 which was commissioned and agreed by the relevant</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		<p>Local Authorities. The level of disagreement is on the level of future need.</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.83 – 4.89 of the NPS provide specific policy guidance on the assessment principles for SRFI, including their function, locational requirements and scale and design. This policy advice was taken into account in the Applicant’s assessment of locations and design options. The Applicant then considered seven potential locations within the area of Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20.</p> <p>Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement (document reference: 6.1.4, APP-113) sets out the process that was followed in terms of considering alternative sites and the reasons for selection, this chapter also explored design options for the main site. Further to this, as reported in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement (document reference: 6.1.3, APP-113), a number of environmental mitigation measures are included within the design with the intention of designing out environmental effects. The reasons for sites being discounted are very clear and have been expressed as such. Further enhancement of the original site assessment would not change the conclusion reached.</p> <p>The reasons for sites being discounted are very clear and have been expressed as such. Further enhancement of the original site assessment would not change the conclusion reached.</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Blaby District Council	<p>Potential ability to locate facilities on land to the north of Stoney Stanton or between Hinckley and Nuneaton to the south of the A5. Other than a cursory comment on alternative sites, no enhancement of the original site assessment appears to have been undertaken by the Applicant. The assessment provided is therefore still considered inadequate by BDC.</p>	<p>It is a fundamental requirement for locating a SRFI that it has 'effective connections for both rail and road' (NPS-NN 2.56). A location north of Stoney Stanton was considered by the Applicant (Option B: Croft) in ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Evolution (document reference: 6.1.1, APP-113). Such a location does not have good road access to the SRN. DfT Circular 1/22 National Highways and the Strategic Road Network makes clear that the principle of creating new junctions on the SRN should be identified at the plan making stage, in circumstances where an assessment of the potential impacts on the SRN can be considered alongside whether such new infrastructure is essential for the delivery of strategic growth. Where this has not occurred no new connections on those sectors of the network designed for high-speed traffic will be supported (other than in limited exceptions which do not include an SRFI). In consequence the approach taken by the Applicant utilising an existing connection to the SRN is entirely reasonable. Land between Hinckley and Nuneaton to the south of the A5 is mainly Green Belt – situated within Warwickshire where no comparable study to the Warehousing and Logistics Study has been undertaken. The area of land that lies outside of the Green Belt is too small to accommodate a SRFI. A SRFI with the form and scale of development would cause substantial harm to the purposes of the Green Belt.</p>
	<p>The lack of consideration of sites further to the west is considered to be particularly important. Whilst not within Leicestershire, the Solent and Felixstowe lines connect close to Nuneaton, providing the opportunity for a single facility which would also serve two ports.</p>	<p>The NPSNN (paragraph 2.56) makes clear that the number of locations suitable for SRFIs will be limited, which will restrict the scope for developers to identify viable alternative sites. A developer is not required to demonstrate that the choice of site is the 'best site' in some form of geographic location. Rather the planning test is whether it is suitable when primarily considered against the</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	BDC consider this alternative location has not been adequately considered by the Applicant.	<p>provisions of the NPS. The decision taking matrix is provided for by S104 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Land further west of the West Coast Main Line (WCML) at Nuneaton has to route rail freight through Birmingham, either to reach Southampton or the Northwest and Scotland. This is restricting. HNRFI by contrast can readily access the West Coast Mainline (WCML) at Nuneaton and can therefore access virtually all major markets and ports, not just Felixstowe. If the Nuneaton Dive Under is developed to a suitable gauge, Southampton would be more readily accessible from HNRFI than sites further west of the WCML.</p>
EIA		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Principal and associated development not distinct in the assessment of environmental effects in individual and cumulative terms.	The terms ‘Principal Development’ and ‘Associated Development’ are used in the description of the authorised development in the DCO (document reference 3.1, APP-085). However, the distinction is not relevant to an assessment of the Proposed Development’s environmental effects and a detailed assessment of all parts of the development has been provided in the Environmental Statement.
Phasing		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The expected phasing plan illustrates the point, where for example the quantum of impact during construction and operation are under assessed. The interactions between the development zones A-F are unclear where there a dependency between phases and with that the likely impacts / risks on program	Phasing is set out in ES Chapter 3 paragraphs 3.90 – 3.127 (document reference: 6.1.3, APP-112)

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	where phases A to F are so interlinked and dependent.	
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Programme and phasing is indicative over ten years. The Council is concerned about the potential risks to the program and how these might validly be mitigated in terms of an indicative construction programme.	Phasing is set out in ES Chapter 3 paragraphs 3.90 – 3.127 (document reference: 6.1.3, APP-112)
Access Infrastructure		
Leicestershire County Council	Access to the site is proposed via an A47 link road between B4668 Leicester Road, Hinckley and the M69 J2 with the inclusion of new south facing slip roads. This change to the access strategy for the site i.e., including a through link to the B4668 was not agreed by the Has.	Access Infrastructure was agreed with the TWG to test through LCC's PRTM 2.2 model ahead of running the forecast modelling. The link provides significant alleviation of traffic on roads in and around Hinckley.
Leicestershire County Council	The A47 link acts as an alternative route to the M69 J2/M1 J21 and consequently shows traffic displaced onto the less desirable local road network (LRN) and away from the strategic road network (SRN).	The displacement of traffic from the LRN to the SRN especially south of M69 Junction 2 is significant and is reported within the Forecast Modelling Report (APP-148)
Leicestershire County Council	The details of these proposals are shown on Highways Plans (APP-022, APP025 and APP-026). 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. From the submitted drawings it is noted that the A47 link road is to be offered to LCC for adoption. However, based on the limited information submitted with the application it is unclear if this road can be designed and delivered in accordance with the	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4, response number 35)

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	adopted design standards of LCC found within the LHDG.	
Leicestershire County Council	Basic design information appears to be missing from the submission including:	See responses below
Leicestershire County Council	Vehicle tracking to demonstrate that the proposed designs are safe and appropriate for all traffic, including HGV's, in line with the NPPF paragraph 110;	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 36).
Leicestershire County Council	Details of structures e.g., bridge over the Nuneaton-Felixstowe railway line, underpass to accommodate diverted Public Right of Way (ProW) U52 to identify required levels and gradients comply with adopted design standards and ensure safe access can be achieved for all users in line with the NPPF paragraph 110;	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 36)
Leicestershire County Council	Visibility splays, cross sections, access for private dwellings (e.g. access to Bridge Farm presents concerns in respect of highway safety given potential restricted forward visibility over the proposed railway bridge), maintenance etc to demonstrate the design can comply with adopted design standards and provide safe access for all users in line with the NPPF paragraph 110.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 36)
Leicestershire County Council	Furthermore, if the link road and its junctions can be designed to an adoptable standard it is unclear if this can be achieved within the constraints of the red line boundary given that those design changes could	Larger scale plans of the link road, including the areas noted here showing key geometric features to demonstrate compliance with relevant standards will be produced and submitted for Deadline 3

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>require different footprints than those submitted. Of particular concern are the constrained red line boundaries surrounding the proposed access roundabout at B4668 Leicester Road as shown on APP-022 and the M69 J2 to roundabout 1 as shown on APP-025.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>In the absence of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) and Designer’s Response, LCC LHA is also unable to confirm that the proposed access will be safe and suitable in accordance with paragraph 110 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 37)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>It can be seen from the submitted drawings that the A47 link road is proposed to be dual carriageway from its junction with M69 J2, to its junction with the third roundabout, and then single carriageway thereafter to the B4668 Leicester Road. The TWG agreed that a sensitivity test of the A47 link road dualled along its entire length should be carried out. This was included in section 5: Model scenarios of the agreed Forecast Modelling Brief (APP-145). It is noted that the results of this modelling exercise have not been reported in the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138). Therefore, LCC LHA is unable to conclude if the development access infrastructure would operate within capacity and with a reduced impact on the wider network if dualled in its entirety. Modelling</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 39)</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>outputs previously provided to LCC LHA suggest that this could be the case.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>No detailed junction assessments of the roundabouts along the route of the link road have been carried out. On the basis that roundabout 3 will provide access to a lorry park and other facilities (see comments below), resulting in cross movements to the main development site, and this will impact the capacity of the link road. Review of the Illustrative Phasing and Works Plans (APP-050 – APP-055) would appear to show reliance on cross movements at roundabouts 2 and 3 up to and including the final phase of development when the “Railport Estate Road Link” is proposed to be constructed.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 39)</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The Council is concerned at the explicit reference in the requirement for the southern slip roads at Junction 2 M69 driving the need to carry out further infrastructure. The Council is concerned about the potential risks to the program and how these might validly be mitigated in terms of an indicative construction programme.</p>	<p>See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4 (response number 39)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>From the scale of the drawings submitted it appears that the link road includes for a 3m footway/cycleway which does not appear to be continuous and would require pedestrians and cyclists to continually cross the road, not always with designated crossing provision. APP-011 does appear</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 1)</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>to include for a pegasus crossing and a toucan crossing. However, it remains unclear how these facilities link with footway/cycleway provision. 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>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>LCC LHA have reviewed the VISSIM model for M69 J2. LCC LHA note that whilst the model includes for the proposed pegasus crossing it does not account for this being called i.e., being used by pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. This will clearly impact the capacity of the junction and the link road but does not appear to have been accounted for.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 27)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The elevated M69 J2 circulatory is also under the jurisdiction of LCC. No information has been provided to demonstrate that the existing structures are capable of accommodating the provision of slip roads without structural integrity being compromised, and therefore the deliverability of the slip roads is questioned.</p>	<p>There are two structures that form part of M69 J2 roundabout. These are the bridge structures which span over the M69 and form the northern and southern parts of the roundabout circulatory carriageway. While the carriageway construction is under the jurisdiction of LCC, the bridge structures are owned by National Highways (NH) and the applicant has undertaken discussions with NH about the bridges, including obtaining structural records. The new slip roads do not interact with these structures in any way and therefore will not affect their structural integrity. Furthermore, there are no proposals to widen the bridge structures or provide additional lanes over the bridges. The loading on the bridges will therefore be unaffected by the proposals. The applicant will, through the detailed</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
		design, continue dialogue with NH and LCC in relation to these structures.
Leicestershire County Council	<p>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 to encourage employees from the eastern villages of Stoney Stanton and Sapcote to walk or cycle to the site. In addition, no walking and cycling improvements are included to the west to encourage employees from Hinckley and Burbage to walk or cycle to the site.</p> <p>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>	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 16)
Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data		
Leicestershire County Council	Paragraphs 4.76 – 4.136 of the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138) include for an analysis of PIC data to identify existing patterns and trends of accidents on the LRN and SRN with the intention of demonstrating that the development proposals will not exacerbate these. This appraisal appears	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 3)

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	incomplete and does not appear to inform the access and mitigation strategy, especially for vulnerable users.	
Leicestershire County Council	The Collision History Study area at Figure 4-10 of the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138) was not agreed with the Has, nor does it marry with the Area of Influence (Aol) of the development as identified in the Forecast Modelling (APP-148). The Collision History Study area should be expanded to reflect the area of impact of the development i.e., the agreed Aol.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 3)
Leicestershire County Council	Analysis of PIC data should include the latest 5-year period. It is noted that the application submission only includes for analysis of data between 2015-2019. This approach was not agreed with the Has, nor is it acceptable.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4, response number 3)
Leicestershire County Council	LCC LHA advised BWB some time ago that this would need to be addressed in future revisions of the Transport Assessment. PIC data is a fundamental consideration in the Road Safety Auditing process in line with the requirements set out in DMRB GG119 and LCC LHA will not sign off the RSA briefs until this has been addressed.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4 (response number 3)
Leicestershire County Council	As a consequence, LCC LHA remains concerned about the impact of the development on highway safety contrary to paragraph 110 of the NPPF and paragraphs 4.60 to 4.66 of the NPSNN	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 3)

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Strategic Modelling		
Leicester City Council	<p>We are aware the transport assessment has not yet been concluded. It is understood that the Applicant is undertaking a sensitivity test of the proposed modal split based on employee origins identified by a gravity model assessment. Whilst at present despite the observation above, we do not expect the envisaged highway impacts to differ significantly from those identified in the initial transport assessment, due to the relative distance from the proposed Hinckley National rail Freight Interchange site to the City of Leicester, we may need to reconsider our position if impacts identified on the City's highway network were to change significantly. The sustainable Transport Strategy has not yet been agreed with stakeholders, but the mitigation so far proposed appears to be proportionate to the expected impacts for the City of Leicester, based on the outputs of modelling to date.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 70)</p>
Leicestershire County Council	<p>Whilst the process as set out in APP-146 is generally sound, clarification is required on some points. Furthermore, the survey data that is furnished dates between 2017-2019. This is clearly not within the latest 3-year period and predates the Covid-19 pandemic. This introduces uncertainty given that any significant changes that may have occurred to trip patterns and travel behaviour (including timing of trips) since the surveys were undertaken are not</p>	<p>To be further discussed and clarification submitted ahead of Deadline 3.</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>reflected in the data. Whilst LCC LHA did cease issuing permits for data collection during the Covid-19 pandemic, access to the LRN for purposes of traffic counts has not been restricted since April 2021. Therefore, the Applicant has had ample opportunity to collect. Once collected, the updated survey data would require update of the proposed furnishing process.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>In February 2022, LCC LHA formally signed off the “Base Year Model Review” (APP-144) and in doing so accepted that the model was fit for purpose in its strategic assessment of this development. To model the impact of the development proposals various inputs to the exercise needed to be agreed. This included trip generation, trip distribution, and planning and network assumptions (uncertainty log).</p>	<p>Noted- as per timeline shared in Deadline 1 submission Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>In March and October 2021, LCC LHA formally signed off the “Trip Generation Addendum” Appendix A (APP-141). This trip generation calculation was based on 5 “comparable sites”. Comparable sites were identified based upon use class and connection by rail. Employee numbers at these sites were not explicitly identified within the document. It is worthy of note that this comparability exercise dated back to 2018 (using to 2016 survey data) and a number of these sites are now in the process of being built out and occupied. More up to date data should therefore be available.</p>	<p>The applicant has provided a detailed explanation within Deadline 1 submission 18.2.1 Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033). As the statement here says, this was signed off by the Local Highway Authority ahead of the Forecast model run.</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Leicestershire County Council	In addition to the above, at no point during our discussions with BWB were the TWG made aware that the development proposals were to include a lorry park to the west of the proposed A47 link road. Indeed, 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 LHA therefore also questions the comparability of the 5 sites on this basis, none of which appear to include for assessment of a lorry park.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 5)
Leicestershire County Council	In October 2021, LCC LHA formally signed off version 8 of the uncertainty log (APP-148). The uncertainty log details the planning and network assumptions to be included in the modelling exercise i.e., committed development and associated infrastructure. However, in March 2023 it was resolved to grant planning permission to a significant employment development. This development, known as Padge Hall Farm (21/01191/HYB3) takes access directly from the A5 at Hinckley and has not been considered as committed.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 6)
Leicestershire County Council	The mitigation strategy for Padge Hall Farm, 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	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 6)

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	stretch of the A5 by as much as 20%. This additional HGV traffic has not been accounted for in the modelling exercise.	
Leicestershire County Council	The Padge Hall Farm development includes for 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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 6)
Leicestershire County Council	The Padge Hall Farm 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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 6)
Leicestershire County Council	LCC LHA, NH and WCC requested that BWB undertake a sensitivity test of this development at a meeting held on 9 th August 2023. To date this information has not been provided.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 6)
Leicestershire County Council	In February 2021 LCC LHA signed off the Forecast Modelling Brief (APP-145). The contents of this brief and the outputs of the modelling are now brought into question as a consequence of discrepancies in employee numbers (and trip generation), land uses, and planning and network assumptions (uncertainty log) as described above.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 7)
Leicestershire County Council	In addition, this Forecast Modelling Brief (APP-145) at paragraph 5.2 included reference to producing a “phased development timeline and trip generation as	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 7)

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<p>part of a separate brief". To date LCC LHA has not had sight of this brief, nor to our knowledge has any phased strategic modelling been undertaken.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Whilst the application is accompanied by an HGV Route Management and Strategy document (APP-362), this Strategy was developed after the trip distribution (APP-142) and Forecast Modelling brief (APP-145) were agreed. Hence, the modelling does not take account of the Strategy. For example, at paragraph 3.11 the Strategy proposes to restrict development HGV movements "to/from A5 West via link road, B4668, A47". However, the modelling outputs at Figure 2.2 of the Forecast Modelling (APP-148) clearly show development HGV traffic using this route. The strategic impact of the HGV Route Management Strategy therefore remains unknown and is not reflected in either the strategic or local model outputs.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 7)</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The Council is concerned that there is a lack of clarity regarding precisely how triggers – floorspace thresholds for example – are to be applied on the phasing plan where a finalised DCO might specifically require describing commitments and assurances, either through legal instrument or statutory commitment, of the proposed development in phases with specific reference to the completion of off-site highways works and elements of the Railport.</p>	<p>Should the DCO amend phasing, associated plans will be amended accordingly, however the railport, highways works and the first phase of buildings will occur in the early phase. Notably highways infrastructure and off site highways works will occur prior to the first operation of the logistics buildings or the rail terminal.</p>

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
Strategic Model Outputs		
Warwickshire County Council	Following this modelling work, the outputs from the PTRM model runs were not reviewed and agreed by the Highway Authorities, for two principal reasons 1) because the planning situation within the Area of Influence continued to change and new committed development and network changes needed to be scoped in, or at least assessed as a sensitivity assessment to understand the potential changes that could occur, such an instance is the Padge Hall Farm development; and 2) the approach taken to furnishing in order to derive turning flows at junctions was not agreed with the Highway Authorities, the PRTM model provides link flows and not junction turning flows.	See detailed Deadline 1 submission Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033).
	<p>Whilst the Padge Hall Farm application was submitted in 2021, and has not yet been granted whilst the section 106 agreements are being finalised, the resolutions to grant were made at Rugby Borough Council's and Hinckley and Bosworth's Borough Council Planning Committees in March 2023 and June 2023 respectively In the run up to this period, the highway mitigation proposals were in the public domain (August 2022).</p> <p>The access and mitigation proposals include:</p>	To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Introduction of a signalised site access junction onto the A5 (between A5/A47 Dodwells junction and Nutts Lane railway bridge which passes over the A5) that does not provide for a right turn out of the site access · Changes to the A5/A47 Dodwells junction to facilitate u-turning traffic on the A5 east arm from the Padge Hall Farm site · Lowering of the carriageway beneath the A5 Nutts Lane railway bridge to allow high sided HGVs to use this section of the A5 (A47 to M69 junction 1) <p>The Highway Authorities requested that these proposals be modelled as a sensitivity test given the impact they could have on the assignment choices for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange HGVs, particularly high sided HGVs, and therefore the potential impacts that could occur should high sided HGVs assign to/from the site via the M69 junction 1 and A5/Dodwells roundabout rather than to/from the site via the A47/Dodwells roundabout.</p> <p>This modelling assessment has not been carried out, and therefore the impacts are unknown.</p>	

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>Further to this issue being raised, a Technical Note has been submitted to the Examining Authority. This sets out the furnishing methodology, and whilst helpful with the detail provided, there are some outstanding queries that need to be addressed, for instance the treatment of turning movements which were observed to be zero or close to zero. It is understood that this matter has been raised by National Highways with the applicant team and will be discussed further following the submission of documents required for Deadline 1 set out in the Timetable within the Rule 8 letter.</p> <p>As a consequence of these two issues, the PRTM outputs have not been agreed by the Highway Authorities.</p>	<p>See detailed Deadline 1 submission Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033).</p>
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>WCC has requested that in order to assess the impact of the proposal on critical parts of the Strategic Road Network that interface with both Warwickshire and Leicestershire networks, the following junctions should be assessed in the National Highways VISSIM models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A5/A426 Gibbet Hill (NB. the A426 is part of the Major Road Network) · A5 Longshoot-Dodwells · M69 Junction 1 	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3. Attempts to discuss ahead of the ISH2 were made by the applicant but a date where all parties of the TWG were available was not identified.</p>

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>A5/A426 Gibbet Hill (NB. the A426 is part of the Major Road Network)</p> <p>This junction was to be signalised to mitigate the impacts of DIRFT III in accordance with their planning consent, but they have not yet triggered for this improvement. However it is understood that the promoter of that development site is in discussions with National Highways.</p> <p>This junction was also to be signalised to mitigate the impacts of Symmetry/Magna Park as required as part of that planning consent. However, as part of their discussions with National Highways with regard to the detail around the scheme design, the promoter of Magna Park South used the VISSIM model to assess development impact given the junction interactions with M6 junction 1 and the A426 corridor on the Major Road Network (MRN) in North Rugby, and we would expect the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange promoter to use the same approach to assess the impact of development traffic.</p> <p>National Highways considered the junction signalisations proposals and recognised that due to these committed developments and other Local Plan led growth in the area, the proposed signalisation scheme will not accommodate the cumulative impact of various consented developments. As a</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p>
------------------------------------	--	---

	<p>consequence the traffic signal scheme assessed as part of the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Transportation Assessment is no longer proposed.</p> <p>National Highways is currently working to identify a scheme that can accommodate the forecast growth, and secure contributions, so that the network, travelling public and businesses do not have to suffer the queues and delays associated with multiple improvement schemes each of which would have roadworks and diversions associated with them if several different schemes are delivered in succession</p> <p>Furthermore, the queues and delays forecast in the LinSig assessment for the proposed traffic signal junction (with the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange traffic) are significantly lower than those in the VISSIM model (without the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange traffic).</p> <p>Whilst BWB has noted in its response to point 19 in HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XXRP- TR-0031 Rev P01 that there is not full correspondence between the 18 entry points identified within the VISSIM model and the traffic flows derived from PRTM, Warwickshire County Council consider that it is still important for the VISSIM to be used to assess development impact for the reasons set out below:</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>National Highways does not have a committed scheme at this junction as highlighted previously and therefore the baseline position for the modelling must be the existing non-signalised junction arrangement (i.e., a Do Nothing)</p> <p>Blocking back towards M6 Junction 1 along the A426 and platooning of traffic between M6 Junction 1 and the Gibbet Hill junction can only be considered within the VISSIM model.</p> <p>Whilst Warwickshire County Council understands that flow correspondence may only exist across 8 loading points, we do not necessarily consider this to be a limitation which invalidates the use of the VISSIM model.</p> <p>For example, if the loading points within the VISSIM model which correspond to the PRTM data include the A5 (2), the A426 north and south (2) the M6 (2) and Gibbet Lane (1) then there is sufficient network correspondence to assign the development trips across the study area from the PRTM outputs.</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council does not require the interaction on the minor roads (i.e., Lutterworth Road or Arthur James Drive) to be considered in terms of changes in development flows and, as such, impacts at these locations can still be considered, particularly</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>in the context of the effects arising from delivery of any proposed mitigation at Gibbet Hill.</p> <p>Therefore for these reasons Warwickshire County Council does not accept the modelling or proposed mitigation at this location, and requires the VISSIM modelling to be carried out.</p>	
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>A5/A47 The Longshoot/A47 Dodwells</p> <p>The Transportation Assessment identifies a 3% impact at the A5/The Longshoot junction within the PRTM modelling, and conclude that this is not considered a sufficient impact to warrant further assessment.</p> <p>This is a critical junction on the Strategic Road Network, and its efficient operation is critical to the local road network. Any additional queues and delays will impact on the network, and in order to consider the safety and efficiency of the network that modelling has been requested.</p> <p>All developments that are shown to be assigning traffic through the A5/Longshoot/Dodwells junctions, including Padge Hall Farm, and several other large sustainable urban extensions (within Warwickshire and Leicestershire) have been required to use the National Highways VISSIM model and we would</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p>

	<p>expect the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange promoter to use the same approach for consistency.</p> <p>Therefore Warwickshire County Council does not accept the position that the impacts on this part of the network are acceptable and that further assessment is required.</p>	
	<p>Whilst National Highways are responsible for this part of the network, the B4109 Hinckley Road connects at this junction, and the junction is a controlling factor on vehicle route choice from other routes such as the B4455 Fosse Way, and the A426 further east.</p> <p>The modelling carried out within the Rugby Rural Area Model includes this junction, and from the information below, the modelling has highlighted some notable impact on the Hinckley Road approach which we require to see further assessment of by way of modelling in the VISSIM model.</p>	To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3
Warwickshire County Council	Results of the Rugby Rural Area Model confirm no instances of impact on the rural road network east of the M69 and north of the M6.	See response to WCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 5)
Warwickshire County Council	There are notable impacts at M69 junction 1. Given the nature and location of this junction Warwickshire County Council would wish to defer to National Highways as to whether this junction operates effectively but reserves the right to provide further commentary on the M69 junction 1 VISSIM model, in	To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3

	particular we would expect that modelling to be able to demonstrate that there are no impacts observed on the Hinckley Road approach to junction 1 or that mitigation can be provided.	
Warwickshire County Council	It is considered prudent to also raise concerns with regards the journey time impact on R7 S6 SB which indicates that there may be impacts which occur on the A5 SB approach to the Cross-in-Hands roundabout during the PM peak. Further analysis of this impact is required to determine if it is the Crossin-Hands roundabout or the Mere Lane junction which is the root cause of the delay.	To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3
Warwickshire County Council	There are also issues which are apparent on the approach to the A46 Binley Woods junction east of Coventry which could be related to the operation of the junction, since that has also indicated an increase in queueing between scenarios.	This junction is remote and impacts from the HNRFI are minimal. However, this will be reviewed and discussed with the TWG ahead of Deadline 3.
Warwickshire County Council	Adjustments were made to reassign HGV trips identified on the local roads within the PRTM such that they were completed within the microsimulation modelling via alternative routes. PRTM appears to indicate around 60 HGVs across the modelled period could interact with the local road network and Warwickshire County Council believe these have been omitted from the RRAM assessment by being assigned to other OD pairs. Confirmation on this point, and how the HGV movements identified in PRTM will be managed, is requested	This will be reviewed and discussed with the TWG ahead of Deadline 3.

Warwickshire County Council	The queueing analysis indicates potential issues around the Cross-in-Hands junction which is confirmed in the RRAM journey time analysis. We require further evidence that the network will function acceptably in this area.	To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3
Warwickshire County Council	The analysis presented by BWB concludes that the VISSIM modelling, coupled with the fact that it operates under dynamic signal control, is sufficient evidence to conclude that M69 junction 1 will operate effectively. We would require National Highways to be satisfied with this point and, additionally Warwickshire County Council wish to see the supplementary modelling in detail so that we can be confident that the impact on Hinckley Road will not be severe.	Noted. The signal timing amendments, through our analysis, mitigate the development impacts.
Warwickshire County Council	We consider that BWB should provide further detailed evidence, most likely by way of statistical analysis (e.g., Confidence Intervals) to demonstrate that the queueing observed at the Binley Woods junction will not impact Warwickshire County Council's local road network.	This junction is remote and impacts from the HNRFI are minimal. However, this will be reviewed and discussed with the TWG ahead of Deadline 3.
Warwickshire County Council	In order to check the validity of the input turning flow data used in the ARCADY assessments for this junction, we require evidence to be submitted in the form of a spreadsheet which includes a comparison of RRAM modelled and demand turning flows for the scenarios listed below inclusive of the A5 calibration adjustment at the Smockington junction (assuming 1	To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3.

	<p>HGV = 2.3 PCUs) with turning flows from the corresponding scenarios in the ARCADY analysis:</p> <p>2018 Base</p> <p>2031 Reference Case</p> <p>2031 HNRFI Development + HGV Routing Restrictions + Mitigation</p> <p>The spreadsheet should highlight the absolute difference between the RRAM and ARCADY turning flows and use the GEH measure to assess the significance of these differences.</p>	
Leicestershire County Council	<p>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.</p>	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 10)
Leicestershire County Council	<p>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.</p>	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 11)
Leicestershire County Council	<p>This modelling information was provided to the TWG in more detail than appears to have been formally</p>	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 13)

	submitted with the application, including zoomable volume/capacity plots which cover the entire Aol of the development.	
Leicestershire County Council	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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 14)
Leicestershire County Council	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 BWB acknowledged that this modelling could be undertaken but declined to carry out the exercise. with the NPSNN paragraph 5.213.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 15)
Sapcote Village Impact		
Leicestershire County Council	Two-way flows through Sapcote village appear to double on the B4669 Leicester Road. This can be seen in Section 3.3 of the Forecast Modelling (APP-148). It is worthy of note that the TWG have been provided	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 17)

	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 LHA is not in a position to identify the severity of the impact.	
Leicestershire County Council	LCC LHA 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 LHA had requested further assessment of this sensitive part of the LRN. To date this assessment has not been provided.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 18)
Junction Assessment Criteria		
Leicestershire County Council	When LCC LHA signed off the Forecast Modelling Brief in February 2021 (APP145) this included how the AoI of the development would be determined. The criteria are set out at Section 6 and follow an industry standard approach.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 19)
Leicestershire County Council	However, at paragraph 7.39 of the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138) an alternative non-standard approach has been adopted. Not only are alternative criteria set out, but combinations of this criteria have been applied to establish whether the impact of the development on local junctions warrants further investigation. Furthermore, the combinations of criteria do not appear to have been consistently applied. This means that where there is a development impact on the LRN it may not have been	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 19)

	identified nor tested, and therefore the mitigation strategy identified may not be comprehensive.	
Leicestershire County Council	LCC LHA is therefore unable to conclude that significant impacts from the development on the transport network can be mitigated in line with the NPPF paragraph 110.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 21)
Leicestershire County Council	As a consequence of the application of the unagreed assessment criteria, only 21 junctions have been assessed in detail at Table 8-10 in the submitted Transport Assessment (APP-138). It is worthy of note that some junctions and arms have been incorrectly labelled and do not marry with the description in the Table.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 22)
Leicestershire County Council	In addition, the following junction specific errors have been noted:	Noted, see individual responses below.
Leicestershire County Council	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 (Appendix 1).	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 23)
Leicestershire County Council	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	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 24)
Leicestershire County Council	Junction 26: A5/A426/Gibbet Lane – the assumption in the Transport Assessment is incorrect. NH do not have a committed scheme at this junction. Therefore, the impact of the development has been incorrectly	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 25)

	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.	
Leicestershire County Council	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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 26)
Leicestershire County Council	Significantly, LCC LHA note that despite requests from the HAs and LPAs no detailed VISSIM assessment of M1 J21/M69 J3 has been submitted. This would appear to be a fundamental omission given that VISSIM models have been provided for M69 junctions 1 and 2. M1 J21/M69 J3 is fundamental to the safe and appropriate functioning of the LRN and SRN, and the development proposals as a whole. It is worthy of note 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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 27)
Mitigation Strategy and Proposals		
Leicestershire County Council	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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 33)
Leicestershire County Council	As outlined above, LCC LHA does not agree with the Applicant’s approach to mitigation, and this position has been documented over a period of time. LCC LHA	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 33)

	<p>maintain that the approach to mitigation for this strategic development of national importance should be to mitigate against its own impact at M1 J21/M69 J3 identified through an unconstrained modelling exercise, and then address this impact to encourage traffic displaced onto the LRN by the development to return to the SRN. Furthermore, 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>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>At 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. This is not the case as demonstrated in the Forecast Modelling (APP-148). For example, at Figure 3.6 it can be seen that in the with development scenario there is a reduction in traffic on the M1 north of the development (at least to J22), with an associated increase in traffic on the LRN. Furthermore, the assumption that the traffic that is displaced by the development proposals is local would not appear to be supported by select link analysis outputs from PRTM which would identify the origin and destination of these trips.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 34)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The details of the off-site mitigation proposals are shown on Highways Plans (APP-028 and APP-029). The drawings have been supplied at such a scale (1:2500) that makes design checking extremely</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 35)</p>

	difficult and not in line with the basic requirements as set out in the LHDG.	
Leicestershire County Council	Basic design information appears to be missing from the submission including topographical surveys, vehicle tracking, highway boundary information, signal equipment etc. It is therefore unclear if this package of mitigation can be delivered to adopted design standards within the constraints of the red line boundary.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 36)
Leicestershire County Council	In the absence of a Stage 1 RSA and Designer's Response for any of the mitigation proposals, LCC LHA is 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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 37)
Additional information requests		
Leicestershire County Council	Submission of a Technical Note explaining discrepancies in employee numbers, subsequent inclusion of a lorry park and justifying continued use Submission of a Technical Note explaining discrepancies in employee numbers, subsequent inclusion of a lorry park and justifying continued use	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 4)
Leicestershire County Council	Drawings at a scale of 1:500 for the purposes of design checking with topographical survey data, visibility splays, cross sections, signal equipment, highway boundary information, gradients and details of structures added	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 35)

Leicestershire County Council	Vehicle tracking drawings	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 36)
Leicestershire County Council	Submission of Stage 1 Road Safety Audits and Designers Responses	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 37)
Leicestershire County Council	Submit details and assessment undertaken in relation to a fully dualled access link road	A fully dualled link is not and was not proposed by the Applicant. A sensitivity was performed in the PRTM2.2 at the request of LCC.
Leicestershire County Council	Capacity assessment of the link road junctions including identification of the internal site demand and cross-movements to the rail terminal and lorry park which may impact link road capacity	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 36)
Leicestershire County Council	Further consideration of the pedestrian and cycle provision along the link road and B4668 including how this connects into existing infrastructure	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 1)
Leicestershire County Council	Resubmit the M69 J2 VISSIM model to include Pegasus crossing demand	To be reviewed and submitted ahead of Deadline 4.
Leicestershire County Council	Identify and propose improvements to walking and cycling provision to facilitate access from the local area	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 2)
Leicestershire County Council	PIC assessment to match the development AoI and include for the most recently available 5-year period to inform the access and mitigation strategy, especially for vulnerable users.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 3)

Leicestershire County Council	Undertake up to date baseline traffic surveys	Further details to be provided ahead of Deadline 3.
Leicestershire County Council	Undertake a sensitivity test including the now committed Padge Hall Farm including a VISSIM assessment of Longshoot/Dodwells junctions	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 6)
Leicestershire County Council	Undertake phased development testing	The access infrastructure and mitigation are proposed to be delivered ahead of first occupation. This is driven by the influence the access infrastructure has on background traffic ahead of the introduction of the development. No further phased testing is proposed
Leicestershire County Council	Strategic assessment of HGV Route Management Strategy	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 44)
Leicestershire County Council	VISSIM assessment of M1 J21/M69 J3	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 27)
Leicestershire County Council	Establish unconstrained demand at M1 J21/M69 J3	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 14)
Leicestershire County Council	Mitigation proposals for M1 J21/M69 J3	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 14)
Leicestershire County Council	Submit detailed select link analysis of village impact, including identifying HGV impact	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 17)

Local Planning Authorities: Blaby District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, Leicestershire County Council and Warwickshire County Council

Leicestershire County Council	Agree methodology for further junction capacity analysis	This is to be discussed with the TWG ahead of Deadline 3.
Leicestershire County Council	VISSIM assessment of Gibbet roundabout	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 25)
Leicestershire County Council	VISSIM assessment of Narborough level crossing impacts	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 29)
Leicestershire County Council	Consider impacts of future passenger rail provision	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 30)
Leicestershire County Council	Strategic modelling of mitigation proposals	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 39)
Leicestershire County Council	Revisit mitigation proposals for B4114/B581 junction	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 40)
Leicestershire County Council	Revised HGV Route Management Strategy	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 44)
Leicestershire County Council	Submit details in respect of PRow proposals	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 51)
Leicestershire County Council	Clarification of future maintenance responsibilities	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 58)

Leicestershire County Council	Details of construction traffic access proposals, impacts and routeing	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 59)
Leicestershire County Council	Revised Framework Travel Plan including review of employee modal split	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 63)
Leicestershire County Council	Revised Sustainable Transport Strategy	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 66)
Leicestershire County Council	Amend DCO in line with all comments	Noted
Leicestershire County Council	Amend s106 Heads of Terms in line with all comments	Noted
Rail		
Leicestershire County Council	LCC LHA do not consider that the impact of the additional downtime on traffic has been adequately assessed. The only assessment of this impact has been an adjustment of signal timings in PRTM. LCC LHA hold a VISSIM model of the crossing and local area and have suggested this be used by the Applicant. However, this advice does not appear to have been heeded. Consequently, no mitigation proposals have been included within the application submission.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 29)

<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 30)</p>
	<p>WCC's work on the proposed Nuneaton Parkway has tested a future scenario of up to 4 passenger trains per hour on the Birmingham-Leicester line. The expansion from the existing 2tph to 4tph on this route is linked to wider capacity enhancements on the line, as proposed by Midlands Connect in their Midlands Rail Hub proposal. Midlands Connect, in their initial draft letter in response to the HNRFI (dated 14/01/2022), indicated that the proposal aligned to the Midlands Connect Strategy. Midlands Connect also acknowledged that their strategy for growth on the corridor required an expansion of capacity on the corridor, for which investment is being sought.</p> <p>We believe that the timetabling work is sufficient and robust and would not impede the future aspirations for additional passenger rail growth between Birmingham and Leicester (which itself would require capacity enhancements), nor impede the aspiration for delivery of a Nuneaton Parkway station.</p>	<p>Network Rail have confirmed that the capacity study as allowed for this additional passenger traffic.</p>

<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Whilst the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (APP-085) includes for a Requirement to complete the rail freight terminal associated with the development before the occupation of 105,000sqm of warehouse floorspace, there does not appear to be any requirement for future occupiers to use the terminal. In addition, LCC LHA is aware of challenges on other NRFI developments (including Northampton Gateway) where such trigger points have subsequently been challenged by developers with the delivery of the rail connection significantly delayed.</p>	<p>The Applicant explained its position on the proposed timing for the provision of the rail terminal in requirement 10 of the dDCO in its Highways Position Statement submitted at Deadline 1 (Appendix A to the Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations, document reference: 18.2.1) (see paragraphs 3.47 – 3.61).</p> <p>With regard specifically to the imposition of a requirement for occupiers to use the terminal, the Applicant strongly disagrees that this is necessary or appropriate.</p> <p>It is not acceptable to include a requirement for occupiers to use the rail terminal. This would unreasonably restrict the commercial operation of the site by dictating occupation terms to occupiers. The absence of a requirement does not mean that the terminal will be less utilised, but is important to the Applicant’s delivery and commercial operation of the site that no such requirement is imposed. No other SRFI has imposed such a restriction and it is evident from East Midlands Gateway that occupiers are using the rail terminal without such restriction, including those occupiers who were in occupation before the terminal was operational (this was confirmed by the terminal operator in the recent application for the Northampton Gateway Amendment Order).</p> <p>Importantly, there is no policy requirement to impose any such requirement on occupiers in the DCO. Indeed, the NPSNN acknowledges the need for commercial flexibility to respond to the market (paragraph 2.45). The emerging draft NPS also recognises that applicants may need to deliver warehousing ahead of the final</p>
--------------------------------------	--	--

		<p>delivery and commissioning of connections to the rail network going forward (paragraph 4.86).</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers that such a requirement would be contrary to paragraph 4.9 of the NPSNN.</p> <p>It is not for the Applicant to comment on the rail delivery at Northampton Gateway, however the Applicant understands that there are no occupations yet and the rail infrastructure is well advanced on that site. As noted in paragraph 3.52 of the Applicant's Highways Position Statement submitted at Deadline 1 (Appendix A to the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (document reference: 18.2.1), the Secretary of State clearly had regard to the NPSNN in making his decision on the Northampton Gateway Amendment Order 2023.</p> <p>It is understood that the timing issues at Northampton Gateway related to the possession time Network Rail could secure to undertake the connection works, on this particularly busy section of the West Coast Main Line. This was beyond the scheme's intended programme date and hence the request to move the trigger point. It is understood that the rail connection was completed in September 2023.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident through its extensive engagement with Network Rail that the connections required to the railway will be delivered in line with the Applicant's proposals for delivering the private rail infrastructure and ensuring the terminal will be available</p>
--	--	--

		for use in accordance with the Applicant's proposed DCO requirement.
Leicestershire County Council	It has not been evidenced that Croft Quarry can remain rail served for up to four trains in a 24 hours period during the construction and operation of HNRFI.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 30)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The Council notes that reference is made to the proposed Nuneaton 'dive-under' connection enabling access to Southampton and Cardiff and is concerned as to how much reliance is placed on this connection to support market need when it is only being promoted as part of the draft West Midlands Rail Investment Strategy 2026-2031 and has no firm commitment.	No reliance is being made of the proposed 'dive under'. There is capacity through Water Orton to the WCML south of Birmingham, with a spur at Leamington Spa to Southampton via Oxford. However, the scheme is not predicated on Southampton traffic either.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The interchange design that is being promoted in the development presents a sub-optimal arrangement when compared with design options on alternative sites. This is illustrated in the arrangement for trains and trucks being brought directly alongside each other, with one-way flow for HGVs through a railport where the emphasis is to promote the fast and efficient transfer of freight.	The scheme has been designed specifically for the efficient use of the rail connections to the mainline and to achieve fast turnaround times for both trucks and trains. Without detailed evidence of the challenge, it is considered to be without merit.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Comparative analysis of space for additional sidings has been indicated in the reports and design parameter drawings. Optimal design, as one of the important factors in compliance with the NPS, should allow for greater depth of comparative analysis where	The Site Selection and Evolution (Document reference: 6.1.4 APP-113) dealt with the fact that there are no other suitable sites. The Application scheme includes rail connectable warehousing, should this be required (although it is for very specialised sectors of the

	<p>several options are expected to be considered. For example, how are other sites compared against optimised criterion where for example designs might consider permitting direct rail access to warehouse units on site, as well as additional stabling and the ability to handle electrically hauled freight trains in future.</p>	<p>market), stabling and is designed to accommodate electrically hauled freight trains in the future.</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Council</p>	<p>It is not made clear whether engineering and timetable assessment work undertaken with Network Rail through its in-house “GRIP” development programme has confirmed the ability to achieve the main line connections on which to commence operations, along with capacity within the timetable to accommodate the rail freight services associated with those operations.</p>	<p>Network Rail has confirmed the ability to achieve the main line connections to ES2, now towards achieving ES3 (formerly GRIP 2 and 3 respectively). It has also confirmed there is the capacity, including protecting the planned increase in passenger services. This is set out in the Rail Report Document ref 6.2.3.1 APP-131)</p>
<p>Scheme Evolution</p>		
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>During the pre-application stage, BDC raised concerns in respect of the layout of the Proposed Development, with any tugmaster movements needing to cross the A47 link road (see Table 4.2 of document 6.1.4 – Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement – Site Selection and Evolution). This issue is considered important to ensure the Proposed Development operates principally as a rail-linked facility and not as a road served distribution centre. The updated illustrative masterplan includes a ‘railport estate road link’ which seeks to address this previous concern</p>	<p>Additional modelling has been carried out in relation to tugmaster and lorry park movements to test the internal junctions and their capacity. This has been submitted as part of Deadline 2.</p> <p>The masterplan is illustrative and demonstrates one way in which the site could be developed. It is considered that Requirement 4 will be used to deliver the details of estate roads including any ‘railport estate road link’.</p>

	<p>Suggested amendment to the design code, 7.3.2 add additional bullet point: Internal estate roads will allow for access through to the railport without needing to use the A47 Link Road, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan (document reference 2.8).</p>	
<p>Relevant Legislation and Policy</p>		
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>Due consideration not given to local policy.</p> <p>It is also unclear to what extent the draft revised NPSNN has been taken into account.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered the provision of the development plan as a matter that may be both ‘important and relevant’. (S104 of The Planning Act)</p> <p>Individual topic chapters of the ES chapters 7 to 19 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-144 to APP-157) have identified development plan policy relevant to the particular environmental topics under consideration.</p> <p>The development management purpose of these policies is addressed within the generic impacts that are set out in the NPS – National Networks.</p> <p>The Planning Statement (document reference: 7.1, APP-347) has focused on development plan policy considerations that are not addressed in the NPS. Section 5 of the Planning Statement is titled Development Plan Considerations. The Planning Statement has considered the effect of HNRFI on Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy Policy 6, which relates to a Green Wedge. Blaby District Council has not identified any policy provision from the development</p>

		<p>plan which it is alleged the application for HNRFI has failed to consider.</p> <p>Document ref 7.2 submitted with the application is titled '<i>Response to draft National Policy Statement National Networks.</i>'</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>No reference is made to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). There is a traveller community around Aston Firs, immediately adjacent to the Site and thus, this policy is directly relevant.</p>	<p>All policy statements need to be read in their proper context. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) is a policy statement for the provision of traveller sites (paragraph 4) in both plan making and decision taking. The potential environmental effect of HNRFI upon residents of existing traveller sites has been considered within the Environmental Statement. Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119) included the caravan and mobile homes sites in the Aston Firs area as noise sensitive receptors (NRS). These are listed at Table 10:14 and shown on Figure 10.1 as NSR15; 16 and 17 and NSR28. Paragraph 10.326 identifies the noise mitigation barriers proposed which are shown in Long-term Development Generated Road Traffic Assessment with Mitigation - Noise Contours 'difference between with and without development' (document reference: 6.3.10.14, APP-283)</p> <p>Chapter 9 Air Quality (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) considers the effect of HNRFI on human receptors. At paragraph 9.148 the assessment concludes that the overall effect of HNRI on air quality is considered to be 'negligible' and 'not significant'. The application proposes appropriate mitigation to the potential effects of traffic noise on the community in the Aston Firs area to properly taken into account within the NPS-NN under the general impacts of noise and air quality. The PPTS does not provide planning policy guidance for new development close to existing gypsy and traveller sites. The</p>

		Applicant has applied equal consideration of the effect of HNRFI on the gypsy and traveller site community, and the residents of nearby mobile homes, as the consideration of the impact upon nearby residents in occupying traditional built dwellings.
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	It is not clear whether there has been any engagement with the Government on how it expects to account for any interventions. The Council is concerned that no consideration or examination of the likely social value of the project or indeed the mechanisms through which these interventions are included as part of the business case.	<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 clear gauge the strategic rail freight network – including Nuneaton to Felixstowe railway to W10. The socio-economic impacts of the development are addressed in the ES Chapter 7 (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116)</p> <p>There is no specific Government investment intervention required to deliver this Scheme, which is entirely privately funded. Without privately funded investment in SRFI's, Government's wider intervention in the Strategic Rail Freight Network would create no benefits.</p>
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	Introducing the new link road into this part of the Green Wedge is contrary to policies 1,2,3,4,6 & 20 of the Core Strategy and DM.4 and DM.9 of the Development Management Policies DPD and undermines the environmental and landscape protection role of the Green Wedge at this location.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 9)
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	The alignment of the A47 link road runs parallel to Burbage Common and Woods in close proximity to the designated wildlife site which covers the Common	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 9)

	and the Aston Firs Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The impact of the proposed development on these sensitive wildlife areas renders the proposal contrary to policies 1 and 20 of the Core Strategy and policies DM.6 and DM.9 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	The failure of the proposal to satisfactorily deliver a range of sustainable means of transport access to the site from nearby local communities means the proposal is contrary to policies 1,2,3,4 & 5 of the Core Strategy and policies DM.3 and DM.17 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 9)
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	The failure of the proposal to meet 'good design' criteria means that it is contrary to policy DM.10 of the Development Management Policies DPD and the Good Design SPD; and the potential adverse effects of the proposal on nearby residents and local communities by way of lighting, noise and air quality impact mean that it is contrary to policy DM.7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 9)
Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects		
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	Construction assumptions regarding displacement and use of 'average' years employment rather than spend profile.	Response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed in the draft HBBC SoCG with under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects, (document reference 19.2).
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	Operational assumptions regarding leakage and displacement.	See above

Hinckley and Bosworth Council	Inadequate analysis of types of construction skills required and the current local skills profile.	See above
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	Unrealistic assumptions regarding ability to fill future vacancies from local unemployed.	See above
Hinckley and Bosworth Council Leicestershire County Council	The use of the 2017 Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) when a more up to date 2022 version is available and this consequently fails to take account of the scale of other economic growth in the area.	See above A response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed in the draft LCC SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference 19.3).
Hinckley and Bosworth Council	Insufficient analysis of the development's impact on the local housing market and whether future housing delivery will be sufficient to support employment growth associated with the development.	See above
Leicestershire County Council	It is concerning that when considering the impact of construction, average levels of employment across the 10 year build period has been used rather, than a full spend profile, which means the housing market impact is inaccurate. There is limited analysis of the skills required, the availability of labour, and impact on health service provision and whether there are any housing affordability implications, including greater demand for shared accommodation.	A response to this matter is provided under Matters not Agreed in the draft LCC SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference 19.3). The applicant has also responded to the is matter as part of RR-0731 (document reference: 18.2, REP1-033).
Blaby District Council	Positive impacts related to employment creation in the area and general Gross Value Added (GVA) during both construction and operation.	Noted and agreed

Blaby District Council	Neutral impacts on the current demand for housing to meet Proposed Development employee requirements during operation.	See response to BDC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 13)
Blaby District Council	Negative impacts related to the scale of the Proposed Development which could cause the rate of demand for labour to experience a step change, which could create challenges for the local labour pool with the risk of demand outstripping supply posing recruitment difficulties for local businesses.	See response to BDC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4)
Blaby District Council	Whilst the overall socio-economic impacts of the Proposed Development may be positive for the wider region, many of these benefits will not be experienced in BDC's area.	It is agreed that there is some uncertainty on the absolute level of positive socio-economic impacts that will be experienced in the BDC area.
Skills and Training		
Blaby District Council	Whilst the operational effect on employment within the wider area is considered beneficial in terms of job creation, the likely employment requirements of the Proposed Development in operation could have negative impacts for resourcing staff or particular skills in the area	See response to BDC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 31).
Blaby District Council	There is a strong possibility that the Proposed Development would lead to the movement of people between different companies and sectors. BDC therefore consider that the strain in resourcing skilled workers would mean that the benefits of employment generation will be largely conferred upon those outside the District who are likely to travel	The applicant has considered the movement of people between different companies and sectors with the application of displacement. Further justification is provided in Table 7.16 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document reference: 6.1.7, APP-116). The displacement level used is agreed with BDC as per the draft BDC SoCG under Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects.

	<p>by car, this highlights the need for a robust Skills and Training Programme and sustainable travel plan.</p>	<p>The skills and training strategy is currently being worked through with the Local Authorities as part of S106 discussions. Response to this matter is also provided under Matters not Agreed in the draft BDC SoCG in the Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects section submitted at Deadline 2 and is under discussion with the Local Authorities.</p> <p>Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy is to be submitted at Deadline 3</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>It is imperative that the Applicant implements a robust employment, skills and training programme, the current proposals are not sufficient. Specific comments on Skills and Training measures (set out in page 9 of the WR). BDC considers the implementation of an effective Employment and Skills Strategy is essential to ensure the realisation of the employment benefits of the proposed development and avoid some of the potential negative socio-economic impacts identified. BDC considers that the strategy would be best secured via the S106 Agreement. This together with appropriate oversight vis the formal stakeholder group, should provide the necessary flexibility and improve the deliverability of the strategy without compromising the ambitious targets necessary due to the identified impacts. This will have implications for requirement 32.</p>	<p>The Applicant remains in discussion with the local authorities as on the provisions of the Skills and Training Programme. The Applicant is awaiting a response from the Local Authorities on the latest draft document. The Applicant has emphasised to officers at the Local Authorities that Obligations can not be entered into which the Applicant can not fulfill, in short form because the Applicant is not able to prescriptively enforce provisions such as the number of apprenticeships, upon future occupiers. The Applicant is hoping that the Local Authorities response will be proportionate and display greater understanding of the Applicant’s control over future employment provisions such as apprenticeships and training programmes.</p>

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	No provision is made to address skills and training in the HBBC area.	The Employment and Skills Strategy is an evolving document. The Applicant accepts that a Framework and Skills Programme is an appropriate requirement, or alternatively it may be addressed as a Planning Obligation. The Applicant awaits the response of the local authorities to the proposed content of the strategy. The Applicant will then consider such proposals in the context of the lawful provisions of Requirements/Planning Obligations.
Transport and Traffic		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The strategic modelling has not included any sensitivity tests around HGV routing or the employment distribution.	Refer to Applicant's response to Relevant Representations; Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) and the Applicant's response to the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Impact Report (document reference: 18.4).
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Little underlying source data, and there are no actual surveys of similar facilities to provide good information on the likely distribution of freight trips.	Refer to Applicant's response to Relevant Representations; Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) and the Applicant's response to the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Impact Report (document reference: 18.4).
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The Council notes that the sensitivity and importance of J21 of the M1 in the network suggest that testing using different distribution scenarios would help understand the impacts here much better.	Refer to Applicant's response to Relevant Representations; Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) and the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Impact Report (document reference: 18.4).
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The Council requested the applicant undertake an LTN 1/20 audit of the links (and proposed mitigation) for cycling (and walking) between the site and key local residential areas and the station, and this will clarify if the proposals are adequate- this has not been undertaken.	Refer to Applicant's response to Relevant Representations; Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) and the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Impact Report (document reference: 18.4).

Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council	There is no reconciliation of the parking proposals with the travel generation and the travel plan mode shift objectives.	Refer to Applicant’s response to Relevant Representations; Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) and the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Impact Report (document reference: 18.4).
Blaby District Council Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	A significant increase in traffic through Junction 3 M69 / Junction 21 M1. BDC is concerned that the Applicant has failed to appropriately assess and mitigate the Scheme’s impacts on both the SRN and the local road network.	Modelling of J21 has been carried out to understand the impacts of the development. The Environmental Statement - Appendix 8.1 - Transport Assessment [Part 8 of 20] - PRTM 2.2 Forecast Modelling Brief for the strategic model was signed off by LCC on 17/02/22 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP 145), this included future year scenarios and access infrastructure proposals. No sensitivity testing was requested at the time of agreement. Further detail is contained within Appendix A, Highway Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033).
Blaby District Council Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Inadequate proposals in respect of sustainable transport	Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy is to be submitted at Deadline 3
Blaby District Council	Consequential impacts of insufficient mitigation on local road network, including villages east of the site such as; Sopcote, Stoney Stanton and Sharnford.	Response to this matter is provided in the Applicant’s response to the BDC LIR (document reference 18.2) (response number 8)
Blaby District Council	The increased barrier downtime at Narborough Level Crossing and the impact it will have on the local road network and users of the crossing.	A Narborough Level Crossing Note covering all matters raised on Narborough level crossing in written representations and the Rule 17 letter will be submitted at Deadline 3.

Blaby District Council	BDC states LCC have raised issues within the following areas of the Applicant’s submission	See responses below
Blaby District Council	(a) Strategic model outputs	<p>Modelling brief for the Strategic Modelling was signed off by LCC on 17/02/22.</p> <p>Furnessing methodology and outputs have been shared from early in the model process. Points made by LCC and NH at the time related to changes in methodology to account for the fact that Junction 2 would have wholly new arms. Discussions were held with LCC NDI and their consultants who broadly agreed with the BWB approach- which was ultimately included in the DCO submission.</p> <p>Further comment was provided by LCC Highways Development Management (HDM) in June 2022, this was again incorporated into the final iteration of the Furnessing. NH had provided a technical note from their call off consultant AECOM (unconnected with the LCC NDI modellers) on the subject dated 03/09/21. This summarised that the “Approach described is generally considered to be sound, the process for deriving inputs to the Furness process is reasonable and the proposed process itself is correct” before describing specific observations and making clear recommendations. Outputs from the strategic modelling had been shared in April 2022 with further information shared up to early September 2022, based on requests for information by both NH and LCC. A commentary dated 29/09/22 was provided by NH which contained observations but no red flags. LCC provided a headline review of the information in August 2022 which reiterated their position on ‘no agreement’ and requested the analysis of several additional junctions within the study area. A</p>

		<p>review and analysis for these junctions was included in the DCO TA submission.</p> <p>A further clarification on the furnishing was included in a submission to the ExA on 11/09/23. This did not change the outputs for the analysis.</p>
Blaby District Council	(b) Junction assessments (including J3 M69 / J21 M1)	<p>Response to this matter is provided in the Applicant’s response to the LCC LIR (document reference 18.4) (response numbers 9, 10 and 11).</p>
Blaby District Council	(c) Rail and local road network impacts	<p>Narborough Level Crossing is an existing issue on the network. Network Rail has indicated that there is capacity for the train paths required and that barrier downtimes are not considered excessive. Adjustment to base and forecast strategic model was carried out at the request of LCC, to account for delay at Narborough. This was signed off by LCC on 01/03/22.</p> <p>Strategic modelling inputs and base models were all agreed with the key highway authorities at the time. The LCC Network Data Intelligence team were commissioned to carry out the modelling on agreement with the Transport Working Group. Further detail is contained within Appendix A, Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033). The mitigation approach has been based on the impacts reported from the strategic model forecasts and which address the impacts from the development and its associated access infrastructure. The Narborough Level crossing was subject to scrutiny by the LHA and models were adjusted to suit the existing and forecast delays.</p>

		<p>Network Rail have undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier down time. Based on the pre-pandemic timetable, in the morning peak hours 7 – 10 am, there is only one possible time an additional intermodal freight train could run. In the afternoon, between 4 – 7 pm only two. Each train travelling at 75 miles an hour would cause a maximum barrier downtime of 2.5mins. This is far less than a stopping passenger train coming from Leicester, which is 4-5 minutes. In each hour the total barrier down time would be approximately 20 minutes, with 40 minutes open which is well within Network Rails acceptable barrier down time at a level crossing.</p> <p>Network Rail is satisfied that sufficient capacity has been identified for HNRFI services in the Working Timetable. This allows for known passenger service development aspirations identified by Midlands Connect, to better link Birmingham, Nuneaton, Hinckley and Leicester.</p>
Blaby District Council	(d) Insufficient modelling for the Narborough Railway Station barrier downtime	<p>Refer to the Applicant’s response to the LCC Local Impact Report (document reference 18.4) (response number 29).</p> <p>In accordance with the ExA’s request for a 24 hour - 7 day analysis based on the ‘current situation’, a full video survey was taken for 7 days from the 11th October 2023. The data from this is being extracted and is being used, working with Network Rail, to provide a comprehensive analysis for the whole week, which will be provided in writing as a Technical Paper on completion and submitted to the ExA as soon as possible.</p>
Blaby District Council	(e) Mitigation strategy and proposals	<p>Mitigation has been communicated throughout the engagement process and adapted when informed by new strategic modelling outputs in stages where applicable. Mitigation has largely remained</p>

		unchanged. See Appendix A, Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) submitted at Deadline 1..
Blaby District Council	(g) HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy	Drafts of documents have been shared throughout the engagement. Further information is within Highway Position Statement, in Appendix B The HGV Strategy (document reference: 17.4, APP-362) is for agreement. The premise is based on precedent from Redditch Gateway, which is operational and is agreed with the relevant authorities. This places the onus on the applicant to enforce transgressions through penalties on operators at the site. The Applicant is happy to explain this position in dialogue with BDC if necessary.
Blaby District Council Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	(h) Construction impacts	<p>A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (document reference: 17.6, APP-364) was submitted as part of the DCO Application and seeks, where reasonably possible to do so, to limit temporary closures and diversions. This includes the submission to, and approval by, the local highway authority of a temporary traffic management plan (see paragraphs 1.113 - 1.116 of the CTMP). Requirement 24 (Schedule 2) of the draft Development Consent Order (document Reference: 3.1, APP-085) requires the Applicant to submit a detailed construction traffic management plan which must accord with the principles set out in the CTMP submitted with the Application.</p> <p>Information and advance warning will be available through the highway authorities who will manage the Project's impact on the highway network. The Applicant will liaise with the relevant highway authorities to enact the highway improvement works on a phased basis.</p>

Blaby District Council	(i) Framework Site Wide Travel Plan and Sustainable Transport Strategy	<p>Drafts of documents have been shared throughout the engagement.</p> <p>With regard to operational traffic, Requirement 8 of the DCO ensure that the development traffic is controlled through the Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.2, APP-159).</p> <p>Drafts of documents have been shared throughout the engagement.</p> <p>With regard to operational traffic, Requirement 9 of the DCO ensures that the development traffic is controlled through the Sustainable Transport Strategy (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153).</p>
Blaby District Council	(j) Access infrastructure	Access Infrastructure, its design and capacity have been communicated with LCC throughout the engagement.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	There is a lack of detailed public information on the traffic impacts on different links; for example graphics with bars are shown, but not necessarily the number of vehicles at each location (particularly for HGV's alone)	Further plots from the PRTM Model to be shared at Deadline 3.
Mitigation		
Warwickshire County Council	Given the significant scale of the proposed development, we would encourage the applicant to set up and administer a forum akin to the Magna Park Lutterworth Community Liaison Group (MPCLG) and a Transport Review Group as set up for the DIRFT III/Rugby SUE (Houlton). Both forums were established in order to address concerns by local	This can be considered as the HGV Routing Strategy and Travel Plan evolves.

	communities and those experiencing impacts as a result of the developments.	
Warwickshire County Council	The DCO does not include a S278 agreement. This would be Warwickshire delivery mechanism.	The Applicant is awaiting detailed comment from WCC in respect of Work No. 16 which needs to be dealt with between all three highway authorities. The Applicant is continuing to attempt to engage with WCC as the Applicant requires suitable protective provisions within the Order to deal with the relevant highway works, which is consistent with the approach taken with the other local highway authorities.
Warwickshire County Council	It would be Warwickshire County Council's preference that s106 contributions should only be secured towards schemes/infrastructure already identified, any new schemes/infrastructure required to mitigate the proposal should be funded and delivered via a s278 agreement to avoid the cost burden falling on the public purse.	
Warwickshire County Council	It is not clear if all of the mitigation proposed is within the highway boundary or on land within the applicant's control. Given the issues highlighted above with modelling, there is insufficient information to judge whether such mitigation is appropriate.	Land for highway works is contained within the Order Limits, the majority of the land is within the highway boundary, where land for highway works is not within the highway boundary compulsory Acquisition powers are being sought through the dDCO, these would be enacted should the applicant not achieve voluntary agreement with the landowner. The Applicant confirms that all land required for highway works within Warwickshire County Council's administrative area is within existing highway land and therefore that the inclusion of appropriate provisions dealing with the highway works (akin to a s278 agreement) within the Order is sufficient. The Applicant is seeking to engage with WCC on the inclusion of such provisions.

HGV Routing		
Warwickshire County Council	The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange proposal includes for a HGV Route Management Strategy, similar in form to that implemented for the Redditch Eastern Gateway development. However there are elements of the document submitted that do not make reference to Warwickshire's network and the roads/villages, and therefore the detail contained within this document would require further revision for Warwickshire County Council to agree to it.	See response to WCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 9)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The applicants' HGV management strategy indicates that HGVs from the site will not use the B4468 Leicester road to the north of the site (and by assumption the link road here); this is welcomed by the Council, but it is noted that the applicant's transport modelling does show HGV's using this route. This implies that the traffic assessment is therefore incorrect, and these HGVs will be using other routes, and more information is needed to assess the local impact of HGV movements. The Council also has concerns about how the enforcement of the HGV strategy will be secured and undertaken.	The route is undesirable, not prohibited. Measures to limit HV traffic on these routes are to be communicated by site management, but they are not to be limited as the connection provides linkage to the A47.
Leicestershire County Council	The intention of the submitted HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (APP362) is to ensure that development HGV traffic uses the most appropriate routes to/from the site. The sentiment of this document is welcome in its acknowledgement	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 44)

	<p>that the impact of development HGV traffic on the LRN and Leicestershire residents could be significant. As noted above this Strategy was developed following the strategic modelling being undertaken and therefore the impact of the Strategy has not been tested.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>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. The term undesirable suggests that routes can still be used by development HGV traffic. Indeed, at paragraph 6.3 the Strategy states “a package of encouragement measures” will assist in formalising HGV movements. This does not provide assurance that HGV routing to/from the site will be effectively monitored and enforced against a strict routing plan.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 45)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Within the draft DCO (APP-085), there is a proposed Requirement to implement the HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (APP-362). However, on the basis that the Strategy acknowledges that it remains subject to further discussions and amendments, it is unclear how this requirement could be discharged. The Strategy uses phrases like “could”, “to be agreed”, “details of implementation will be subject to approval”.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 46)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The monitoring and enforcement of the Strategy is intended to be included within tenancy agreements with future occupiers of the development. However,</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 47)</p>

	<p>the only control appears to be the loosely worded Requirement as set out above that relates to a Strategy under development.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The Strategy (paragraph 5.34) places onus on LCC and WCC to investigate breaches. This is not something that has been discussed with the HAs. It is unclear what legal powers of investigation and enforcement the HAs hold, and no resource is proposed to be provided to assist. Whilst the Strategy used at Redditch Gateway has frequently been referenced LCC LHA has questioned deliverability, enforcement, implications in respect of GDPR, and the legality of ANPR cameras for private enforcement on the public highway. The Document does not provide these answers, nor does it appear to include for a robust, implementable, enforceable Strategy.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 48)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Responsibility for co-ordination and monitoring the Strategy will be the responsibility of the Travel Plan Co-ordinator as set out at paragraph 8.5 of the Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (APP-159). However, there appears to be no commitment in the DCO (APP-085) or the s106 Heads of Terms (APP-351) to this Travel Plan Co-ordinator post. Moreover, 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 LHA question how</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 49)</p>

	the Strategy will be co-ordinated and monitored in perpetuity.	
Public Rights of Way (PRoW)		
Leicestershire County Council	<p>PRoW - U52</p> <p>No details have been provided within the application of the proposed A47 link road underpass. Therefore, it is unclear if this will provide sufficient clearance for equestrian users, and indeed how attractive this underpass may be to use. 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.</p>	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 52)
Leicestershire County Council	<p>PRoW – V35/1</p> <p>LCC LHA 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 APP279.</p>	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 53)
Leicestershire County Council	<p>PRoW – U17</p> <p>The proposed PRoW diversion in this location to facilitate removal of the existing level crossing as</p>	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 54)

	<p>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. 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>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>PRoW – T89/1</p> <p>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 LHA have requested a RSA of this proposal. To date this has not been forthcoming.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 55)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>PRoW – V23 & U50</p> <p>LCC LHA 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 access to Bridge Farm. LCC LHA have requested details of this proposal. To date these have not been forthcoming.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference: 18.4) (response number 56)</p>

<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>PRoW – U8</p> <p>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, no details of the footbridge design appear to have been provided in the application submission. LCC LHA 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). However, 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>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 57)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>In addition, LCC LHA 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. Given details of the structure have not been provided LCC LHA remain unclear if the restricted access to this location as identified by the red line boundary will allow for the structure to be installed.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 58)</p>
<p>Construction Impacts</p>		
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The application submission includes a Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-359) and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (APP364). Neither document is drafted in any detail.</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 59)</p>

	<p>Details of construction traffic routeing and monitoring and enforcement are extremely limited, and details in respect of access from the LRN, haul roads, compounds, contractor parking, methods to prevent detritus being deposited on the public highway etc. have not been provided. Furthermore, the limited details provided do not appear to cross reference with the Illustrative Phasing and Works Plans (APP-050 – APP-055).</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Whilst LCC LHA accept that further information would be available following appointment of a Principal Contractor, commitments to providing this information are limited. For example, LCC LHA 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 (APP085) or the s106 Heads of Terms (APP-351).</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 60)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Concerningly, the proposal for routeing of construction traffic to construct the slip roads includes for U-turning HGV traffic at M1 J21/M69 J3. Whilst the CTMP (APP-364) 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. Indeed, 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</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 61)</p>

	reference to restrictions on peak hour movements. Given concerns in respect of capacity at this junction as outlined above, it is unclear what additional impact this U-turning construction traffic may have on the displacement of traffic onto the LRN, or indeed any associated impacts on highway safety.	
Leicestershire County Council	It remains unclear how the Applicant proposes to construct the A47 link road access and where construction vehicles are proposed to route i.e., will it be built out from M69 J2 and all construction traffic routed through the site, or will construction traffic need to route via the A47/Hinckley/Leicester? No reference appears to have been made to construction traffic routing and management for the construction of off-site mitigation works.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 62)
Framework Site Wide Travel Plan		
Leicestershire County Council	The submitted Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (APP-159) appears to be very limited in content. Moreover, it lacks commitments to the measures identified, incentives to encourage modal shift, monitoring and penalties. It is therefore unclear to LCC LHA how the modal shift target of 10% reduction in single occupancy car trips (paragraph 3.7) will be achieved.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 63)
Leicestershire County Council	Paragraph 4.6 of the Framework Site Wide Travel Plan (APP-159) acknowledges that “given the location of the site, opportunities to encourage more people to walk to the site are limited”. Paragraph 4.12 also	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 64)

	acknowledges that whilst “there is some cycle infrastructure in the area, the access to the site is currently limited”. Despite these statements and acknowledgement that there is an opportunity for residents of local villages to walk and cycle to the site, no improvements to the existing network to facilitate walking and cycling access are proposed. This is in clear contrast to the requirements set out in the NPPF paragraph 110.	
Leicestershire County Council	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 obvious omissions e.g., reference to EV charging and parking.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 65)
Leicestershire County Council	The Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan (APP-153) includes for a Bus Strategy at section 7. This relies on the X6 Leicester to Coventry service being diverted to serve the site. However, this service operates with limited stops outside of the City boundaries on a frequency and timetable not conducive to shift working patterns. 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. It is noted that no discussions have taken place with the operator since April 2022.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4,) (response number 66)
Leicestershire County Council	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	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 67)

	<p>limited period of 5 years. This is not something that LCC LHA have requested. Given the service is limited stop it would provide little benefit to County residents. Moreover, it is unclear how the contribution is calculated, and this is not something that LCC would lead on procuring. The Applicant has been advised to liaise with LCiC in this regard.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The Bus Strategy relies on a Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) proposal for serving surrounding villages. It is important to note that the DRT service referenced is a trial funded by the Department for Transport. 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. There is no guarantee that the service will continue after this trial period as has been the experience elsewhere in the County. LCC LHA do not consider that DRT is the most effective provision for an employment site operating on fixed shift working patterns. This would be most suited to a fixed timetable service. Moreover, there appears to be no commitment to providing a DRT service in either the DCO (APP-085) or the s106 Heads of Terms (APP351).</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 68)</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>It is also worthy of note 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 (APP159) appears to have been made since October 2022. Some of the services listed have seen timetable</p>	<p>See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 69)</p>

	and/or routing changes, and others have been subsequently withdrawn and cannot be relied upon.	
Leicestershire County Council	It is understood that the Applicant is undertaking a sensitivity test of the proposed modal split based on employee origins identified by a gravity model assessment. This 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.	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 70)
Strategic Road Network		
Blaby District Council	The Proposed Development would significantly increase the traffic through Junction 3 M69 / Junction 21 M1, without mitigation this is concerning...	This matter has been addressed in detail in Appendix A, Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) submitted at Deadline 1.
Blaby District Council	Shortcomings in the modelling of J21 and this has implications across other ES chapters.	Modelling of J21 has been carried out to understand the impacts of the development. The Environmental Statement - Appendix 8.1 - Transport Assessment [Part 8 of 20] - PRTM 2.2 Forecast Modelling Brief for the strategic model was signed off by LCC on 17/02/22 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP 145), this included future year scenarios and access infrastructure proposals. No sensitivity testing was requested at the time of agreement. Further detail is contained within Appendix A, Highway Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1).

Blaby District Council	BDC is therefore concerned that the Applicant has failed to appropriately mitigate the scheme's impacts on both the SRN and the local road network. Issues with congestion on the SRN have been highlighted however the only mitigation that has been proposed is a £500,000 contribution towards an existing bus service. The figure of this contribution has not been agreed with any of the Local Authorities and there has been no explanation and justification for the figure offered. Whilst this mitigation has been offered, bypass options around the southern villages of Blaby District have been prematurely discounted. Moreover, the mitigation has not been agreed with the appropriate highway and planning authorities.	It is the applicant's view that the proposed infrastructure, highway and public transport proposals proportionately mitigate the impact of the development. The proposals for the X6 are to be discussed further ahead of deadline 3. Though the contribution will fund a minimum of 5 years pump priming for the extending the X6 service. The bypass options were subject to a public consultation during which there was near unanimous opposition. Initial consultation with LCC highlighted that the A47 Link Road presented a preferred highway option as it provided clear strategic benefits to the area. The bypasses would have limited localised benefit with additional impacts on key routes such as the B4114.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The applicant has provided information (Figure 5.5. of the TA) that suggests that some existing bridleways/footpaths will be replaced by permissive paths, which is a downgrade of the existing status.	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 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.
Inconsistency in employment numbers used		
Blaby District Council Leicestershire County Council	The Proposed Development provides scope to create between 8,400 and 10,400 jobs (low and high development quantum) however the various technical reports have adopted an inconsistent approach to these employment figures.	The Applicant has prepared a note on employee numbers and trip generation which addresses the derivation of the figures used in

Blaby District Council	The Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.8.1) and the associated transport modelling appears to be predicated on the lower employment level, the potential under estimation of workers on site by 24% could significantly alter the quantum of vehicle movements, potential vehicle routing and the associated impacts of the traffic generated by the Proposed Development.	modelling and the relationship between the approaches, this was submitted at deadline 1 as part of post hearing submission ISH1 and CAH1 as Appendix A (document reference: 18.1.1, REP1-018). As this note clearly demonstrates, the modelling is robust and has been based on the maximum parameters in accordance with Rochdale envelope principles and therefore all other technical assessments that use the transport modelling are considered to be robust.
Blaby District Council	Changes to the highway quantum and routing of highway movements will have a knock-on effect upon the other environmental areas such as noise / vibration, air quality reports, and sustainable travel. Significant concern is therefore raised in respect of the adequacy of the assessment undertaken	
Maximising use of rail during construction		
Blaby District Council	How is the use of rail during the phase to be maximised to reduce road-based HGV movements	Once the terminal is connected and operating then construction materials can be delivered by rail via the terminal, where they can be suitably conveyed.
Sustainable transport		
Leicester City Council	The City Council had initial discussions with the applicant about a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) in late Spring 2023. This included support for and / or direct provision of public transport service enhancements between the city and site, including public transport infrastructure enhancements within the city and / or financial support for city based employees. However, the Council has not had any further direct dialogue with the applicant or transport	Sustainable transport Strategy is to be updated with further detail ahead of Deadline 3.

	<p>consultant since then and has not been listed as a party to enter into a SoCG as part of the submission documents. The Council is concerned that it has not been listed and it is imperative that this is required to fully secure the Sustainable Transport Strategy.</p>	
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>The measures included within the Framework Travel Plan and Sustainable Transport Strategy are generally in accordance with the type of measures that would be expected. However these documents do not provide any detail as to how employees living in Warwickshire, albeit the northern part of the County most likely, would realistically be able to access the site using sustainable travel modes. Further the baseline percentage mode share applied within the assessment is based on 2011 census data and whilst using the local middle super output areas (010 & 012) for Blaby, the percentage for walking is noted as being high (11%) given the rural location of the proposal. This matter was raised at the Transport Working Group meetings.</p>	<p>Sustainable transport Strategy is to be updated with further detail ahead of Deadline 3.</p>
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>Public Transport most viable option from Warwickshire.</p> <p>Nuneaton and Bedworth, Bulkington, Wolvey, Rugby, Atherstone and Tamworth, the public transport provision needs to provide suitable bus services that connect the site with those population centres.</p>	<p>Sustainable transport Strategy (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) is to be updated with further detail ahead of Deadline 3.</p>

Blaby District Council	The X6 will not provide a suitable option for those employees who do not live within easy accessibility of those city centres.	The X6 covers areas of potential employee catchment density as identified through the Trip Distribution (APP-142) which was signed off by TWG members
Blaby District Council	It is unclear why the Applicant's proposals are split between the Site Wide Travel Plan (secured by Requirement 8 of the dDCO) and the Sustainable Transport Strategy (secured by Requirement 9). This creates a risk of overlap, duplication and a disjointed approach. It also increases the administrative burden on the relevant discharging authority. BDC considers these Requirements should be combined and the Applicant's commitments set out in a single Travel Plan which incorporates measures to support sustainable travel.	Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy and the Travel Plan will be submitted at Deadline 3
Blaby District Council	Revised draft NPSNN requires consideration to be given to whether the Applicant has maximised opportunities to allow for journeys associated with the Proposed Development to be undertaken via sustainable modes, BDC considers the Applicant's proposals do not maximise these opportunities.	Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy will be submitted at Deadline 3
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The X6 bus contribution is flawed as LCC have rejected it as they do not operate the service. The X6 is impractical as it does not stop at the site.	The X6 is operated by Arriva between Coventry and Leicester, these are two significant cities within a short distance from the site and present likely sources of employees at the site. The service is proposed to be enhanced and will enter the site.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) is understood to be a DfT trial service which cannot be relied upon to continue and for which there is no fallback support in the draft s106 should the trial be withdrawn.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4, response number 41)

Warwickshire County Council		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Figure 13 of the Sustainable Transport Strategy indicates that there is a possibility of fixed bus routes directly into the site from Hinckley, Earl Shilton and Barwell, but there is no explanation as to how this could be secured, nor is it a provision in the draft s106 and therefore there is no guarantee that suitable bus transport is going to be accessible for commuters to get to the development site.	Table 6 of the Sustainable Transport Strategy (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) outlines the approach to the bus operation in the areas indicated in Figure 13. This service would be privately funded by the site.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	No additional connectivity between the railway station and the site other than DRT.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 41)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Poor walking connectivity to the units within the site and no detail of the buses to stop at the bus stops within the site.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 41)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Lack of cycling facilities including on the B4669 Sapcote Road from the site to Hinckley and the railway station and only partial cycling facilities on the B4668 Leicester Road to the west of the proposed link road junction with this road. Controlled cycling crossing facilities do not exist on these roads or on the A47 in the vicinity of the Leicester Road junction.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 40)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Given the stopping up of the extensive existing PRoW network and its replacement by more circuitous routes, the Council requests that the proposed alternative bridleway/footpath and cycle path network should not be permissive routes but instead	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 42)

	<p>be part of the PRow or public cycle path network where the public have a legal right across the land. In response to this point the applicant notes 'A more direct route from the eastern edge of Elmesthorpe to Burbage Common can be made via pedestrian and cycle routes within the main body of the site. In these circumstances providing full PRow (and cycle access) status is required.</p>	
Blaby District Council	<p>Limited information has been provided on bus route upgrades. Disappointing that the intended connection of the Site by a bus service to Hinckley Railway Station has been replaced by an 'on-demand' service. BDC consider DRT inappropriate for the Proposed Development. Framework Site Wide Travel Plan should be amended to require a fixed bus service from the station.</p>	<p>Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>Improved cycle storage at Hinckley Railway Station will aid those choosing to travel by rail and bike. BDC requests that a secure hub undercover and overlooked by CCTV, accessed by a fob is provided. Similar secure cycle parking hubs on the Site should also be provided to encourage movements by bicycle.</p>	<p>Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy will be submitted at Deadline 3</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>Secure cycle storage should be provided at Narborough Railway Station, together with a contribution towards future maintenance.</p>	
Blaby District Council	<p>Consideration should be given to the implementation of an E – Bike hire scheme for staff to access.</p>	

Blaby District Council Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Walking and cycling facilities should be designed to the standard of LTN1/20 and included in the DCO and associated S106 to connect the site to Hinckley town centre and Hinckley railway station.	WCHAR pt 16 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-154) carried out for the site, cycle and pedestrian provision is enhanced throughout the site.
Blaby District Council	Existing cycling routes and key walking routes should be assessed with official Government tools. Current cycle provision should be audited with Department for Transport’s Cycle Level of Service and Junction Assessment Tools to ensure all aspects of user experience and safety have been assessed and scored. The Department for Transport’s Walking Route Audit Tool will ensure that facilities such as dropped kerbs are assessed for tactile paving.	Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Travel Plan proposed ahead of Deadline 3
Blaby District Council	It should also be noted that the Council are producing a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (“Blaby LCWIP”) which is in the very early stages of production. There will be an expectation that the Proposed Development delivers the required cycling and walking infrastructure to contribute and connect to the Blaby LCWIP.	Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Travel Plan proposed ahead of Deadline 3
Blaby District Council	A cohesive pedestrian and cycle signage scheme should assist with movements through the Site, highlighting links to villages and towns accessible onwards through the Site	Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Travel Plan proposed ahead of Deadline 3
Narborough Level Crossing		
Leicestershire County Council	There are potential impacts on the residents of Narborough and Littlethorpe due to the impact of the freight trains and increased barrier down time at	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 71)

	<p>Narborough Level Crossing (situated within Blaby District). The level crossing does not currently provide step-free access, therefore, making it inaccessible to people with disabilities or pushchairs. Alongside this, there is potential for additional delays and increased barrier downtime associated with this project, which may cause community severance in the ability to access key services including schools, pharmacies and medical centre for people unable to navigate the stairs at Narborough Data from Office for National Statistics, Census 2021 shows the disability rate Blaby District to be 6.1% of the population to be Disabled under the Equality Act with day to day activities limited a lot. There is a risk that the increase in the level crossing downtime will impact local traffic flow. Ambulance response between Narborough Ambulance Station to incidents in Littlethorpe and surrounding areas may be delayed due to the level crossing impacting traffic flow. A full health impact assessment could identify likely impacts in full and consider mitigation. The study area included in APP-137 does not clearly include these areas</p>	
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>Significant concerns around the impacts of additional barrier down time at the Narborough Level Crossing on Narborough, Littlethorpe and the surrounding area.</p>	<p>There is a history of blocking back over the crossing, which largely relates to the existing road layout and poor driver discipline. However, many of the issues relating to the crossing are pre-existing and the direct impact of the Scheme would be to increase the barrier down time by only another five minutes in the hour.</p> <p>Network Rail is satisfied that the small increase in barrier down time will not impact significantly on the risk profile at the crossing as</p>

		<p>regards rail traffic and thus it is not considered the Terminal would trigger the need for further works at the crossing.</p> <p>In accordance with the ExA's request for a 24 hour - 7 day analysis based on the 'current situation', a full video survey was taken for 7 days from the 11th October 2023. The data from this is being extracted and is being used, working with Network Rail, to provide a comprehensive analysis for the whole week, which will be provided in writing as a Technical Paper on completion and submitted to the ExA as soon as possible.</p>
Blaby District Council	Narborough level crossing provides an important link between the communities of Narborough and Littlethorpe. The level crossing is used by vehicles and pedestrians, when the barrier is down, there is a stepped pedestrian footbridge but no lifts for people with impaired mobility. The narrow pavements make waiting and crossing unpleasant, and potentially unsafe.	A Narborough Level Crossing Note covering all matters raised on Narborough level crossing in written representations and the Rule 17 letter dated will be submitted at Deadline 3.
Blaby District Council	The crossing downtime, would increase. No improvements or mitigations are planned for the Narborough Level Crossing or its approach.	A Narborough Level Crossing Note covering all matters raised on Narborough level crossing in written representations and the Rule 17 letter dated will be submitted at Deadline 3.
Blaby District Council	Significant deficiencies in the Applicant's assessment of the traffic impacts of downtime at the level crossing. Consider the Applicant's assessment understates the likely impacts of the increased barrier down time at the level crossing including the noise and air quality impacts from the additional queuing traffic, and the potential rerouting of vehicles	In accordance with the ExA's request for a 24 hour - 7 day analysis based on the 'current situation', a full video survey was taken for 7 days from the 11 th October 2023. The data from this is being extracted and is being used, working with Network Rail, to provide a comprehensive analysis for the whole week, which will be provided in writing as a Technical Paper on completion and submitted to the ExA as soon as possible.

	<p>unwilling to wait. A detailed analysis of traffic flows and capacity modelling should be carried out to determine the traffic impacts on local junctions as a result of the increased barrier down time. The noise and air quality impacts associated with an increase in queuing and diverted traffic should also be assessed.</p>	
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>Increased down time creates an ongoing daily inconvenience impacting upon individuals' experience and perceptions of accessibility. There is a risk that the increase in downtime would impact the accessibility to healthcare.</p>	<p>The potential impact on access and accessibility, community severance as well as pedestrian and driver delay has been assessed as part of the Transport Assessment, and demonstrates no significant impact. To clarify, the downtime comprises one additional train in the morning (between 7am to 10am), and two trains in the afternoon (between 4pm and 7pm). In each case, the maximum barrier down time is 2 minutes and 30 seconds.</p> <p>This is not of frequency or duration to materially impact on existing use, behaviours or perceptions of accessibility, would not have any measurable physical or mental health impact, or prevent access to healthcare.</p> <p>Blaby District Council's own assessment on this confirms that:</p> <p><i>"This assessment concludes 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. Nevertheless, there will be occasions when the effects will be noticeable and would likely to influence daily routines causing delays."</i></p>

		<p>Blaby District Council Written Representation. Appendix 4: Narborough Social, Health & Wellbeing Impact Report (Iceni)</p> <p>The Iceni report commissioned by Blaby District Council does suggest mitigation, including the provision of a lift to a historic structure, of which is likely to result in similar if not longer delay to use (more than 2.5 minutes), and the provision of lighting.</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>Given the importance of the level crossing as a community link improvements to the Narborough Level Crossing are necessary to mitigate the impacts. Would be beneficial to improve accessibility for disabled users, those with pushchairs and those who require step free access, BDC considers it unacceptable that the needs of these residents have been afforded no consideration. Potential indirect impact of the increase in freight is a perceived decrease in safety. The Applicant should be required to improve safety measures such as additional lighting at the crossing.</p>	<p>As detailed in the DCO, potential impacts at the Narborough Level Crossing have been assessed through inappropriately scoped and proportionate assessment to consider any potentially significant impact. All credible environmental and socio-economic changes with the potential for a significant impact have been assessed and addressed accordingly. In this instance, there is no significant impact on access and accessibility, and no significant delay to pedestrians.</p> <p>This is further tested and confirmed in Blaby District Council’s own Written Representation. Appendix 4: Narborough Social, Health & Wellbeing Impact Report (Iceni), which concludes:</p> <p><i>“increased downtime of the barrier at Narborough Crossing is not considered to have an overall material impact on quality of life of residents. Nevertheless, there will be occasions when the effects will be noticeable and would likely to influence daily routines causing delays”.</i></p> <p>The absence of any significant impact is not a failure to assess, and it is incorrect to infer that the needs of residents have been afforded no consideration, when both the DCO and Blaby District Councils own</p>

		assessment on the mater confirms no significant impact in this regard.
Landscape and Visual Effects		
Blaby District Council	The scale and proposed built form of the Proposed Development will have a major, permanent, adverse effect on landscape character and visual amenity of the surrounding environment. These impacts are not solely constrained to the Site and the rural character of the surrounding landscape and villages and the wider area will change as a result of the bulk and scale of the development.	As noted in LIR BDC (response 32) it is acknowledged that there will be significant residual effects on the local landscape character. The proposed development site has been defined by the parameter plans and it is inevitable the creation of an SRFI site, in an environment that has been used for agricultural purposes will create a new aesthetic and character that is in discordance with the existing character and vernacular.
Blaby District Council	The Proposed Development will cause significant long term negative residual effects on the character and fabric of the Site, the character area within which the Site is located, adjacent character area and in relation to the character and fabric of the A47 link road. The Council's LIR identifies the specific landscape character areas that will be adversely affected.	As noted in LIR BDC (response 32) it is acknowledged that there will be significant residual effects on the local landscape character. The proposed development site has been defined by the parameter plans and it is inevitable the creation of an SRFI site, in an environment that has been used for agricultural purposes will create a new aesthetic and character that is in discordance with the existing character and vernacular.
Blaby District Council	SoS required under NPSNN (para 5.157) to consider whether the proposed development has been designed carefully taking account of environmental effects on the landscape and siting, operational and other relevant constraints to avoid adverse effects on landscape or to minimise harm to the landscape, including by reasonable mitigation. Fails to satisfy these requirements.	Landscape considerations have been a part of the design evolution since the land was first considered for development by TSH in 2016. The impact on the landscape has been considered at various stages including the initial extent of the development and the scale of detail of the design. Over 22ha of publicly accessible green space would be delivered adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park. In addition, Green Infrastructure corridors up to 50m wide and more are

		<p>provided around the boundaries of the development to maintain green connectivity across the site and provide buffering to adjacent woodland. The Green Infrastructure proposals are illustrated on the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (document reference 6.3.11.20). Overall Green and Blue Open Space accounts for approximately 28% of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor.</p> <p>The scale of the project has been reduced following consultation, the heights of the units being reduced by 2-5m (7-18%) when compared with the PEIR Stage. This is described in the DAS (document reference 8.1). Reducing the height of the units to the revised heights does not pose an operational constraint but it reduces flexibility in terms of potential end users.</p> <p>Additional planting and creation of natural green space has been included to the south of the A47 Link Road to extend the area of public open space and provide additional mitigation for users of Burbage Common and Woods Country Park.</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The development will change the character of the extensive site from open countryside to industrial/urban, with complete loss of all features including the mature trees and hedgerows, water features and rural farms within the site.</p>	<p>As noted in LIR BDC (response 32) it is acknowledged that there will be significant residual effects on the local landscape character. The proposed development site has been defined by the parameter plans and it is inevitable the creation of an SRFI site, in an environment that has been used for agricultural purposes will create a new aesthetic and character that is in discordance with the existing character and vernacular.</p> <p>Landscape considerations have been a part of the design evolution since the land was first considered for development by TSH in 2016. The impact on the landscape has been considered at various stages</p>

		<p>including the initial extent of the development and the scale of detail of the design.</p> <p>Over 22ha of publicly accessible green space would be delivered adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park. In addition, Green Infrastructure corridors up to 50m wide and more are provided around the boundaries of the development to maintain green connectivity across the site and provide buffering to adjacent woodland. The Green Infrastructure proposals are illustrated on the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (document reference 6.3.11.20). Overall Green and Blue Open Space accounts for approximately 28% of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor.</p>
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The separation between the main site and the Burbage Common and Woods Country Park is not 'generous' achieving natural separation.	The Landscape Strategy includes woodland and tree planting which maintains good visual separation with Burbage Common and Woods Country Park as demonstrated in the Photomontages, Figure 11.16 (document reference: 6.3.11.16, APP-300). Over 22ha of publicly accessible green space would be delivered adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The application appears silent on the delivery and future management of this newly created extension to the Common and this is a matter which should be given greater certainty by inclusion in the s106 agreement. This area can already be appreciated as an undeveloped rural farmed vale landscape as it exists	Management principles would be agreed at a later, detailed design stage.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The landscape strategy has been designed to fit around the perimeters of the development rather than working with the natural landscape context. The narrow 'green' corridor, wedged between the development and the motorway, location of flood	The proposed development site has been defined by the parameter plans and it is inevitable the creation of an SRFI site, in an environment that has been used for agricultural purposes will create

	<p>attenuation pools at the top of gradients, and design of public amenity space along a major link road are examples of a landscape that does not respond well to the local context and character.</p>	<p>a new aesthetic and character that is in discordance with the existing character and vernacular.</p> <p>Over 22ha of publicly accessible green space would be delivered adjacent to Burbage Common and Woods Country Park. In addition, Green Infrastructure corridors up to 50m wide and more are provided around the boundaries of the development to maintain green connectivity across the site and provide buffering to adjacent woodland. The Green Infrastructure proposals are illustrated on the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (document reference 6.3.11.20). Overall Green and Blue Open Space accounts for approximately 28% of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor.</p>
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	<p>While the site itself is low lying and appears visually enclosed from within, with views partially contained by the woodland backdrop at Aston Firs and the mature trees and hedgerows within the site – it sits as part of a more visually exposed low-lying vale, with settlements on surrounding minor ridges. Apart from Burbage Wood and Aston Firs this is an open, unwooded landscape with a limited sense of enclosure provided by low trimmed hedgerows with mature trees allowing long views, both within and across from surrounding higher land</p>	<p>The boundary planting will be very effective at screening views of much of the development over the longer term, particularly the lower active zone where movement of trains, HGV's and containers would otherwise be a distracting feature in views from the surrounding area.</p>
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	<p>The scale and bulk of the layout of container stacks, rectilinear roofscape, plus the tall rail gantries will have a dominant visual presence and the height of the container stacks (22-28m) means that for the majority of views, mitigation by screening is not possible. The</p>	<p>Visual Impacts are agreed as set out in ES Chapter 11 (document reference: 6.1.11A) and the draft SoCG submitted at Deadline 2.</p>

	<p>development will have many and far reaching significant visual impacts from its initial construction and continuing during operation of the site as illustrated in the applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). People affected include those travelling along local roads between villages and the urban centres at Hinckley and Barwell, people using the network of local rights of way and local open spaces including adjacent to settlements, people resident in local properties, and those travelling on the motorway.</p>	
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>In the ridge top settlements of Barwell and Earl Shilton, the characteristic long views out across the vale from the edges of the development with its patchwork of farmland and trees (where existing linear infrastructure of the road and rail line is not discernible or in the case of the grid line is permeable) will be blocked in the middle ground by the large scale freight facility which breaches the skyline and results in a solid vertical 'wall' with loss of the sense of space and the wider rural landscape continuing across the vale. The proposed visual mitigation includes screening and visual filtering. However, for most views the size and scale of the development means that it remains well above the treeline at year 15 and in the longer term.</p>	<p>This comment is noted.</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>It is currently unclear as to how offsite BNG and the provision of a green area as an extension to Burbage Common will offset the loss of habitat while maintaining habitat connectivity.</p>	<p>Requirement 30 will ensure the development delivers a 10% net gain. Whilst BNG assessments are ongoing, current calculations show there is sufficient scope to deliver net gains on site, with</p>

		options to deliver additional through off-site solutions. Green corridors at the site boundary will maintain connectivity across the site.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Due to the nature of the proposal, it is considered unlikely that recreational activity on the Common and in the woods will be increased as a result of the development and it is likely that there will be a displacement of walkers and dog walkers put off by the presence and proximity of the development.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 32)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Freeholt Wood is located immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the Proposed Development and is comprised of ancient and semi-nature woodland and classified as priority habitat inventory deciduous woodland. This site is split between grassland and woodland with significant scrub habitat, with much of the grassland registered common and unimproved acid grassland with some areas of heath. The site supports over 250 species of fungi, 300 flowering plants, 15 damselflies and dragonflies, 20 butterflies and 100 birds.	Noted.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	There are a large number of important and potentially important hedgerows affected by the development, the total loss of which amounts to 13.44km of hedgerow. This is inclusive of species rich hedgerows along Burbage Common Road which will be partially lost.	See response to HBBC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 27)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	The current proposals anticipate a loss of 3.49 river units (11.85%), or with offsite compensation, 2.58 units (8.75%) loss. The stream present within the site	The applicant is continuously working to minimise on site losses and maximise gains. BNG assessment of watercourse is ongoing to

	is to be rerouted, with the post development condition entered into the biodiversity metric as 'moderate'. It is considered that this will be challenging to achieve and that further assessments of the watercourse will be required, including offsite compensation in order to meet 10%.	minimise losses/maximise gains (as per the draft SoCG submitted at Deadline 2).
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	There is a risk that due to the presence of low, medium and high surface water flood risk areas on and along the boundary of the Proposed Development site, the increased hard standing and built structures, proposed drainage and SuDS attenuation features being overwhelmed, increased overland flow could cause flood water and excess nutrients to inundate the woodland during periods of heavy rainfall.	The proposed scheme will include new surface water drainage infrastructure that will intercept, store, and provide appropriate treatment to the runoff from the development before discharging it to the surrounding watercourse network at the equivalent pre-development (greenfield) runoff rates. The drainage will be designed to accommodate the 1 in 100-year storm event and include an allowance for climate change, in line with best practise. The development does not propose to discharge surface water to Burbage Woods.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Based on the application stage BNG calculations referenced in Document 6.2.12.2 (APP-198) Environmental Statement – Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculations, the project is estimated to result in a 4.82% net biodiversity loss in area units, a 7.12% net gain in hedgerow units and an 11.85% loss in river units. The current offsite proposals are predicted to achieve a 5.5% net gain in area units, an 11.7% net gain in hedgerow units and an 8.75% net loss in river units. This does not meet policy DM.6 of the Development Management Policies DPD requirements or the aims of the Environment Act 2021. It is proposed that through partnering with the Environment Bank, further area habitat and linear river units will be achieved in order to meet the 10%	See response to LCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 82)

	<p>requirement. This, however, has not yet been established nor is it clear how these proposals will be achieved. A full and complete Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) report should provide an assessment of the proposed offsite BNG provision.</p>	
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The applicant proposes retaining and buffering the key habitats and corridors around the perimeter of the order limits, however retaining connectivity of habitats is under explored within the application. In addition, the current lighting strategy is brief and unsupported by appropriate surveys to determine the effect of the proposed development on the surrounding/retained habitats.</p>	<p>Not agreed. Potential impacts from lighting and the potential effects of fragmentation have been accounted for within the assessment. Further information has been added within the Applicant’s response to BDC’s Written Representations, and updated lighting plans demonstrate the limited light spill that the proposals achieve.</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>During the operation of the HNRFI there would need to be ongoing management of the site to ensure compliance with environmental standards and commitments made as part of the DCO. This management will include responsibility for ensuring the planned management and maintenance of the site, including shared areas of public realm and unadopted areas.</p>	<p>Correct. A management company would be employed to manage the site to help ensure compliance with relevant DCO Requirements.</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The Council would expect to understand in clear terms how this management will operate and how close and effective consultation there will be to ensure the relevant enforcement standards that will be committed to as part of the DCO are met. The Council would expect a closely focused set of mechanisms of enforcement either through procurement and or contractual terms where the management process and responsibility is identified.</p>	<p>The DCO will have to be complied with, it is an offence to breach a DCO. The Local Authority can be assured that the DCO will be complied with and it is unclear what additional enforcement would be required. Any contractor or management company would have to comply with the DCO to meet the contractual arrangements of the Undertaker.</p> <p>The Applicant would be keen to agree regular liaison between the relevant parties to ensure an effective dialogue is maintained over</p>

		the discharge of Requirements. Ultimately this will remain the responsibility of the Applicant.
Blaby District Council	There will be significant long term negative residual effects on a large number of visual receptors, footpath (PRoW) and road users, visitors and recreational receptors including to the Country Park, Church users. These locations are identified in the Council's LIR.	The Applicant has undertaken an independent assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development in ES Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual effects (document reference 6.1.11A, APP-120) which acknowledges the residual effects on relevant receptors.
Blaby District Council	The landscape mitigation measures set out in the LVIA and Landscape Strategy will not adequately mitigate these effects such that they will remain significant in the long term. The landscaping proposed by the Applicant is simply not sufficient to enable assimilation into the countryside setting. BDC's views on the inadequacy of the proposed mitigation are set out in chapter 11 of the LIR.	It is simply not realistic to expect that a strategic rail freight interchange can be fully assimilated into the countryside and fulfil the function it is designed to deliver. The design and finishes can be used to soften the effect and landscaping to partially mitigate it. For the avoidance of doubt, however, the Applicant does not accept the assertion that landscape mitigation is inadequate.
Blaby District Council	The scale of residual impacts indicate that the Proposed Development represents an overdevelopment of the Site. Changes to the parameter plans and a comprehensive package of wider landscaping enhancement is necessary to mitigate these impacts to an acceptable level	<p>Landscape considerations have been a part of the design evolution since the land was first considered for development by TSH in 2016. The impact on the landscape has been considered at various stages including the initial extent of the development and the scale of detail of the design.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there would be significant adverse residual effects on identified representative landscape and visual receptors, as noted at paragraphs 11.189, 11.190 and 11.191 in the Summary and Conclusion of Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual Effects of the ES (document reference: 6.1.11, APP-120).</p>

Blaby District Council	It is unclear why the Applicant has proposed a 'Landscape Ecological Management Plan', secured by Requirement 20 of the dDCO, together with a 'Landscape Scheme' that is secured under Requirement 22. The Applicant should be asked to explain the rationale for this and consider whether these Requirements could be combined.	The Landscape scheme and LEMP are two separate sets of documents that provide connected, but separate sets of information.
Blaby District Council	The parameter plan outlines a primary development zone too large for its context and relies on insufficient fringe areas to adequately buffer the development. To improve the quality the parameter plan, illustrative landscape masterplan and dDCO requirements should be revisited. BDC considers the items listed in 7.8.1-7.8.5 warrant further discussion and consideration.	<p>The design of HNRFI has evolved as an iterative process with advice from a specialist team of consultants and through engagement with stakeholders, informal and formal consultations with the local community.</p> <p>Chapter 2 identifies a range of design objectives including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be functional: HNRFI is designed to function to the specific requirements of a SRFI as a component of national infrastructure. 2. Support mixed uses and tenures: This objective is not well related to a SRFI. 3. Include successful public spaces: the thrust of this objective is directed at neighbourhoods in a living environment rather than a SRFI which will not function to attract social activities and avid life. 4. Have distinctive character. HNRFI will have a distinctive character as a SRFI – the design details will be approved by the relevant Local Authority. 5. Be attractive: the details of HNRFI will be attractive representing an efficient business environment. 6. Encourage ease of movement: the layout of HNRFI will enable efficient movement within the park.

		<p>Chapter 7 refers to the success of commercial developments that take a ‘campus’ approach developing a holistic and integrated environment of integrated streets, spaces and buildings. That is the purpose of the Design Code (document reference: 13.1, APP-354).</p> <p>It is submitted that care needs to be applied to the provisions of a Design Guide where the principles are clearly not focused upon the form and character of a SRFI – which necessarily will comprise very large scale buildings primarily functioning for logistics. That is not to say the development will not be of high quality with good design, and extensive areas of landscaping. The scale of development will create its own identity on the edge of Hinckley urban area.</p>
Blaby District Council	BDC also requests the Applicant provides a range of off-site local enhancements and improvements to the surrounding area that are secured through planning contributions secured via the S106 agreement. It is imperative that the detail of any such scheme is agreed to offset the impact of the Proposed Development on the locality.	While the Applicant considers the design that is proposed to be appropriate, it is willing to discuss concrete proposals that BDC wishes it to consider.
Blaby District Council	The visual impacts of the proposed development would not outweigh its limited benefits in accordance with NPSNN (para 5.158)	This is a matter for the ExA to determine. Clearly the Applicant’s position is that the benefits of the Proposal far outweigh the impacts it would have.
Surface Water and Flood Risk		
Blaby District Council	Given that part of the Site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, flood risk and Drainage is of high concern for BDC. Statutory responsibility falls to the Environment Agency for this type of development, with LCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority liaising with the EA and	The Applicant's has worked with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority to develop mitigation measures that will manage flood risk in accordance with best practice guidance. To confirm, the Main HNRFI Site does not drain towards Stoney Stanton.

	<p>with the Applicant in relation to the surface water proposals. In 2019, 30 homes, as well as a commercial property and a school in Stoney Stanton flooded and some people were unable to return to their homes for many months. This highlights the importance of ensuring surface water is adequately assessed and flood risk matters are considered properly.</p>	
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>BDC considers it necessary for additions to the requirements in Schedule 2 to the dDCO to be made so that the lead local flood authority can have better input into the approval of the required flood and drainage mitigation strategies.</p> <p>Requirement 13 (sustainable drainage): The following wording must be added to Requirement 13:</p> <p>“(2) The sustainable drainage strategy must be implemented in accordance with the details approved by the lead local flood authority or in accordance with any variations to those details agreed in writing by the lead local flood authority.”</p> <p>Requirement 14 (surface water): The following wording must be added to Requirement 14:</p> <p>(3) The surface water drainage strategy and the maintenance details must be implemented in accordance with the strategy and details approved by</p>	<p>The current wording of requirement 13 and 14 was specifically stipulated by Leicestershire County Council as lead local flood authority. Therefore, the current wording is considered suitable.</p>

	the relevant planning authority or in accordance with any variations to those details agreed in writing by the relevant planning authority.”	
Design		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Blaby District Council	<p>HBBC feels the proposals do not constitute ‘Good Design’ and have jointly commissioned a Landscape Design Review with Blaby District Council within which the merits of the proposal are considered taking into account the applicant’s submitted ‘design code’ and the National Design Guide, National Model Design Code and the HBBC Good Design Guide SPD.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has significant deficiencies and fails to meet the criteria for ‘good design’ set out in paragraphs 4.28 – 4.35 of the NPSNN. BDC would go as far as to consider the scheme constitutes poor design.</p>	The matter of design and the applicant’s response to design is addressed in a detailed document appended to the Local Impact Report response as Appendix A (document reference: 18.4.1). Should this work have been presented during consultation and ahead of submission it would have been considered in the proposals, nevertheless the Applicant has considered the recommendations of the Landscape Design Review and has updated the Design Code (document reference: 13.1, APP-354) and Design and Access Statement (document reference: 8.1, APP-349) accordingly.
Blaby District Council	The Proposed Development fails to deliver the aim on page 4 of the Design Code and does not propose a landscape scheme of the highest quality or maximise benefits for users and its neighbours	The matter of design and the applicant’s response to design is addressed in a detailed document appended to the Local Impact Report response as Appendix A (document reference: 18.4.1). Should this work have been presented during consultation and ahead of submission it would have been considered in the proposals, nevertheless the Applicant has considered the recommendations of the Landscape Design Review and has updated the Design Code (document reference: 13.1, APP-354) and Design
Blaby District Council	Would lead to an overdevelopment of the site and the proposed landscape is alien to the surrounding landscape character. This in turn would significantly damage the setting to the site and sensitive areas	

	<p>such as Burbage Common, Burbage Woods and Aston Firs SSSI. Masterplan has been designed in an insular fashion disregarding urban grain and vernacular. The parameters plan outlines a primary development zone too large for its context and relies on insufficient fringe areas to adequately buffer the development.</p>	<p>and Access Statement (document reference: 8.1, APP-349) accordingly.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>The intended approach to clear all existing natural site assets in the primary development zone is typical of the proposals and illustrates a general lack of sensitivity.</p>	
Blaby District Council	<p>There is a loss of both visual and physical amenity. Scale and massing of the Proposed Development and its position make it visible from a large number of receptors. This is worsened by the architectural design that has made little attempt to blend into its surroundings. The severance of existing PROWS particularly impact the residents of Elmesthorpe. The proposed diversions are inadequate in quality and poorly laid out. The experience of the user changes from encountering a natural aesthetic to an urban one as a result of the majority of the proposed routes being adjacent to roads.</p>	
Blaby District Council	<p>The streetscape is repetitive and has limited legible hierarchy. Hard surfaces dominate the landscape including large, uninterrupted areas for parking. The detailed proposals are vague in areas some of which are set out in the design code. Wording in this document is not definitive enough and lacks certainty in terms of what will be delivered.</p>	

Blaby District Council	Green infrastructure is largely focussed on the fringe areas of the site. The proposed green areas are disproportionate to the scale of the development and often occur as fragmented spaces of little ecological value. The inclusion of SuDS is welcomed but layout and form is dictated by infrastructure, seems to have missed opportunities to include other features including enhancing existing watercourses that would assist biodiversity.	
Blaby District Council	The proposed materiality is generic and lacks sensitivity to the local area. The large amounts of hardstanding and built form will lead to a future maintenance burden that will likely impact on the schemes overall sustainability.	
Blaby District Council	BDC considers design improvements are needed and the issues listed from 9.11.1-9.11.7 warrant further discussion and consideration.	
Blaby District Council	BDC considers the Proposed Development does not satisfy the requirements for design in NPSNN para 4.32.	
Health		
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Within the DCO Appendix 7.1 Health and Equalities Briefing Note, the applicant has presented some of the national and local legislative and policy requirements pertinent to the assessment of health and equality. However, the Leicestershire 2022-2032 Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS) has not been included in this analysis. This is a key health-	The JHWS is not included in the legislative and policy review section of the Health and Equality Briefing Note, as it is not legislation or policy. The health and wellbeing baseline included in the Health and Equalities Briefing Note (document reference 6.2.7.1A) does however apply the data which will have informed the JHWS and presents a consistent message on local health circumstance.

	<p>focused document that provides an overview of the current health and wellbeing of the County as well as setting the overarching vision for the health of the County’s residents and the strategic priorities.</p>	
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The Council believes that the baseline study area used by the applicants is flawed due to the geographical boundaries of the study area excluding some key communities – for example Hinckley and Burbage (see below).</p>	<p>It is important to firstly recognise that each technical discipline within the DCO has a topic specific baseline, including topic specific sensitive receptors. This is necessary, as the hazard characteristics, environmental circumstance, distribution and exposure characteristics vary between the individual technical disciplines.</p> <p>The Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference: 6.2.7.1A) draws from all of the pertinent technical disciplines and their associated baselines to inform the both the geographic scope of the study area, but also the data selected (appropriate to the health hazards and exposure pathways). The health baseline provided in the Health and Equality Briefing Note does not replace that provided in the overlapping technical disciplines, but compliments it, to provide additional context.</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The Council considers that the study area should have been based on 12 Middle Super Output Areas (MSOAs) comprising Blaby 007, Blaby 010, Blaby 012, Harborough 004, Hinckley and Bosworth 006, Hinckley and Bosworth 007, Hinckley and Bosworth 009, Hinckley and Bosworth 010, Hinckley and Bosworth 011, Hinckley and Bosworth 012, Hinckley and Bosworth 013, Hinckley and Bosworth 014 (see below).</p>	<p>As explained in the Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference: 6.2.7.1A), the study area has been selected based on the DCO Order Limits, the composition of which is referenced in multiple places throughout the Health and Equalities Briefing note. For clarity, the ward study area comprises the wards of: Croft Hill; Hinckley de Montford; Burbage St Catherine’s & Lash Hill; Stanton & Flamville; Barwell; Broughton Astley-Primethorpe & Sutton; Cosby with South Whetstone; Lutterworth West; Ullesthorpe; and Revel and Binley Woods.</p>

		Again, please note that this complementary context to that already provided in each of the technical disciplines, were a discipline specific baseline is provided, geared to the hazard characteristics, distribution and relative receptor sensitivity.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Further, the Council considers that insufficient regard has been given to identified vulnerable groups who will be affected by the proposal – the gypsy and traveller community located to the south of the development site; older people (using the Council’s study area over 20% of the population are over 65) and people suffering from poor mental health (within the study area GP data indicates a higher than average problem with mental health, including depression).	Each technical discipline provides an appropriate baseline and receptor sensitivity to inform the assessment. The traveling community are noted as receptors, as are all pertinent residential receptors, where nationally recognised assessment protocols are then applied to protect the environment and health.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Lack of adequate sports facilities included as part of the development which in an employment space of this size would help promote employee well-being, enhancing physical and mental health;	Noted.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	Based on the QoF NHS Digital data, half of the GP practices surrounding the Development Site have higher than the national average prevalence of obesity. Providing secure, convenient, and attractive open/green space could lead to more physical activity and reduce levels of obesity along with heart disease, strokes and other ill-health problems that are associated with both sedentary occupations and stressful lifestyles. The proximity of the development to Burbage Common and Woods is likely to reduce	The proposed development does not materially impact opportunities for physical activity or recreation, and the mitigations seeks to manage any potential disruption that might alter user experience (including alternative green space).

	<p>their attractiveness as a recreational resource and exacerbate the existing health related issues.</p>	
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>As expressed above although the proposal will provide 22ha of new publicly accessible green space south of the proposed link road, which will be provided with permissive public access, the quality of the proposed space is questioned. This is important as good quality open space enhances community wellbeing by offering areas for recreation, relaxation and social interaction which contribute to physical and mental health. Overall, based on the information provided by the applicant there is a limited understanding of how the adverse effects on Burbage Common will impact residents' use of the open space.</p>	<p>The reprovion of a bridleway that will now pass through an urban setting will not materially impact access to physical activity or mental wellbeing on the basis that several nearby alternative routes which also pass through natural settings exist and can be used if that is the preference.</p>

<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>The Council is concerned about the impact on existing healthcare facilities and whether they are able to accommodate the potential increase in usage arising from the construction and operational jobs. The applicant has stated the inclusion of such analysis has not been completed based on it being “not considered material on the basis that 70% of operational jobs could be relocated from existing, functionally sub-optimal distribution premises in the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP) area.” This comment is at odds with a far lower displacement assumption of 25% for operational jobs in Chapter 7: Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects of the ES table 7.13. Impacts are therefore not readily clear.</p>	<p>Health care is funded through national insurance and tax, and in simple terms, is then allocated on a per head basis. Changes in local health care demand, capacity and funding are therefore a function of population growth.</p> <p>As stated in the Socio-economic Chapter of the ES, the local area is a net exporter of construction staff, and can accommodate the construction phase with no material change in demography, or associated change in local health care demand or capacity.</p> <p>Once operational, the proposed development does not alter local demography, with no change in population size or structure. On this basis, there is again, no change in associated health care demand or capacity.</p> <p>The project does however sustain local construction employment, and generates direct, indirect and catalytic income and employment opportunities vital to local commerce and helps sustain natural population growth that occurs with or without the proposed development.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</p>	<p>Discouraging car use and providing opportunities for walking and cycling can increase physical activity help prevent chronic diseases, reduce the risk of premature death, and improve mental health. However, as expressed above the Council does not consider the applicant has gone far enough in ensuring that a significant enough modal shift occurs from reliance on the car to more sustainable means of accessing the site, including walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Agreed, this is why, as detailed at Para 8.315 of Chapter 8 (Transport and Traffic), a Draft Framework Site Wide Travel Plan- (Appendix 8.2 of the same chapter) is being developed alongside the TA and in accordance with the guidelines in the DfT documents – ‘Good Practice Guidelines: Delivering Travel Plans through the Travel Plan Process’.</p> <p>The Travel Plan includes complementary measures to encourage walking, cycling, bus and car sharing as modes of transport.</p> <p>These are focused into key measures for consideration, several of which are included below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle to Work Scheme: Investigate implementing a cycle to work scheme where employees will be able to enter a salary sacrifice scheme for employees to purchase a bike at a discount. • Personalised Travel Planning: All employers will offer personalised travel planning to all staff, to be undertaken by the associated travel plan coordinator. • Car Sharing and Car Club Participation: The Travel Plan Co-ordinator will promote existing car sharing services such as www.shareacar.com. This type of site does not require members to necessarily have a car as some existing members will offer lifts in exchange for a contribution towards fuel costs. • Car Parking Management System.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the need to travel: Where possible technology will be used to enable staff to work from home with potential for telephone and video conferencing facilities to aid the reduction of travel to customers, suppliers, and partners. • Subsidised bus transport for employees to encourage greater bus use. 8.316. <p>The Travel Plan will be monitored against Travel Plan Targets and managed to ensure measures are effective.</p> <p>We would again welcome Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to comment and inform the development of the Travel Plan to ensure it “goes far enough”.</p>
Air Quality		
Blaby District Council	As outlined in the Council’s LIR, minor air quality impacts are predicted within the Applicant’s assessment and increases in ambient pollutant concentrations will be experienced at a number of human and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Development	Acknowledged; however these increases are predicted to be negligible in accordance with relevant guidance and the current relevant air quality objectives.
Blaby District Council	The approach and extent of the Applicant’s assessment overall of air quality impacts is considered appropriate, but BDC has a number of more specific concerns in respect of the assessment, which are outlined below	Noted

Blaby District Council	The flows used for the environmental assessment (e.g. air quality) do not seem to have been provided.	The traffic data utilised within both the noise assessment and the air quality assessment was provided to Edward Stacey of BDC on 16th August 2023 via a WeTransfer link as part an email regarding the noise assessment works. A response was received from BDC on the 16th August 2023 confirming receipt.
Blaby District Council	No assessment appears to have been undertaken of the air quality impact of queueing traffic as a result of the additional ‘barrier down’ time at Narborough level crossing. With residential receptors and pedestrian traffic, including school children, adjacent to these affected highways, the implication for air quality needs to be assessed by the Applicant.	<p>The Applicant has responded to this point through RR-0134 of the Applicants Response to Relevant Representations (document reference: 18.2).</p> <p>The railway line crossing at Narborough is located on Station Road. Station Road is not part of the modelled air quality road network as the trip generation for the scheme along Station Road does not exceed the Institute of Air Quality Management and Environmental Protection UK screening criteria for when significant impacts may be predicted. It is, therefore, considered that any changes in traffic flow at the railway crossing at Narborough will not cause any significant air quality impacts at the receptors identified.</p> <p>Our transport consultants have provided the following response with relation to the additional barrier downtime at Narborough “Network Rail have undertaken a detailed analysis of Narborough Station and the barrier downtime. Network Rail is satisfied that sufficient capacity has been identified for HNRFI services in the Working Timetable. This allows for known passenger service development aspirations identified by Midlands Connect, to better link Birmingham, Nuneaton, Hinckley and Leicester. The Narborough Level crossing was subject to scrutiny by the LHA and models were adjusted to suit the existing and forecast delays. 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, APP118). The HNRFI is not predicted to cause any significant impacts with regards to air quality.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>Expect the Applicant to cover the expense of any monitoring of the off-site impacts of construction and operational phase, including equipment, ongoing monitoring and staffing. Dust monitoring should form part of the CEMP with monitoring locations to be agreed between BDC and the Applicant prior. BDC cannot make a determination about the need for off-site monitoring without being provided with traffic flow data. Request the Applicant undertake damage cost analysis to determine a suitable monetary contribution to offset impacts which BDC could then use to address existing areas of concern such as the AQMA.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to this point through RR-0134 of the Applicants Response to Relevant Representations (document reference: 18.2).</p> <p>The air quality assessment (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118) did not conclude in any requirements for monitoring during construction or operations, therefore no monitoring is required, therefore no monitoring has been advanced.</p>
	<p>Suggest a commitment to be added to requirement 8 regarding maximising the use of Euro VI compliant HGV and public transport vehicles.</p>	<p>The dDCO has been updated for Deadline 2 (document reference 3.1B).</p>
Noise and Vibration		

<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>The Proposed Development will result in major, permanent and irreversible adverse impacts on the identified Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSR) within the vicinity of the Site. BDC has significant concerns with the assessments undertaken by the Applicant and the conclusions reached by the ES. BDC commissioned an independent assessment of the noise and vibration impacts and identify measures to better mitigate the noise and vibration impacts of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>See the Applicant's response to the BDC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 91)</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>BDC is concerned that the assessment of traffic noise may not be accurate given the inaccuracies within the transport modelling and, in particular, may not reflect the traffic generated in the high development scenario (10,400 jobs). We have asked that the high development scenario should be modelled and the noise assessment should be updated to take account of the updated model outputs.</p>	<p>On the basis that the transport figures are considered a robust basis for assessment, the assessments for traffic related noise effects are therefore deemed to be robust.</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>The acoustic character corrections applied in the assessment are too lenient and do not reflect the irreversible change in acoustic environment that the Proposed Development will have. There would be potential for greater than 12dB increase in absolute sound levels which would result in further impact on residents and would result in nearby residents potentially needing to keep windows closed in order to achieve acceptable noise levels indoors. This would represent a material change in behaviour and/or attitude and a SOAEL in accordance with NPS with the</p>	<p>See the Applicant's response to the BDC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 95).</p>

	subsequent action being to avoid / prevent development.	
Blaby District Council	Machinery proposed for the gantry crane has not been determined, represents an elevated piece of equipment with the potential to produce noise issues. The machinery to be installed should be confirmed and integrated appropriately into the assessment work or details should be provided prior to its installation. Assessment indicates that gantry crane can influence the noise environment by up to 10dB, taken from a proof of evidence based on a project from 2017. Presumably this site is now operational and actual evidence can and should be gathered to support the claim.	At planning stage, it is typical for exact type, make and model of fixed plant and operational equipment to be unconfirmed. Paragraphs 10.311 to 10.313 of the ES Noise and vibration chapter discuss various noise control options available and their effectiveness, and Table 10.66 (summary of mitigation) proposes that the use of rubber tyred gantry cranes and noise level limits set at NSRs can be secured by requirement.
Blaby District Council	The Council has concerns over the extent and proximity and deliverability of acoustic fencing required to protect nearby residential properties and the impact this has upon their visual amenity. The inclusion of 4 and 6 metre high acoustic fencing around the Aston Firs Caravan Site is of particular concern and considered inappropriate (see figure 10.10 for the plan identifying the acoustic fencing locations – document 6.3.10.10 in the Environmental Statement and illustrative masterplan drawing 2.8)	The acoustic fencing is being provided along the eastern and northern boundary of the Caravan Site. The eastern and northern boundaries currently have hedgerow vegetation at a height of 6- 8m (see Hedgerows H368, H369, H372 and H394 on Sheet 33 and 38 of the Tree Constraints Plan and in the Schedules in Annex 2 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (document reference: 6.2.11.4, APP-194) which prevent an outlook and would be retained for amenity purposes. It should also be noted that internal hedgerows and amenity buildings and the internal layout of the site also limits views out from the site. There would therefore be limited change from a visual perspective.

Blaby District Council	The proposed mitigation measures do not follow a good acoustic design process and rely upon visually intrusive barriers, up to 6m in height, between 5 and 20m away from residential properties at Aston Firs Caravan Site, Castlewood Mobile Homes Site and dwellings located on Burbage Common Road respectively.	<p>The Applicant has reconsidered the viability of further design interventions and where feasible, these have been incorporated into the updated illustrative masterplan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the masterplanning approach that has been undertaken, the noise and vibration ES chapter has considered the parameters of the proposed development, as required at this stage of the proposals.</p>
Blaby District Council	No assessment appears to have been undertaken of the noise impact of queueing traffic caused by the additional 'barrier down' time at Narborough Level Crossing. With residential receptors and pedestrian traffic, including school children, adjacent to these affected highways, the implication for noise and vibration needs to be addressed.	<p>The additional 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. Therefore, the noise and vibration impacts from additional trains and stationary traffic as a result of the barrier downtime at Narborough is not a consideration of this assessment.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Applicants transport consultants have provided the following response with relation to the additional barrier down time at Narborough "The Narborough Level crossing was subject to scrutiny by the LHA and models were adjusted to suit the existing and forecast delays. Network Rail have agreed that there is adequate capacity at the cross roads. Impacts at peak hours are minimal."</p>
Blaby District Council	The working hours proposed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan are not acceptable. Whilst 0700 to 1900 hours Monday to Saturday may be acceptable for certain phases, construction works or construction areas, some elements will have an unacceptable impact on sensitive receptors. Suggest	The extended construction hours will mainly be utilised for groundworks which will need to make the most of daylight hours, particularly in the summer months. By contrast, working hours in the winter months are likely to be shorter due to reduced daylight hours. It is expected that by utilising the daylight hours in the summer, the overall time on site for these activities will be reduced, therefore shortening the construction period over the longer term.

	amendment to working hours to be applied to Requirement 16	It has been proposed in the dDCO (document reference: 3.1B) submitted at Deadline 2 that Saturday hours are amended from 07:00 to 19:00 to 07:00 to 15:00.
Blaby District Council	Not satisfied that requirement 27 covers all noise impacts that will arise, warrants further discussion and consideration	No suggested amendments to requirement 27 have been suggested at Appendix 6 to the BDC LIR which addresses requirements. However the Applicant has advanced amendments for the draft dDCO submitted (document reference: 3.1B) at Deadline 2.
Blaby District Council	The following amendment should be made to Requirement 28 (acoustic barriers): Acoustic barriers to be provided as part of any phase in accordance with the details approved pursuant to requirement 4 must be completed prior to the first occupation of that phase and must be maintained for the lifetime of the authorised development.	This is agreeable and has been updated in the dDCO (document reference: 3.1B) submitted at Deadline 2.
Lighting		
Blaby District Council	The Proposed Development will have the following impacts: (a) Potential major, adverse long-term effects on residential receptors due to the height and intensity of some of the lights surrounding the rail yard.	The Applicant has provided a Technical Note for Lighting appended to the draft BDC SoCG submitted at Deadline 2 which contains further guidance, information, and quantitative assessment to demonstrate that the Proposed Development can be provided with an external lighting installation that complies with the criteria as set out in the Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134), while not exceeding the obtrusive light limitations for E2 (rural, low district brightness) post-curfew conditions at residential properties according to the ILP Guidance Note 01/21. This quantitative

		assessment therefore demonstrates acceptable impact according to ILP Guidance Note 01/21.
Blaby District Council	(b) Potential, major, adverse, negative long-term impacts on the commuting and foraging routes of bats as a result of light spill.	The bat assemblage recorded is considered to be relatively typical for an urban edge farmland site in central England with common and widespread generalist species accounting for the vast majority of foraging and commuting activity. The most commonly recorded bats (<i>Pipistellus pipistrellus</i> , <i>Nyctalus noctula</i>), are not considered to be particularly sensitive to lighting impacts when foraging or commuting. The lighting note appended to the draft BDC SoCG submitted at Deadline demonstrates that light spill has been kept to a minimum. The vast majority of open space will be maintained as dark, allowing continued commuting opportunities post development. Whilst some light spillage occurs at the railway and railway bridge (considered unavoidable given the nature of a SRFI), lux levels are generally low, and still allow commuting opportunities for bats (with the northern edge of the railway at 1lux or below).
Blaby District Council	(c) Potential major, adverse, negative long term impacts on road and rail users as a result of glare.	The Applicant has provided a Technical Note for Lighting appended to the draft BDC SoCG submitted at Deadline 2 which contains further guidance, information, and quantitative assessment to demonstrate that the Proposed Development can be provided with an external lighting installation that complies with the criteria as set out in the Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134), while not exceeding the glare rating limitations for railway and highway receptors at normal traffic areas as established in CIE 112 – Glare Evaluation System. This is the most onerous glare criteria. This quantitative assessment therefore demonstrates acceptable impact according to CIE 112 – Glare Evaluation System.

Blaby District Council	(d) A potential minor adverse, negative long term impact on sky glow	The Lighting Strategy (document reference: 6.2.3.2, APP-132 to APP-134) calls for all luminaires to be installed at 0 tilt to meet the ILP Guidance Note 01/21 limitations for sky glow.
Blaby District Council	The Lighting Strategy (document reference 6.2.3.2) prepared by the Applicant partly responds to requests from the Council. However, due to the scale of the Proposed Development, the amount of lighting required and the proximity of highly sensitive receptors, the Council considers that the Lighting Strategy is insufficient. The Applicant needs to present further evidence in the form of a quantitative assessment to prove that the impact on surrounding receptors in terms of light intrusion and glare intensity is acceptable.	The Applicant has provided a Technical Note for Lighting appended to the draft BDC SoCG submitted at Deadline 2, which contains further guidance, information, and quantitative assessment to demonstrate that the Proposed Development can be provided with an external lighting installation that complies with the criteria as set out in the Lighting Strategy, while not exceeding the obtrusive light limitations for E2 post-curfew conditions.
Blaby District Council	Requirement 31 (lighting) of the dDCO is not sufficient. BDC submits that the following drafting should be used instead: (1) No phase of the authorised development may be commenced until a report detailing the lighting scheme for all permanent external lighting to be installed in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The report and schemes submitted and	The Applicant has suggested the following requirement in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 2. Lighting 1. — No phase of the authorised development is to be commenced until a report detailing the lighting scheme for all permanent external lighting to be installed in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The reports and schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy and include the following: (a) a layout plan with beam orientation;

	<p>approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy (document reference 6.2.3.2) and include the following;</p> <p>(a) a layout plan with beam orientation;</p> <p>(b) an Isolux contour map showing light spillage to 1 lux both vertically and horizontally and areas identified as being of ecological importance.;</p> <p>(c) a quantitative light intrusion and luminous intensity assessment in accordance with ILP Guidance Note 01/21; and</p> <p>(d) measures to avoid glare on surrounding railway and highways.</p> <p>(2) The approved lighting scheme must be implemented and maintained as approved by the relevant planning authority during operation of the authorised development and no external lighting other than that approved under this requirement may be installed.</p>	<p>(b) an Isolux contour map showing light spillage to 1 lux both vertically and horizontally and areas identified in the detailed ecological mitigation and management plan approved pursuant to requirement 20 as being of ecological importance;</p> <p>(c) a quantitative light intrusion and luminous intensity assessment in accordance with ILP Guidance Note 01/21; and</p> <p>(d) measures to avoid glare on surrounding railway and highways.</p> <p>(2) The lighting scheme for each phase must be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved strategy for that phase and may be reviewed by the undertaker as necessary with the approval of the relevant planning authority. No external lighting other than that approved under this requirement may be installed.</p>
Ecology and Biodiversity		
Blaby District Council	The quantum of ecological work undertaken by the Applicant is recognised and sufficient. Phase 1 and 2 species surveys have been completed and in general accordance with the standard guidance. In terms of	Agreed. Matters relating to the content of assessment are discussed below.

	<p>the content of the assessment, BDC has a number of comments and concerns.</p>	
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>In general, BDC agrees with the position stated in respect of important ecological features within the Order Limits. However, the level of importance afforded to various protected species is not agreed, with them generally being undervalued. This includes:</p> <p>(a) Bats should not be afforded only 'Local' importance.</p> <p>(b) Breeding birds, such as lapwing and skylark, are considered to be higher than 'District' importance.</p> <p>(b) Otters are considered to be higher than 'District' importance.</p> <p>All former European Protected Species should be of 'National' level importance irrespective of their presence within the Main Order Limits.</p>	<p>This matter is being considered through the SoCG process.</p> <p>As per CIEEM EIA guidelines, "Deciding the importance of species populations should make use of existing criteria where available. For example, there are established criteria for defining nationally and internationally important populations of waterfowl. The scale within which importance is determined could also relate to a particular population, e.g. the breeding population of common toads within a suite of ponds or an otter population within a catchment. When determining the importance of a species population, contextual information about distribution and abundance is fundamental, including trends based on historical records. For example, a species could be considered particularly important if it is rare and its population is in decline."</p> <p>This guidance is referred to at paragraph 1.55 of the Ecology Baseline (document reference: 6.2.12.1, APP-197). When a particular species is a national priority species or declining at a national level, it does not automatically make the population recorded of that level of importance, unless it makes up a significant proportion of the local/county/national/international or wintering/breeding/migratory population. In other words, the level of protection or conservation status of a particular species is not necessarily synonymous with its importance in EIA terms.</p> <p>In the context of Lapwing (for example), the Leicestershire and Rutland Bird Report 2020 classifies Lapwing as an 'Abundant winter visitor / uncommon migrant breeder'.</p>

		<p>Breeding Bird Surveys estimated 2 - 5 pairs of breeding lapwing utilising the site. This is not considered to be of any greater significance than district level, as these are not regionally or nationally significant numbers when considered in the context of wider population data.</p> <p>Similarly, the bat assemblage recorded within the Main Order Limits is typical of an urban edge farmland site in central England, with common and widespread generalist species accounting for the vast majority of foraging and commuting activity. Survey data to date suggests the buildings on site support day roosts supporting low number of common species. The assemblage is therefore only of local value.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.44 of Chapter 12 Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12, APP-121) states that the conservation status of habitats and species within a defined geographical area is described as follows (CIEEM, 2018) and has been used in the chapter to determine whether the impacts of the Proposed Development on non-designated habitats and species are likely to be significant:</p> <p><i>‘Habitats – conservation status is determined by the sum of the influences acting on the habitat that may affect its extent, structure and functions as well as its distribution and its typical species within a given geographical area;</i></p> <p><i>Species – conservation status is determined by the sum of influences acting on the species concerned that may affect its <u>abundance</u> (my emphasis) and distribution within a given geographical area.’</i></p>
Blaby District Council	The Applicant’s Ecological Report (document 6.2.12.1) states that baseline information is	As stated within the Ecology Baseline (document reference: 6.2.12.1), the Main Order Limits includes the Main HNRFI Site, contiguous areas

	<p>presented for the Main Order Limits and that other areas within the dDCO limits are 'typically of negligible ecological importance'. However no data is presented to support this assumption. It appears that Phase 2 surveys were only conducted within the Main Order Limits and not the full DCO Order Limits. BDC queries the ability to assume 'negligible importance' without undertaking surveys</p>	<p>to the north-west, south and east, respectively to contain the corridor of a proposed link road that would cross the Leicester to Hinckley railway and connect to the B4668/A47 Leicester Road (the 'A47 Link Road'), the proposed works to M69 Junction 2 and a section of the B4669 Hinckley Road towards the village of Sapcote. The DCO Site also includes additional non-contiguous areas of land which will be subject to highway enhancements, traffic management measures, and pedestrian level crossings.</p> <p>An extended Phase 1 survey was undertaken on 14 April 2022 of the additional areas included for the highways works. A review of the proposals for these non-contiguous areas found them to be ecologically insignificant, given that they typically involve development of already developed areas. Where impacts on semi-natural habitats are required (i.e. the construction of the pedestrian footbridge across the railway), impacts to habitat will be temporary and minimal in nature to allow for work zones, and will not significantly impact protected species (e.g. no impacts to trees with bat roost potential, commuting bats, badger setts etc).</p> <p>As such, no Phase 2 surveys are proposed in these areas. Update surveys, including habitat walkovers and badger surveys, are scheduled for 2024/2025 and will include all areas where the proposals will impact semi-natural habitats. Management Plans (i.e. Construction and Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs) secured by Requirement 7) will ensure appropriate working methodologies for any removal of habitat to ensure no adverse impacts on ecological features. As discussed during initial discussions with LUC, the scope of surveys was agreed during initial consultations</p>
--	--	--

		<p>with Leicestershire County Council, and the scope of surveys was not raised by local authorities during the PIER consultation stage.</p> <p>This matter is currently being discussed through the SoCG process, with updates likely to follow.</p>
Blaby District Council	BDC disagrees with the grading of importance to habitats and species, which appears to be based on their abundance within the Order Limits as opposed to their status or level of protection	<p>The rationale for assigning importance to relevant species is outlined above. Habitats within and adjacent to the site are valued between site and district value (see Table 12.6 of Chapter 12 Ecology and Biodiversity [document reference 6.1.12, APP-121]), which is considered appropriate, given the majority of habitats are agricultural in nature, with district-level exceptions including the hedgerow/tree network and stream habitat.</p> <p>As is typical, non-statutory wildlife sites have typically been assigned county importance, unless where surveys have found them to fall short of designation criteria (in which case local importance has been assigned). Similarly, statutory designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are assigned with national importance.</p>
Blaby District Council	There is a general disagreement with the assigning of value to ecological receptors – this is heavily based on presence within order limits rather than based on national decline/legal protection.	As detailed above, the assigning of importance has been undertaken in line with the CIEEM guidelines. The terms ‘importance’ and ‘value’ are used interchangeably within EIA.
Blaby District Council	Furthermore, there is a lack of consideration to habitat fragmentation during the operational phase, including the provision of only one relatively narrow corridor in a north-east/south-west direction. Further assessment of the impact habitat fragmentation will have on bats needs to be undertaken.	As per the Relevant Representations, the assessment of the likely impacts includes fragmentation. 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 linear gain, before any local or off-site solutions have been implemented. Future iterations of the Net Gain metric will ensure 10% net gain in hedgerow units will be achieved - a significant factor in terms of alleviating fragmentation impacts.
Blaby District Council	There is a general lack of detail provided for long term ecological management plans.	The existing LEMP (document reference: 17.2, APP-360) is only outline in nature, with a detailed LEMP(s) secured via Requirement 20. Further detail will therefore be provided at the detailed design stage. Detailed iterations of the EMMP (document reference 17.5, APP-363) and the WMP (document reference 6.2.12.4A) are also secured via Requirement 23 and 22 respectively.
Blaby District Council	BDC requires drafting amendments to Requirement 21, the Council's proposed drafting provided in the version of the dDCO appended to the WR	The wording of Requirement 21 is being reviewed.
Blaby District Council	Applicant committed to delivering 10% BNG however mechanisms for calculating and securing the implementation are unclear	Requirement 30 is written in a 'Grampian style' – and accords in the planning guidance for the use of planning conditions (PPG – paragraph 09 Reference ID: 21a-009-2014306) in the context that the full 100% BNG commitment may not be achieved on land that is presently within the control of the Applicant. Discussions are ongoing to secure off site BNG credits locally and discussions have also taken place with the Environment Bank in relation to their BNG credit system.
Blaby District Council	In terms of the BNG, it is difficult to provide any meaningful comment as the mapping associated with	Figure 12.3 (document reference: 6.3.12.4, APP-309) shows the pre-development site. The Post-development BIA Plan is provided at

	<p>the BNG has not been provided. Mapping should be included within the metric 3.1 and associated reporting. This also links the Biodiversity Improvement Area and Landscape Enhancement Management Plan that also need to be provided for full review. Additionally, completed DEFRA BNG metric and supporting condition sheets, including assessor comments and supporting rationales for decision making (such as strategic significance and 'fairly' condition selection) needs to be provided for review.</p>	<p>Annex 2 of the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculations (document reference: 6.2.12.2, APP-198).</p> <p>The illustrative Landscape Strategy (document ref.: 6.3.11.20, APP-304) and illustrative Landscape Sections (document reference: 6.3.11.17, APP-301 and 6.3.11.18, APP-302) show the proposed landscape mitigation.</p> <p>As outlined in the BIA report Appendix 12.2, (document reference: 6.2.12.2, APP-198), the 'fairly good' condition was selected within the Defra metric for created grassland on precautionary basis, which in line with the Rochdale Envelope approach, is considered appropriate. The Detailed BNG will justify any use of 'Fairly', and include assessor comments throughout.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>The Council understands the Applicant has committed to delivering 10% BNG in relation to the Scheme and that the Scheme may have to comply with the BNG requirements of the Environment Act 2021. The Scheme as proposed fails to clearly demonstrate and secure 10% BNG, including its long-term management, and further mitigation is required in this respect.</p>	<p>Requirement 30 will ensure the development delivers a 10% net gain. Whilst BNG assessments are ongoing, current calculations show there is sufficient scope to deliver net gains on site, with options to deliver additional through off-site solutions.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>It is proposed that through partnering with the Environment Bank, further area habitat and linear river units will be achieved in order to meet the 10% requirement. This, however, has not yet been established nor is it clear how these proposals will be achieved.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to delivering 10% however, and the mitigation hierarchy has been followed. Where gains cannot be provided on site, they will be delivered through other land in the Applicants control in the local vicinity. Where a shortfall remains, this will be dealt with by obtaining off-site credits. Opportunities to maximise gains and minimise losses are still being explored. Conversations with the environment bank are on going.</p>

Blaby District Council	The need for a phased assessment approach needs to be further explored, as it is intended that the Proposed Development will be constructed in phases, therefore it may be possible that habitat could be created or enhanced in advance of loss, thus improving the overall BNG score and providing greater enhancements for biodiversity.	This is agreed and will be explored further through the SoCG process. The key openspace provision will be delivered within the initial phases of the project, effectively meaning that over the proposed 10-year construction period, planting may be delivered up to 9 years in advance.
Blaby District Council	BDC considers that light spill onto retained and enhanced hedgerows has the potential to have significant adverse, long term effects on species, in particular bats. The current lighting strategy is brief and unsupported by appropriate surveys to determine the effect of the proposed development on the surrounding/ retained habitats. Further assessment and surveys need to be undertaken to adequately understand the potential impacts light spills will have on bats and to subsequently inform a robust mitigation package.	<p>The lighting technical note appended to the draft BDC SoCG submitted at Deadline 2 demonstrates that light spill have been kept to a minimum. The vast majority of openspace will be maintained as dark, allowing continued commuting opportunities post development. Whilst some light spillage occurs at the railway and railway bridge (considered unavoidable given the nature of a SRFI), lux levels are generally low, and still allow commuting opportunities for bats (with the northern edge of the railway at 1lux or below). The bat assemblage which utilise the site are not typically light sensitive, and so low levels of light does not preclude continued opportunities for the local bat population. No further assessment is deemed necessary.</p> <p>Where newly provided or retained habitats are subject to lighting, it is considered that any impacts will be off-set by the quantum of habitat provision, most of which will be retained as dark corridors.</p>
Blaby District Council	There is also a lack of consideration to the retention of existing hedgerows/features of note within the Site area to minimise need to displace fauna (including protected species). Further detail is required from the Applicant with regard to the proposed additional hedgerow creation or enhancement that is expected	Given the nature of SRFI, the majority of the site will be levelled to ensure a consistent plateau. As such, most existing habitat will be removed. Areas of retained habitat are primarily located at the site boundaries, or within the A46 Link Road. Retained hedgerows and wet ditch habitat within the A47 Link Road will be kept mainly light

	to be achieved through partnering with the Environment Bank to enable BDC to assess whether these proposals adequately mitigate the impacts on existing hedgerows.	free, and buffered by new species-rich habitat (approximately 11.33ha).
Blaby District Council	The Applicant’s mitigation includes a buffer around the proposed retained/enhanced habitats, however it is unclear within the application documents as to the dimensions of these proposed buffers. Further detail is required regarding the biodiversity impact of the loss of hedgerows, particularly those which link to the Common and how this will be mitigated.	The parameter plans (document reference: 6.3.3.2, APP-231) demonstrate how retained habitats will sit in the context of the proposals. Buffers to woodland, trees and hedgerows will be in line with adopted guidance. As above, the large provision of open space to the north and west of the site will complement and buffer the Burbage Common habitats. See the Applicant’s response to Relevant Representations submitted at Deadline 1 (document reference 18.2) for response regarding fragmentation.
Cultural Heritage		
Blaby District Council	The key impacts that the Proposed Development will have on cultural heritage assets relate to impacts on the following structures that appear on the HER: Woodhouse Fram; Hobbs Hayes Farm; Freeholt Lodge; Burbage Common Road Bridge Considered that these are of low sensitivity but will be subject to a large magnitude of change equating to moderate or minor impacts on their significance in environmental terms when assessed under the methodology.	See responses below.

Blaby District Council	For heritage mitigation has been sought in the form of a Historic Building Record by way of a conditional requirement in the event that the DCO is consented.	Agreed through SoCG
Archaeology		
Blaby District Council	LCC Archaeology on behalf of BDC will be undertaking on site archaeological monitoring and post excavation review to ensure appropriate and efficient management of the mitigation programme. The work will be undertaken at cost and the Applicant should commit to meeting these costs through the S106 agreement.	Incorporated into the S106
Geology and Contamination and Waste		
Blaby District Council	The Council have no concerns in respect of the work undertaken or proposed additional investigative work programmed in respect of the geology and contamination.	Noted and agreed
Blaby District Council	The Soils and Waste Materials Management Plan (SWMMP) and Construction Environmental Management Plan set out the remedial measures proposed to deal with any contamination encountered within the soil and potential spills of fuel during the construction period.	Noted and agreed
Blaby District Council	BDC considers additional details should be added to the SWMMP to detail the procedure that will be followed when dealing with site waste materials if contamination or suspected contamination is	See response to BDC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 121).

	encountered during movement and handling of these materials, with a particular focus on asbestos materials.	
Blaby District Council	<p>Requirement 15 in Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO includes provision for exercising planning controls over the contamination associated with the Proposed Development. BDC consider additional controls should be put in place to ensure their sufficient planning controls can be exercised over the contamination associated with the Proposed Development. The following wording should be added to Requirement 15:</p> <p>(2) Prior to each phase of development being brought into use, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall, after consultation with the Environment Agency, be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>(3) The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.</p>	The wording of the requirement follows standard drafting and has been agreed with the Environment Agency, including the minor updates to the requirement made in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 2 (document reference: 3.1B). The Applicant considers the requirement deals with contamination risk sufficiently.
Energy and Climate Change		
Blaby District Council	The applicant should be required to give a full explanation why the suggested energy generation cap is to be imposed and why the development is not	This matter has been addressed in Post hearing submission ISH1 and CAH1 [Appendix B Energy Note] (document reference: 18.1.2, REP1-019) submitted as part of Deadline 1.

<p>Hinckley And Bosworth Borough Council</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>being future proofed by enabling more on site energy to be generated.</p>	
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>In 2020, BDC made a commitment to tackle climate change. BDC's ambition is for the Council to be carbon neutral by 2030, and the District carbon neutral by 2050. This ambition is supported by BDC's Climate Change Strategy, which provides a vision for a Green Recovery, post Covid 19 to create sustainable communities, low carbon transport networks and a thriving local economy.</p>	<p>Chapter 18 (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127) paras 18.31 to 18.33, refer to the climate change policy "CS21" held within the Blaby District Local Plan (2013-2029) and BDC Climate Change Strategy (2020-2030). The assessment clearly aligns with National and BDC's commitments to deliver Net Zero and maximise sustainability benefits to the area.</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>It remains unclear how much of the modal shift carbon benefit is down to a real shift from road to rail, versus new freight due to growth from additional demand created by the Proposed Development. As a result, the Council is concerned the proposed carbon benefits are overexaggerated</p>	<p>The Proposed Development does not create demand, it responds to demand.</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Local, on-site, energy generation and low carbon solutions have only been considered for office and warehouse use and not for other energy intensive infrastructure on site such as cranes and lighting. The Council strongly recommends the site's full energy system, across all uses, is within scope for renewable and low carbon solutions from the outset of site design and planning.</p>	<p>This comment is noted. On-site energy generation has been maximised, within the constraints of the site.</p>

<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The Council is concerned that not all potentially significant emissions have been analysed and thus mitigated against. For instance, carbon generated by construction waste, and land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) and energy used by temporary structures during the 10-year construction period, are not currently accounted for within the Applicant’s carbon analysis undertaken. The impact of this could be that the carbon emissions of the site are currently underestimated and would in reality contribute a greater proportion of emissions to the county of Leicestershire and reduce the carbon benefit of the site in regards o shift of road to rail freight. The Council strongly recommends the development monitor all significant emissions sources through the site’s development and take appropriate action to mitigate and reduce these emissions as far as reasonably practical.</p>	<p>Table 18.22 of the ES Chapter for Energy and Climate change (APP-127, 6.1.18), 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>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>Recognised that the Applicant is seeking to reduce energy requirements on the site and included a commitment to achieving net zero in construction. This is commended by BDC.</p>	<p>Noted by the Applicant.</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>CEMP and CTMP, whilst the inclusion of best practice measures is supported, details should be provided with respect to how the sue of construction plant that relies on fossil fuels may be avoided, particularly when considering the location and the proposed land uses.</p>	<p>See response to BDC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 117)</p>

<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>The proposed development will bring a significant amount of new emissions to Leicestershire that currently either do not exist due to the development leading to growth, or shift emissions from outside of Leicestershire into the county. Therefore, there will be significant growth in Leicestershire’s territorial emissions due to the proposed development. The Council strongly encourages the Applicant take note of and act upon the concerns and recommendations mentioned (paragraphs 2.129 – 2.134), to reduce the emissions impact on Leicestershire and support the county’s net zero ambitions to the best of the site’s ability. Where residual emissions remain and carbon offsetting is considered, the Applicant should prioritise local projects that provide benefit to Leicestershire residents and help contribute to the county’s net zero ambitions, i.e carbon sequestration or local renewable energy generation.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to disaggregate GHG 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>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>It is recognised that the Applicant is seeking to reduce energy requirements on the Site and included a commitment to achieving net zero in construction. This is commended by BDC.</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to support the application, as detailed at ES paragraphs 18.248 and 18.249. Whilst the inclusion of best practice measures is supported, details should be provided with respect of how the employment of</p>	<p>Fossil fuels are certainly not a main source of energy provision (document reference: 6.2.18.1, APP-217). The energy infrastructure design expressly optimises the path to net zero operations and minimises reliance on fossil fuels.</p> <p>Onsite renewables used directly when generated or after storage in batteries are the first supply. Grid electricity is the second. The use of battery storage will enhance the ability of occupiers to use only</p>

	<p>construction plant that relies of the use of fossil fuels may be avoided, particularly when considering the location of the Proposed Development, and the nature of the existing land uses</p>	<p>renewable grid energy. Any CHP or standby generation would only be used in exceptional circumstances during a failure of supply.</p> <p>The Energy Strategy Appendix 18.1, (document reference: 6.2.18.1, APP-217) concludes that 83% of the peak operational energy requirements would be produced by solar photovoltaics (PV) with 100% of the total available roof space (excluding areas required for rooflights, drainage and safe access) to be covered by PV cells.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>The significance of GHG emissions associated with the road traffic during construction and operation should be reconsidered in line with the change in emissions compared to the 2019 baseline and not the future baselines used in the chapter. The use of an alternative baseline fundamentally changes the outcome of the assessment,</p>	<p>The assessment of GHG emissions is considered to be robust. It is considered inappropriate to alter the baseline selected for assessment. A further, more detailed response to this comment will be provided at Deadline 3.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>The GHG emissions associated with rail movements should be recalculated to account for the known origins and destinations of trains that will serve it. Will provide a more accurate picture of the emissions that may be associated with the movement of freight trains.</p>	
Blaby District Council	<p>Total GHG emissions arising during construction and operation should be recalculated to account for recommendations above. Potential that outcomes of the chapter will change and the development may have a significant adverse effect. BWB should provide evidence of any communications in respect of the baseline, between the time of the scopnig study and the document being issued. BDC is aware new guidance on this has been issued and ask for copies of</p>	

	correspondence between BWB, the Applicant and and ExA on this matter.	
Blaby District Council	Commended that includes net zero buildings, however unclear on what the scope of this is and whether it only applies to operational emissions or emissions across the whole lifecycle. Evident from the proposed use of gas fired CHP and that PV only serve 80% of energy demand that some form of offsetting would be required to achieve net zero carbon emissions in operation. This should be clarified and the approach to offsetting the residual operation and / or embodied carbon emissions of the buildings clearly set out.	
Blaby District Council	Whilst it is encouraging that the Proposed Development will seek to achieve a 'Very Good' BREEAM rating, as stated at ES paragraph 18.253, BDC considers that this is not an ambitious enough target. By only designing to BREEAM: Very Good, the HNRFI is unlikely to be future proofed – an aim stated in the Opportunities and Constraints section of the Design and Access Statement (document reference 8.1). It is recognised that the achievement of 'Excellent' or 'Outstanding' is challenging, however considering the scale and expected lifetime of the proposed development, this would be a proportionate challenge.	In response to this comment which has been discussed through the SoCG discussions, the Applicant will construct HNRFI to BREEAM excellent. This will be secured within the Design Code (document reference: 13.1, APP-354) which is secured by Requirement 4
Blaby District Council	Truly sustainable projects that aim to be future proofed and meet the challenge of net zero would need to go beyond what has been outlined in the	HNRFI will contribute to “achieving national targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions focussing new development in the most

	<p>Proposed Development. The timescale for construction means that construction and energy targets will continue to be increased, leaving the Proposed Development potentially lagging behind other proposals. As it will have a development lifespan to and beyond 2050, where the UK must operate at net zero, a failure to design a net zero capable development will make it impossible to operate in this manner without substantial retrofitting of technology. This creates an unnecessary and avoidable barrier to achieving the Country's net zero ambitions. The necessary building specification to ensure net zero operation should be secured in the Scheme's Requirements.</p>	<p>sustainable locations and seeking site layout and sustainable design principles which reduce energy demand and increase efficiency.”</p> <p>The assessment of effects on climate changes and resilience to its impacts is proportionate to the information known at the time of writing and reflective of an application made where the proposals are in outline development.</p> <p>As set out in para 18.290 of Chapter 18 (document reference: 6.1.18, APP-127), as each phase comes forward it will include a detailed GHG reduction strategy. A more refined and comprehensive understanding of the project's specifics, when detailed design work is being carried out allows for more achievable and strategic net-zero plans and a greater ability to respond to emerging technologies and sustainability opportunities. The Applicant are committed to maintaining a rigorous approach to environmental impact assessment. The commitment to staying up-to-date with the latest data and research ensures that informed decisions that prioritise sustainability and minimise adverse effects on the climate are made.</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>A potential constraint to the ability to generate on-site renewable energy and be net zero in operation is the 49.9 MW limitation for the generation of on-site electricity proposed in Requirement 17 of the dDCO. BDC queries why this cap is included other than to avoid the Proposed Development triggering the thresholds for energy generation in section 15 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant should be asked to justify this limitation. If the cap is justified, it should be included in the description of the authorised</p>	<p>This matter has been addressed in Post hearing submission ISH1 and CAH1 [Appendix B Energy Note] (document reference: 18.1.2, REP1-019) submitted as part of Deadline 1.</p>

	<p>development in Schedule 1 to the DCO, not as a Requirement as it fails to meet the test of necessity for Requirements</p>	
<p>Blaby District Council Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Further rationale for the proposed choice of technologies as well as reasons why others have been ruled out is required. It is unusual that a gas powered CHP and an uncertain and unproven technology is being considered ahead of already widely used heat pump technology. Both Ground Source Heat Pumps and Air Source Heat Pumps should be used and if either are to be excluded this should be justified. Currently Ground Source Heat Pumps are not proposed as part of the Proposed Development, but they should be because they make the onsite generated renewable energy (from solar) go further which takes the pressure off of finite energy resources</p>	<p>The proposed infrastructure allows the future deployment of current and emerging technologies in an economic manner for occupiers, strongly encouraging their adoption and the progressive improvement in energy performance through the operating life of the site.</p> <p>The proposed infrastructure already maximises onsite renewable solar generation, includes substantial electricity storage and pooling through the microgrid. Further, it is adaptable and allows for further development at unit and central areas. The initial expectations will not prejudice or constrain future technological developments.</p> <p>The Energy Strategy Appendix 18.1 (document reference: 6.2.18.1, APP-217) details the potential for renewable energy provision during the operational phase, which will greatly reduce GHG emissions compared to procuring this energy from the National Grid. This strategy has been developed to optimise potential onsite to its greatest means, therefore minimising energy consumption from on-grid and non-renewable services as much as feasible.</p> <p>Where surplus energy is generated, it is proposed that this energy is captured and stored onsite for future use.</p> <p>For heating, the Energy Strategy provides a summary assessment of current technologies relevant for the office spaces, where air source heat pumps are typically preferred due to the low loading and</p>

		<p>seasonal usage. For warehouse spaces the use of gas has been excluded, and if any occupier does require some heating to the warehouse, ground source will be included in their assessment.</p> <p>Continuity and certainty of supply have been considered for the operational site (inclusive of rail operations and other safety-critical aspects). To ensure smooth operations, safety compliance, and overall project success, it is crucial to provide reliable electricity supply to the site throughout the construction process. It should be noted that a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) energy centre is to be used as emergency redundancy in the event of a grid failure and/or the on-site PV been non-operational (e.g. snow cover). The infrequent use of such a facility means that it does not compromise the sustainability of the wider energy strategy.</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>There ought to be an assumption that the HNRFI is entirely off-gas due to the unsustainable nature of natural gas and the unreliability of hydrogen as a replacement. There is no certainty that Hydrogen will be available especially given the inefficiency of the production process (when compared to solar or wind) and lack of transportation infrastructure. It is disappointing that reliance is being placed on fossil fuels for a main energy source to the facility. It doesn't appear that decarbonisation of heat via heat networks and the utilisation of ground, water or air source heat pumps have been fully explored by the Applicant. Instead, Gas CHP and possibly hydrogen have been proposed. This shows a lack of ambition for this project, particularly given it will be constructed</p>	<p>The Energy Strategy (document reference: 6.2.18.1, APP-217) sets out the objective of the site to be self-generating for its power and the feasibility of the different technologies currently available, which could further add to the sustainable credentials of the scheme. Para 11.1.8 sets out that these technologies are in line with national and local planning policy. Para 11.1.10 sets out a commitment where possible to exceed minimum requirements during detailed design.</p>

	over the next 10 – 15 years and thus needs to comply with future requirements on such matters.	
Blaby District Council	In terms of energy use, it is far more efficient to use renewable energy power directly via the grid or to store this close to where it’s produced for later use. This may well be via battery or conversion to hydrogen. To assume that hydrogen will be widely available for use in CHP plants at some unknown point in the future is a risk and does not make sense from a climate resilience or sustainability perspective.	As set out in the Energy Strategy (document reference: 6.2.18.1, APP-217), onsite renewable generation and battery storage are already central to the site design. Whilst Government policy is to decarbonise the gas grid, it is not assumed that this will be achieved. Surplus electricity generated on site and after battery storage is filled, could be used for local electrolysis for use as a transport fuel or instead of grid gas, whether or not fully decarbonised.
Blaby District Council	The Council would expect to see a full consideration and uptake of zero carbon heat and cooling options as standard in the application as per the EIA Hierarchy (Figure 18.3 of ES Chapter 18 Energy and Climate Change document reference 6.1.18). Heat pump technology is likely to remain a far more efficient and cost effective use of a finite resource (renewable energy) than Hydrogen. Given the direct control the developer has over GHG emissions arising from space heating (scope 1) and the potential to eliminate emissions arising from it, it’s not clear why this hasn’t been proposed.	The design already includes for heat pumps to the office areas, which would meet that objective. Gas has been excluded in the design from use for heating. Should any occupier require any heat or cooling for warehouse areas, this will also be provided using heat pumps. It is anticipated that electricity for any such heat pumps would be locally generated renewably, and that heat storage would also be included.
Blaby District Council	The Scheme is adopting a ‘fabric first’ approach to development which prioritises the energy efficiency of a property right from conception, at the start of the design and development process. This approach is supported to minimise the energy requirements of the buildings for operation. It is not however clear	The Applicant has developed a ‘Blueprint Design’ document for the design and specification of its buildings and sites to ensure that its buildings are consistently of the highest quality and meet / exceed all current legislation.

	<p>what innovative approaches, if any, are being considered and allowed for in this Proposed Development beyond that typically included in such new warehouse units.</p>	<p>In addition, and as a Gold Member of UKGBC (United Kingdom Green Building Council), the Applicant is not only striving to ensure that all their new developments reduce the quantity of embedded carbon within their buildings and the built environment within which they reside, but also, by working in conjunction with the Contractors that will ultimately deliver their buildings, tap into their supply chains to push this aspiration further.</p> <p>The Applicant is also committed to ensuring that their schemes are future proofed for inclusion of emerging technologies and energy provisions such as Battery Storage and Hydrogen.</p> <p>The Applicant commits to providing a minimum of 20% of the car parking bays with electric vehicle charging systems and the balance of 80% is future proofed by installing the necessary infrastructure in readiness for upgrading to electric vehicle charging in the future.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to ensuring that all their developments achieve a Net Zero Carbon in Construction rating.</p>
<p>Blaby District Council</p>	<p>Not satisfied that the proposed requirement covers all impacts that will arise, warrants further discussion and consideration in respect of a potential requirement requiring an updated embodied and whole life carbon assessments to be undertaken at each RIBA stage building on the Assessment at RIBA</p>	<p>The Energy and Climate Change chapter (ES Chapter 18, document reference 6.1.18, APP-127) satisfies a RIBA stage 1-3 whole life carbon assessment with high level estimations of embodied carbon using industry standard calculators and detailed estimations of operational carbon using operation vehicle trip information from the transport modelling and energy demand for the site itself.</p>

	Stage 1 and also accounting for the measures listed in 17.17	As described in the chapter carbon reduction plans will be required as design progresses (RIBA 4-5) for each phase of work, so the work requested by BDC will take place as the detailed design for each phase progresses.
Blaby District Council	Water conservation measures are only being 'considered' at this stage. Far greater water harvesting and conservation techniques could and should be employed and secured via a Requirement. It is widely publicised that the demand for water in the future will be greater and thus the Proposed Development should include commitments to and set out the mechanisms for securing the measures taken to reduce water usage.	Water harvesting systems require significant amounts of infrastructure which significantly increases the embodied carbon of the building, they are power hungry, making the carbon in operation increase for the life of the building, they require considerable additional maintenance, which has negative impacts on both cost and carbon and they can only be relied on for a proportion of the year, so you have to have a mains connection which feeds all of the water fittings anyway.
Blaby District Council	The Scheme's existing approach to sustainable travel is unacceptable and results in excessive climate related impacts. The ES states that due to its location, significant worker commuting is expected to be by private car. Greater practical choice of sustainable transport options is important to future energy use and climate change.	Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.1 pt 15 of 20, APP-153) Contains detail of DRT services and further sustainable transport provision this is to be read in tandem with The Framework Travel Plan (document reference: 6.2.8.2, APP-159)
Blaby District Council	The Scheme's commuting patterns prove that the Site is in an unsustainable location and that the mitigation currently proposed is inadequate.	Further development of the Sustainable Transport Strategy is to be submitted at Deadline 3.
Blaby District Council	Requirement 4(3) specifies a minimum provision of electric charging points for car parking spaces. It should go further and state a requirement for LGV and HGV charging points to encourage the early adoption of an electric fleet of goods vehicles	The Applicant works closely with global Industry experts to ensure that their developments are future proofed with regards to developing technologies such as EV and hydrogen powered HGV's and LGV's. The scheme will incorporate protected routes to incorporate and install infrastructure to meet the needs and

		requirement of our end user client with regards to HGV / LGV charging facilities.
Blaby District Council	Should commit to going beyond the minimum requirements of Part S of the Building Regs, providing a proportion of spaces with chargers prior to commencement of operation of the proposals with remaining spaces provided with cabling routes that would enable latter installation of chargers. More detail should be provided as to the exact degree of EV infrastructure being proposed and how it will be sufficient to serve the future levels of battery electric vehicles that will be going to and from site.	The development would provide 20% vehicle charging spaces with the balance of 80% being provided with cabling routes to allow later 100 % installation of chargers.
Blaby District Council	A requirement should be added to require the undertaker to submit a green procurement strategy	As a Gold Member of UKGBC (United Kingdom Green Building Council), the Applicant is not only striving to ensure that all their new developments reduce the quantity of embedded carbon within their buildings and the built environment within which they reside, but also, by working in conjunction with the Contractors that will ultimately deliver their buildings, tap into their supply chains to push this aspiration further.
Blaby District Council	A requirement should be added requiring the undertaker to submit a circular economy statement	The Applicant will work with its contractors and suppliers during the construction phase to maximise the Circular Economy within a 40 mile radius of the scheme
Blaby District Council	A requirement should be added requiring the undertaker to submit meter readings and energy consumption data to the relevant local authority under the 'Be Seen' tier of the energy hierarchy. This will provide accountability for ensuring energy	The applicant agrees in principle although the energy demand for individual buildings and occupiers can only be estimated at this stage and the future increases in EV charging requirements for HGV and LGV will make setting a target at this stage unfeasible as we would not wish to preclude the implementation of Zero Emissions vehicles due to setting an arbitrary target.

	demand does not exceed the levels targetd during design.	
Health and Wellbeing		
Leicestershire County Council	Although health has been addressed in accordance with the formal scoping opinion, Leicestershires Public Health team would prefer a Health Impact Assessment to be submitted.	<p>Confirmation of the agreed scope being delivered is welcomed, and the reporting preference is noted. Please note however that a Health and Equality Briefing Note was provided to aid transparency as to the how and where health has been assessed and addressed through the regulatory assessment process within the reporting structure agreed.</p> <p>The Health and Equality Briefing Note includes all the stages of a HIA, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a health policy and legislation review; • scoping; • project profile; • community profile; and • assessment sections. <p>It draws from the overlapping technical disciplines within the DCO, and responds to community health concerns raised throughout the process.</p> <p>The Health and Equality Briefing Note was delivered by an internationally recognised HIA team, acknowledged in much of the UK HIA Guidance, and provides Health in Planning Training to Local Authorities and Combined Authorities with the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities, and sits on the IEMA Health Assessment working group.</p>

		<p>On this basis, while the reporting structure was defined and agreed through scoping, the principles of HIA were integrated into the DCO process, and the reporting was captured through the Health and Equality Briefing Note (a HIA in all but name).</p>
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>APP-137 includes legislative and policy requirements pertinent to the assessment of health and equality, however, it does not appear to include the Leicestershire 2022-2032 Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS) and the Leicestershire Health Inequalities Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA 2023), both of which provide robust, up to date, local data.</p> <p>The Health Inequalities JSNA (2023) provides context and evidence on current health inequality priorities within the county. It identifies current groups at risk of facing health inequalities in Leicestershire.</p> <p>Based on the groups of concern identified Gypsies and Travellers could potentially be at higher risk of harm to their health from the HNRFI, and those vulnerable to poor air quality due to traveller site of Aston Firs being in close proximity to the proposed site for development. A consultation with Aston Firs residents was undertaken by the applicant but not included within the APP-137.</p>	<p>The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) does not form policy or legislation, thereby omitting it from the legislative and policy review section of the Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference: 6.2.7.1, APP-137).</p> <p>The JSNA does however form a valuable resource on local health circumstance priority and need, of which corroborates the health baseline provided in the Health and Equality Briefing Note.</p> <p>Travellers are identified as sensitive receptors in the pertinent EIA Technical Disciplines (including but not limited to air, noise and transport assessments), and are further considered in the Equality Impact Statement.</p> <p>Wider protected characteristics are further considered in the Equality Impact Statement.</p>

	Groups more affected by air pollution include: Older people, children, individuals with existing CVD or respiratory disease, pregnant women, communities in areas of higher pollution, such as close to busy roads and low income communities (Health Matters: Air Pollution 2018).	
Blaby District Council	The Proposed Development will result in negative impacts to numerous health determinants as detailed in BDC's LIR. BDC consider the Wards chosen for the Applicant's assessment of health and wellbeing impacts has underrepresented the areas of Narborough, and also Hinckley and Earl Shilton	Each technical discipline within the ES addresses a specific health pathway with varying hazard nature, geographic distribution and receptor base to consider. The scope and focus for each technical discipline is defined in the relative chapter accordingly. The Health and Equality Briefing Note draws from each of the technical disciplines, and where appropriate provides additional narrative to set potential risk into context. The geographic distribution and magnitude of effect are not defined by the Health and Equality Briefing Note, but the detailed assessment outputs from the respective technical disciplines.
Blaby District Council	The negative impacts upon health and wellbeing determinants can be summarised as including: Reduced accessibility to social infrastructure and additional wait times for emergency services due to the increased downtime at the Narborough Level Crossing. Negative mental and physical health impacts due to the reduction in the Burbage Commons area, further there has been a lack of analysis around the	It is noted that the sole remaining adverse health and wellbeing impacts from the construction and operation of the proposed facility raised by Blaby District Council include: 1) reduced accessibility to social infrastructure due to active level crossings, including delay to emergency services 2) Physical and mental health impact from altered user experience at Burbage Commons

	<p>qualitative nature of replacement rural open space bridleways. BDC consider the change in user experience for bridleways from a previously natural experience to a predominantly urban one will have negative physical and mental impacts.</p> <p>Negative impacts on mental health from a reduction of the tranquillity of Burbage Common due to excessive noise impacts.</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>
Blaby District Council	<p>BDC consider the mitigation measures proposed are presently unclear and underpinned by a lack of analysis. It is presently unclear as to the quality of the proposed alternative open space which will be provided.</p> <p>BDC consider there has been a lack of analysis around the qualitative nature of replacement rural open space bridleways, The user experience will change from encountering a natural aesthetic to an urban one with most of the proposed routes being adjacent to roads.</p>	<p>Replacement and enhanced bridleway will be different, but the physical, mental and social health benefits from their use will be maintained.</p> <p>Further analysis is not possible, where there is no supporting health evidence on the qualitative user experience of alternative, replaced or enhanced bridleways on health.</p>
Blaby District Council	<p>There has been no analysis within Appendix 7.1 of the ES of the commuting patterns and how active travel will be incorporated into the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>Appendix 7.1 is Health and Equality Briefing Note (document reference: 6.2.7.1, APP-137), intended as a concise summary of how and where key health pathways have been assessed and addressed through planning and in the ES. It does not seek to repeat the entire ES, baseline or supporting evidence base.</p>

		<p>For details on current use, including active travel and recreational use, please refer to the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment Review (WCHAR).</p> <p>(Environmental Statement - Appendix 8.1 - Transport Assessment [Part 16 of 20] - Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment Report) (document reference: 6.1.16, APP-125)</p> <p>For the assessment on travel, including walking and cycling, please refer to Chapter 8: Transport and Traffic (see walking and Cycling section) (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117).</p> <p>Please note that potential for severance, delay, fear and intimidation of non-motorised users and risk of accident and injury are all addressed such that there is no significant impact.</p> <p>In terms of active travel incorporated into the design, please also refer to Section 8.315 of the same ES Chapter: Framework Travel Plan and Smarter Travel Measures (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117).</p>
Blaby District Council	Given no traffic flow information has been provided as part of the air quality assessment, any stated impacts on the human receptors cannot be verified or relied upon.	As stated in ES Chapter 9: Air Quality, the maximum change in annual mean concentrations of pollutants due to the presence of construction traffic is predicted to be $<+0.01 \mu\text{g.m}^{-3}$ for NO ₂ , PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} . When considering the health evidence base, the relative change in emission concentration and community exposure remains orders of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any measurable adverse health outcome on local communities, and the predicted environmental concentrations for all pollutants would

		<p>remain below the objective threshold protective of the environment and human health.</p> <p>As further stated in ES Chapter 9: Air Quality (document reference: 6.1.9, APP-118), the results indicate that changes in air quality would remain well within all air quality objectives protective of health.</p> <p>Following a review of the air quality modelling results, during the opening year (2026), the average change in annual mean concentrations across all districts analysed would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +0.08 µg.m-3 for NO2; +0.06 µg.m-3 for PM10; and -0.16 µg.m-3 for PM2.5. <p>During the future year (2036), the average change in annual mean concentrations across all districts analysed would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +0.02 µg.m-3 for NO2; +0.02 µg.m-3 for PM10; and +0.01 µg.m-3 for PM2.5. <p>These average changes in concentration are considered to be negligible in air quality terms and the relative change in concentration and exposure remains order of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any measurable adverse health outcome on local communities.</p>
--	--	---

		In summary, the relative change in construction and operational emissions to air are negligible, air quality will remain well within recognised UK air quality objective limits protective of health, and the quantum of change and exposure is orders of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any change in health applying the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollution risk ratios.
Blaby District Council	Furthermore, the transport modelling underpinning the Proposed Development is not considered robust and so the mitigation proposed in terms of sustainable travel and road network improvements is not considered adequate.	It is noted that Blaby District Council do not consider the Transport Assessment Modelling within the DCO to be robust, and question the mitigation and adequacy of road network improvements.
Blaby District Council	The Applicant should be required to commit to the following measures to mitigate these adverse impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Ensure quality open space provision b) signage and wayfinding strategy proposed in and around the development 	The proposals includes a 22ha park and woodland. A signage and wayfinding strategy would form part of the detailed design secured by Requirement 4.
Draft DCO and Requirements		
Leicestershire County Council	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.	The Applicant will enter a Planning Obligation under Section 106 on matters that satisfy the statutory tests set out at Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010. It is agreed, that the proposed development provides new safe and accessible routes for pedestrians, cyclists and bridleway users.

<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Financial support is provided for GP support/ outreach youth workers for children and young people in Earl Shilton and Barwell to help ensure health inequalities do not widen.</p> <p><i>The context to which this reference is made appears to be directed to the application of the Community Fund – as referenced at LIR paragraph 7.102. Blaby DC has informed TSH that it is not intending to engage further with TSH on the Community Benefit Fund (CBF) as proposed by TSH. The proposed CBF follows the form and structure which TSL (the parent company for TSH) generally apply to major logistics developments. For the avoidance of doubt, it is considered that such financial contributions as referred to in LIR paragraph 7.103 could not be lawfully sought as a Planning Obligation (CIL Regulations 2010(122)).</i></p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>Sufficient advance notification provided for local communities of forthcoming disruptions (including</p>	

	utilities) and diversions to lessen the impact on daily living.	
Blaby District Council	Require financial contribution in a S106 agreement from the Applicant in respect of the administrative costs of hosting the certified documents if the Proposed Development is consented.	The Applicant will discuss this with the Council however does not consider it appropriate for the Council to require financial contribution for hosting the documents, which is part of its normal statutory function for planning documents, nor is the Applicant aware of such a requirement on other schemes.
Blaby District Council	BDC's comments on the draft DCO are set out below. A revised draft of Schedule 2 to the dDCO incorporating the amendments which BDC considers necessary is appended.	The proposed BDC amendments to requirements and DCO are set out in Appendix A to this Written representation report.
Blaby District Council	Para 5 of Part 2 of schedule 2 of the dDCO seeks to apply the fee arrangements in the T&CP Regs to the determination of the requirements under the DCO. This is not appropriate because the fees payable under those regs do not reflect the level of resource that will be required from BDC officers to respond to applications to discharge the DCO requirements. BDC will seek to negotiate more appropriate fee arrangements with the Applicant and secure these by way of a PPA or appropriate legal agreement.	
Conclusion		
Blaby District Council	This Written Representation identifies a range of fundamental concerns that BDC has about the Proposed Development, as such, BDC vehemently opposes the Proposed Development given the far-reaching adverse environmental and social impacts it	It is submitted that these Written Representations seek to advance objections to HNRFI based on unsupportable assertion. BDC has failed to properly analyse the extensive documentation which accompanies the application for HNRFI – particularly the comprehensive Environmental Assessment. BDC fails to

	would cause in the local area, as outlined throughout this document. BDC acknowledges that the Proposed Development will have benefits in terms of employment during the construction and operational phase, however, this is overridden by the significant negative impacts upon the natural and built environment.	acknowledge the wide benefit of HNRFI in terms of a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFIs in the national interest. The national interest that SRFIs serve clearly benefits the local community as well. In only recognising national benefit from HNRFI and in failing to provide cogent argument as to impact of HNRFI, the planning balance of the benefits being weighed against adverse impacts is flawed.
Blaby District Council	In the event that the Secretary of State consents the Proposed Development, BDC insist that the Requirements and obligations to be secured pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, which are still under negotiation and are not yet acceptable to BDC, should be an essential part of the overall scheme	The Applicant will enter a Planning Obligation under Section 106 on matters that satisfy the statutory tests set out at Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010.