

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 4 of 4 Residents Businesses]

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)

Residents and Businesses

This document provides the Applicant's response to the points raised in the Written Representations prepared and submitted by Residents and Businesses 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. 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 to 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.

Applicants Response
<p>The Applicant has provided a detailed response to Relevant Representations at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Whilst all Residents and Businesses Written Representations contain comments that are specific to the author, the majority of comments are responded to and answered through the detailed responses provided to the Relevant Representations submitted as part of Deadline 1. The Applicant makes specific reference to Deadline 1 Document Reference 8.2 (Section 6 - Summary Residents Businesses).</p> <p>For a response to Relevant Representations raised, the Applicant makes reference to Deadline 1 Document Reference 8.2 parts.</p> <p>For specific matters not responded to in the Relevant Representations, please refer to the table below.</p>

<u>Matter</u>	Applicants Response
<p>Site visits proposed:</p> <p>The specific sites which Dr Evans MP invites the Planning Inspectorate to view are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site on Leicester Road (B4668) where the link road is proposed to join, at rush hour• The A5/M69 Junction at rush hour• Burbage Common and woods	<p>The Planning Inspectorate have undertaken unaccompanied site visits and published notes of the nature of these visits.</p>

Residents and Businesses

Matter	Applicants Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narborough Level Crossing (at times to be agreed during rush hour) Traffic pinch points of concern (during rush hour): Stoney Stanton (where Huncote Road and Occupation Road meet; where Long Street and New Road meet), Sapcote (where Hinckley Road and Leicester Road meet), and Sharnford (Leicester Road) 	
<p>The site has a Severn Trent 500mm pressurised sewerage pipe crossing one corner and the mainline rail track. Severn Trent confirmed a 20 metre easement for this pipeline. The latest proposed diversion route shown on “Concept Foul Water Drainage Strategy” drawing still appears to be within the proposed Railport Area.</p>	<p>The easement as advised by Severn Trent Water is for access and maintenance of their asset, it is not a no build zone. A new alignment will be incorporated into the site (including within the Railport) which will allow access in the future and allow the site to operate normally.</p>
<p>Proposed highway mitigations which will have an adverse effect for residents locally.</p>	<p>Strategic modelling has demonstrated the key impacts of the development. The applicant has developed access infrastructure and mitigation to proportionately address the impacts. Further detail is contained within the ES Appendix 6.8.2.1 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, AS-016) Transport Assessment Sections 8 and 9.</p>
<p>Limited progress in agreeing Statements of Common Ground.</p>	<p>Statements of Common Ground have been subject to frequent discussion with relevant statutory consultees. Each Statement of Common Ground details matters agreed and not agreed and all completed Statements of Common Ground have been submitted as part of Deadline 2.</p>
<p>The green travel plan for site staff walking and cycling to work is not realistic.</p>	<p>The Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan pt 15 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1 , APP-153) as well as the mechanisms for securing sustainable transport measures are still under discussion with the local authorities.</p>

Matter	Applicants Response
<p>The bus service information in “Additional Submission - 6.2.8.1 Environmental Statement - Appendix 8.1 - Transport Assessment Rev 07 (Part 1 of 20) - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority” is significantly incorrect.</p>	<p>The Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan pt 15 of 20 (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) as well as the mechanisms for securing sustainable transport measures are still under discussion with the local authorities.</p>
<p>A number of concerns were raised with regards to the noise assessment undertaken.</p> <p>Principally, those concerns focused on the following points:</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around noise measurement locations not being representative of noise sensitive receptors, particularly using data near to the rail line to characterise properties further away. 	<p>As set out in Table 10.1 of the ES Noise and vibration chapter, the noise monitoring methodology has been detailed within the technical note NTT2814 –Hinckley Survey Method Statement_Issue_P02 (document reference: 6.2.10.5, APP-184), which has been submitted to and agreed with Blaby District Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council – in both cases it was agreed by suitably qualified technical officers.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around the selection of character corrections to specific noise levels in accordance with BS4142 	<p>A detailed reasoning behind the adopted character corrections has been included in paragraphs 10.157 to 10.161 and Tables 10.39 to 10.42 of the ES Noise and vibration chapter, including corrections ranging between 0 and +10, dependant on scenario. Paragraph 10.288 rationalises the removal of character corrections for the With Mitigation assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern around disregarding Saturday night noise data at NMP4 on the basis of it being unrepresentative. 	<p>Paragraphs 10.106 to 10.108 of the ES Noise and vibration chapter (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119) fully discuss the noise survey results and consider whether the Saturday night measured noise data at NMP4 is considered representative of weekend night-time conditions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around the assessment of context in accordance with BS4142. 	<p>The approach to the consideration of context is in line with that of other similar developments such as East Midlands Gateway, where “WHO</p>

Matter	Applicants Response
	<p>Guidelines for Community Noise (1999)", "British Standard 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings" and changes in ambient noise level were all considered.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around the assumptions regarding existing trains and existing activity being overstated. 	<p>Paragraph 10.207 of the ES Noise and vibration (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119) chapter states that the assumed existing train movements have been confirmed by the project Rail Consultant.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around some predicted high noise levels during construction and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures. 	<p>The ES Noise and vibration chapter (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119) adopts a standard approach for assessing "average case" and "worst case" construction noise levels. Only one NSR is predicted to have a significant adverse effect during two phases without mitigation. The worst case assessment shows some much greater noise levels in some phases at some NSRs prior to mitigation. In each case, the actual activity generating the noise levels is likely to be of a short duration and localised. Given that the worst case assessment assumes that stages 1, 2 and 4 could take place within 5m of the DCO limits, in many cases the activity simply will not take place as close as assessed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the framework CEMP incorporates a range of noise control techniques and strategies to reduce noise, many of which are referenced in "British Standard 5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites parts 1: Noise" as effective noise control measures.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification over number of container placements and spreader impacts in the night-time maximum noise assessment. 	<p>The number of individual container placements and spreader impacts have been assessed against a maximum noise level not typically to be exceeded, irrespective of how many events there are.</p>

Matter	Applicants Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around the assumed sound reduction afforded by a partially opened window. 	<p>The 15 dB reduction is taken from “British Standard 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings”, which is based on a partially open window providing background ventilation and, as such, is a reasonable assumption to take.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around the suitability of the criterion selected to assess the impact of noise onto Burbage Common and Woods. 	<p>Noise impacting onto Burbage Common and Woods has been assessed by considering both the absolute noise levels and the change in noise levels. This is in line with the “IEMA Guidelines for environmental noise impact assessment” document.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around some measured levels being lower than the modelled noise levels which are based on traffic data. 	<p>The noise model used to determine off-site road traffic noise impacts underwent a calibration exercise as reported in Paragraphs 10.223 to 10.228. The assessment methodology as adopted from “Highways England (2019) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 Noise and vibration Revision 2” is essentially based on a change in noise level, rather than a consideration of the absolute noise levels. Therefore, for the purpose of the road traffic noise assessment, a situation where the noise model is overpredicting compared to a measured noise level is not problematic. Where a noise model is underpredicting, there could be an issue in regard to future noise levels incorrectly being predicted below the threshold required for qualification under the Noise Insulation Regulations. However, this is not the case here.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absence of a cumulative impact assessment. 	<p>Paragraphs 10.350 to 10.353 of the ES Noise and vibration chapter (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119) provide an assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects of noise and vibration as a result of the development.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns around the lack of visibility in the modelling process. 	<p>All noise model inputs, data sources, calculation methodologies, settings and software have been reported on, and noise contour</p>

Residents and Businesses

<u>Matter</u>	Applicants Response
	outputs have been provided in the ES (document reference: 6.1.10, APP-119).