

# TRANSCRIPT\_OFH2\_SESSION1\_02112023

Thu, Nov 02, 2023 12:05PM • 1:17:08

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

applicant, leicestershire, local, proposal, villages, development, impact, concerns, traffic, application, highways, mitigation, hearing, proposed, minutes, stoney, road, authority, junction, modeling

00:05

Good morning, everybody. It's now 10 o'clock and it is time for this hearing. To begin, I would like to welcome you all to this second open floor hearing for the Hinkley national rail freight Interchange project. Can I just confirm everybody can hear me? And can I confirm with the case team that the live streaming and recording this event has also commenced? Thank you. My name is Robert Jackson, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm now going to ask the federal panel members to introduce themselves.

00:38

My name is Graham sold, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel to examine the application. Good morning,

00:45

my name is Matthew heron, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel to examine this application.

00:50

Thank you. Together we constitute the examining authority for this application. I'll now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Can everyone please set all devices and phones including smartwatches to Silent says he needs to do that himself. The toilets are out of this room are in the corridor on your left and along the corridor. There are no planned fire drills today. So if the alarm does go off, please treat it as a real emergency and follow the green emergency exit signs the muster points outside. This meeting will follow the agenda published on the national infrastructure planning website on the 23rd of October 2033 examination Library Reference EV nine hyphen double 01. It will be helpful if you have a copy in front of you. The agenda will also be displayed on screen. The agenda is for guidance only and we may add other considerations or issues as we progress. We will conclude the hearing soon as all relevant contributions have been made. Today's hearing is being undertaken in a in a blended way. Meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue and some of you are joining virtually using Microsoft Teams. We will make sure that whoever you decide to to attend today, you'll be given a fair opportunity to participate. A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the Hinkley national rail freight interchange section of the National Planning infrastructure planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing has finished. And transcript will also made available which will use a AI technology. We're going to ask you to come to the table at the front here to

say your piece to us to ensure that recording is as good as it can be. Please ensure that you speak clearly into the microphone stating your name and who you are representing. For those who isn't the microphone on the table. There's a button and the microphone as you can see on mine shows red. A link to the planning Inspectorate to privacy notice was provided in the notification for the hearing. We've seen that everyone here has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set down in data protection laws. Please speak to Mrs. Emily Davis, or Mr. Stephen Parker at the back. If you have any questions about this, I would remind you of any questions about outside the scope of the meeting, then either of those two, were at the red room or the people you should approach I would ask you Do not speak directly to the any of the examining examining authority panel in the interest of fairness and impartiality. I will now hand over to Mr. Sword to take us through the second item on this agenda hearing.

03:40

Thank you Mr. Jackson. So this is agenda item two purpose of the open flow hearing. This is an open flow hearing and does not have a subject matter controlled agenda. This means that you can bring up any matter arising from the application that is also important and relevant to a decision taken under the Planning Act 2008. As amended, if you bring up matters that are not important and relevant. I will interject briefly to explain this, and we ask you to move on. However in general terms your time in this hearing is you're on to say what you wish. The convention that has evolved in open floor hearings for national infrastructure is that the inspector here is anyone who has written in and requested to be heard first, and then he has other interested parties who have attended and requested to be heard on the day. We will invite parties to speak based on the order of my list, which we'll come to in a minute. all interested parties who wish to make oral representations have been invited to attend and to participate in this hearing if they wish. Participation is subject to my power to control a hearing. We have set different speaking times for different people. These are three And it's about individual interested parties. Eight minutes where one interested party speaks on behalf of a number of interested parties. It minutes for membership organization and farmer groups and unless we include members of parliament this is a standard rule used in most open flow hearings to ensure that if lots of people attend, the available time is divided fairly between speakers. However, please note that if we have questions which arise during your submission, or we put questions to the applicant journey submission, we will stop the clock. So we will be typing you. The time spent responding these or hearing the applicants response will not count against your speaking time limit. For those who have three minutes, we will advise you when there are 30 seconds to go. For those with either five or eight minutes, we will let you know when the rest 60 seconds to go. We had a first open floor hearing on Monday evening, and we normally only allow you to speak once and not have both open floor hearings. If having left today feel that you missed something or the opportunity to allow you to follow up your submissions. And this can be done in writing at deadline three, which is Tuesday, the 14th of November. The applicant will be given the opportunity to respond to the comments made today at the end of the hearing. There is no obligation for it to do so Nick can also respond in writing it that line three and the 14th of November. So moving on to Agenda Item three confirmation of those who notified the examining authority have a wish to be heard at the open floor hearing. So run through those who have asked to speak today and this will be the order that we will hear them I will also say the time that we think you should have. So if you feel that we have got it wrong. When you get to your time please let us know. We won't count any of that time against your

speaking allocation moving on to the list of Genda item four we have our better caster MP eight minutes look sharp and pay eight minutes answer make surely five minutes. Councillor Stewart Bray five minutes. Counselor Maggie rate five minutes. Look cousins on behalf of Stoney Stanton parish council five minutes. Counselor Mike Milani. Malini, five minutes timbres with all we saw three minutes Catherine bass as a representative of L stands together five minutes. I also understand Catherine bass would also like to speak as an individual resident for three minutes. David Harold on behalf of Stoney Stanton Action Group, five minutes when the firemen three minutes the lock in three minutes. Malcolm laid three minutes. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak but has not had their name? Sorry.

08:55

Wait for the mic. Base.

08:57

Sorry. It's Terry Richardson leader by the District Council. I did apply to speak at both. I appreciate what you said about speaking at one that had I realized I can only speak at one I would not have spoken on the first one would have spoken on this one. And I just feel perhaps as leader of the council, I don't know whether you feel you can give me latitude to actually speak at this one as well.

09:18

Thank you, I'm afraid I think the answer has to be no in the interest of fairness, but doesn't as I said as as previously advised. Mr. Saur that doesn't prevent you putting further representations in in writing. There's another hand up on the other side. Two hands two hands sorry.

09:46

I'm Dr. David Moore. I asked when I came through the reception this morning if I could at the door here whether I could speak and the lady took my name down so I would like to speak please So it's the minutes,

10:01

not tomorrow, it would be three minutes, obviously at the bottom of the list as it were. And we have another hand up

10:14

I'm William David Moore. I also ready to start this morning to speak and my name was taken down, I was told I will be put on the list, but doesn't seem to have happened. So I would like to speak for three minutes.

10:24

It's a matter of communication between us and the case team can be summed up slightly difficult.

10:39

If we could ask Albert Acosta, MP. Understand your wish to speak with a roving mic.

10:52

Good morning, gentlemen. And thank you very much for organizing this meeting. Um, just a bit of housekeeping. I'm joined by Mr. Robinson, who's a personal security officer. Under operation Bridger, you may not be aware that members of parliament are advised by Mr. Speaker in the Metropolitan Police to have security personnel when their names are advertised in attending public meetings. I'm sure you weren't aware of that. But I would ask that you take note of that going forward in any future meetings that you hold with members of parliament, given the recent martyrs of some of my colleagues.

Good morning, gentlemen, it is my view that this development should not be recommended to the Secretary of State in its current form, due to one a number of key flaws in the application and to the wider negative impact on infrastructure the proposals would have in this part of Leicestershire. Now, as far as I can see, the applicant has completed little or no modeling on traffic movement for when the site is fully operational. That means that there is no best case or worst case model for traffic movement for after the site is constructed. There is only modeling for the period until the year 2036. Further, there is little or no modeling on the impact of HGV movements within the surrounding roads network. For example, that appears to be no modeling on the impact of own junction one of the M six there is no proper assessment on the impact on the Gibert Hill roundabout, which is a principal roundabout on the E five affecting not just Leicestershire but what is your vehicle movements as well. The Juba tilde roundabout is already at or near capacity, with the doubling in size of Magna Park as we speak, and the nearby draft, as well as expanding logistics operations in and around Leicestershire, and Warwick Sure, the congestion and safety implications of even more hitch GV movements appear to have been largely disregarded by the applicant. Here HGVs traveling along the five with a force way meats Watling Street is already a notorious crossing. The applicant has not explained how it would propose to mitigate against further issues on that crossing. I understand that the applicant has not modelled for the closure of the M 69. And the major impact that would have in the surrounding area during the construction of the proposed development. When the M 69 M six or M one as major arterial routes in my constituency close due to for example, frequent accidents that result in increase in traffic in the villages around southwest showing the wider area on the small roads is very noticeable and is currently a problem. Where is the modeling by the applicants on how it would mitigate against these common scenarios? What is of major concern is that the applicant has not completed accurate or timely transport modeling, which is in my opinion, D legitimized much of the public consultation phase and cost valuable time and money for stakeholders like bleepy District Council. Crucially key stakeholders are expected to make representations on proposals before you which are lacking in substance and accuracy. It is therefore my submission that the failure to adequately prepare modeling for your benefits as examiner's is sufficient reason alone to recommend to the secretary of state that this proposed development does not proceed in its current form. Now with no light to turn briefly to the wider negative impact on infrastructure, the proposal would have in this part of Leicestershire. I do not propose to the house the points made by a wide number of stakeholders except to state that I agree with the submissions in particular made by bleepy District Council as a corporate body and its leader, a numerous councillors. I'd like to turn to the issue of Nobre level crossing. There are significant deficiencies in the applicants assessment of traffic and barrier downtime at Nobre level crossing. I understand that in a recent submission, the applicant assured the examining authority, it would submit details of a video survey of the traffic cues caused by the current level crossing barrio downtime. The applicant survey was conducted again, I understand for seven days from Wednesday the 11th of October this year, meaning that some of the dates for the survey coincide with the local school half term policies, which surely cannot be considered by you as representative of a normal week in that area. The lack of worst case

scenarios, modeling adds to concerns the incidence and delays on the southwest Cheb line are not being factored into this application. As John Hardison and the volunteers at Friends of Narborough station have already pointed out to you the south Leicestershire line is not a main line to quote Mr. Partisan that are no refuges, no passing loops, and no facilities for bidirectional working. Put simply, it means that any breakdown or other incident could close the line for hours or days and quote, for Safe Access, trains will almost certainly be slow to stand up to maximum 10 miles per hour before closing the to clear the enter the site. Depending on the direction the train is coming from. This will mean crossing over the opposite running line. This will cause a prolonged obstruction of both eastbound and westbound trains, trains leaving the terminal will inevitably cause similar delays to passenger trains during the crossover process. The fact that is one in 162 gradient to climb will require extended occupation while the train gets up to the wind speed. Now, what about the overburdening of local instrument infrastructure in the surrounding villages and heat I would like to come to this map. Little consideration appears to have been given to the transport arrangements for the alleged chitkara 8000 employees that the applicant purports will be employed on the site. The employment rate in and around southwest assure is 98% of the working SAP second black, Mr. Costa. In other words, we have very low levels of unemployment. This suggests that the majority of the asserted 8000 person workforce will need to travel from outside southwest assure traveling relatively long distances through villages and country roads. And this is known as the right run as we've seen in and around the magnet Park area. Finally examining authority team. This map demonstrates that South Leicestershire constituents do not suffer nimbyism. What we see on this map is very large scale development in and around South Leicestershire. We have the doubling of Magna Park, which will retain the title of one of Europe's largest logistics parks just a couple of miles as the crow flies from the proposed site. And as the map shows, we have and I put this in the written submissions. We've got other large scale housing, new lumber stock and large scale other commercial developments such as Lutterworth east and Lutterworth, the south with a new logistics park, and Bruntingthorpe, which hosts one of the largest card auction retail sites. In conclusion, I would ask that you take this visual map as evidence of the gross overdevelopment potential for South Leicestershire. Thank you. Thank you.

19:17

Thank you, Mr. Costa.

19:25

It just to add that the map that Mr. Costa displayed is available as attached to the representation on the website. So if I could ask Dr. Luke evidence to speak now. Thanks

20:01

put the mic on. They're not working

20:18

is that working? And there we go. So you are tasked with determining whether the Nash nation will benefit from this project, or will it outweigh the impacts on our local community? And I pose a fundamental question to you. How can you the decision making body pass judgment when the various statutory bodies it relies on are themselves unable to do so due to insufficient information provided by the applicant. And I've heard some say the applicant is bungling. Others have said it's bullying. But as a

member of parliament, my role is to raise the shared concerns of various stakeholders about the process and the impending decision. And I put it to you that through the applicant's actions or lack thereof, you cannot and must not recommend this application. And in the next few minutes, as stated in our joint written submission with Alberto are raised the concerns of my constituents, the issues that have been raised with me, and most crucially, the significant shortcomings in the process. So let me turn to my constituents concerns. They feel this is something being done to them, rather than with them. Why? Well, let's take the public consultation carried out by the applicant. There were so many complaints made to me as an MP, I had to formally raise a complaint myself. Issues included the small size of consultation venues, the long queues, issues with COVID-19 security, access to exhibit panels, documents, were unable to be handed out to the number of attendees inadequate information on air pollution, traffic flow, and even exhibitors adopting a passive aggressive approach when asked questions. So my constituents were hungry for information to be informed of their opinion, and yet were left angry, upset and none the wiser. Now, what are their concerns that they share? Well, they center around the environment and infrastructure. Let's take the environment for my constituents. It's particularly around the Burbidge common, the triple si LCC have said there's a lack of lighting plan to mitigate the impact on wildlife on the common and further still key environmental policies have been ignored. The net zero list share Strategy and Action Plan, the roadmap research evidence base, the Leicestershire climate and nature pack or not considered and even the applicant has acknowledged there were discrepancies in the figures quoted in the environmental statement in terms of traffic impacts. After all, the environmental assessment impact used the lowest of the three employment levels to determine traffic levels. Using these traffic figures to assess the associated environmental effects would therefore underestimate the impact to our community. And according to LCC, with no statement of common ground, the applicant is relying heavily on scoping opinions agreed with pins for the environmental impact assessment, which was agreed over two years ago. So now that leads us on to the infrastructure of the construction and operation. Now there were concerns from my community about the proposed a 47 link road the impact it will have on the sporting facilities and access but also the a five Midlands connect of class the a five corridor as a slow and unreliable route with 1/3 of the traffic there HGVs an average peak times the speed gets down to 10 miles an hour including the M 69 Junction one and we have to factor in the Watling Street Bridge, the most bashed bridge in Britain that's hit every two weeks, causing a six hour congestion going back with people using rat runs. These are significant impacts on my community. And I could go on, but concerns about the environmental infrastructure service provision during the construction and operational phase are stark and simply not addressed. Now you have my constituents concerns with the applicant, but my role as an MP is to ensure the process is followed. And to do this I wrote to the statutory bodies a mere one month ago before the hearing to find out how this was progressing. And I was horrified to hear the following rugby Council on the 27th of the ninth the Inspectorate has asked for I quote a statement of common ground to be prepared between the applicants and the council's and discussions with the applicants regarding this are awaited Leicester City Council on the second of the 10th. We are aware the transport assessment has not yet been concluded. And the sustainable transport strategy has yet to be agreed by relevant stakeholders Berkshire County Council on the 28th of the ninth with regards to the adequacy of the statement of common ground to date, this has not progressed and we're concerned that this will be done at the last minute. We are relying on other colleagues to review some of the more recent information submitted. The delay in receiving all of this transport information has impacted our ability to respond in the relatively short timescales, the DCO timetable set out so it's clear that the

applicant is doing things at the last moment lacking the information required, so let's turn to national highways. And I note the national highways brought to you the inspectorate on the 31st of August and I'm quoting, the applicants transport consultant halted re application discussions with us and the local highways authorities in summer 2022. Going on to say with a number of areas still to be agreed with ourselves and local highways authorities. I quote, national highways has significant reservations on its ability to fully consider the development proposals. Whilst substantial amounts of transport information are yet to be submitted or agreed. And at present, national highways cannot provide comments nor accept the stage one road safety audits because strategic modeling outputs are outstanding. National Highways also remains concerned that the limited sustainability transport strategy for development site has not been submitted. They were so concerned they even wrote to you asking for a delay in this process because of the feedback. And finally Leicestershire county council roads on the 20th of the ninth noticeably there is no statement of common ground for transportation and highways. There are a number of items in issues for example, air quality, noise pollution, which will likely be impacted should the requested missing information be submitted. But I also know they wrote again directly to you the inspectorate about concerns with regards to the missing information, and the time to fully assess the new information. And I quote, assuming the deadline of the fifth of September allows for submissions of updated information. Even if that information is only amended drawings, the subsequent deadline of the 10th of October for submissions of written representations and local impact reports would not allow sufficient time to give due consideration of additional information. So it should be noted that statements of common ground were only published on the 27th of October. Now, I could go on but in closing, given everything you've heard, can you 100% Be sure this applicant did everything it did can to work with all parties. Can you be 100% sure that every single concern raised by the statutory bodies has been addressed in a timely manner built on solid robust evidence? And can you be 100% Sure, that the National benefit of this railfreight interchange fully outweighs the horrific impact it will create on my local community, both in its build and operation? If the answer is no, the second is Docker and you must recommend this application does not go ahead.

27:37

Again, Dr. Evans could have asked a counselor make surely to broach the desk please.

28:01

And make surely not here. Okay, if I move on to Councillor Stuart Brand place.

28:24

Good morning. I'm Stuart Bray. I'm the leader of Hinckley and Bosworth are a council and I'm also the county councillor for St. Mary's electoral division, which covers part of Burbidge and Hinkley Town Center, and my constituents will be greatly impacted. Should the scheme Go ahead? I know there have been lots of comments in the inquiry, expressing concerns about the lack of meaningful consultation and the National Infrastructure process in general, the Borough Council has made its comments known at the adequacy of consultation stage in this regard. I do have similar concerns of my own on this, but I'm going to spend my time today specifically talking about the impact of the scheme on the borrower and generally, in Jebel Bora, generally, and in particular, my constituents in Hinckley and Burbidge. I'm Hinkley born and bred and the value that people locally place on Burbidge common and woods cannot be understated. I believe that the impact of the proposal will have a devastating detrimental impact on



the common and people's ability to join, enjoy the peaceful open space it provides and on the on the impact on the wildlife. It houses. The loss of open countryside that separates our villages from the motorway, which will replace by units up to 30 meters in height will have a huge impact on the visual beauty and blight the landscape forever. The a 47 link road will impact on the Green Wedge in Leicestershire. We don't have any Greenbelt but the Green Wedge provides a similar function and always has been long established and the function is to maintain separation between settlements. In this case, Hinkley, Burbidge, Humboldt, and or Shelton If this length road goes ahead that will devastate the impact on the Green Wedge. I have major concerns about the impact of traffic. Anyone who lives locally will know how busy our roads already become at peak times, hundreds if not 1000s of extra car movements will simply ensure that our area grinds to a halt. The impact especially on the a five and the likelihood of traffic traffic traveling east being attracted to use the A four seven around Hinkley to get to the link road. Rather than following the a five to the M six nine and then go north em to jump to junction two will cause gridlock. I'm particularly concerned about what will happen if there was an incident on the MC six nine or other local strategic roads. I've seen little if any alternatives proposed, the only alternative will be more traffic through the urban area of the borough, which will cause absolute chaos. I've seen nothing that persuades me that employees these sites will not have to come and go by car. There'll be a need to connect Hinkley Bowell or Shelton communities to the development and the sustainable transport strategy currently does. It currently doesn't give me any confidence that this will be delivered. We know that public transport across Leicestershire is at best patchy and when you get to early mornings and late evenings it's virtually non existent. We're all aware of the need for sustainable development. But in my view, this development is entirely unsustainable. I see very little benefit to the scheme. There are no shortages as has been said of haulage and warehousing jobs in this part of Leicestershire, and the impact of the noise light traffic on the surrounding towns and villages will be devastating. I will formally endorsed the submissions from Hinkley boss of Borough Council. And I'd like to commend colleagues from the surrounding towns and parishes for their efforts in opposing the scheme. I'd like to thank the inspectors listening to me today and respectfully urge you to recommend to the secretary of state that they reject this application because I believe it will be a permanent blight on the area.

32:01

Thank you bringing Mr. Brue could now ask Maggie rate to step forward please.

32:25

Yeah, yes, it is now. Good morning. I'm counselor Maggie. Right. I'm the county councillor for Stoney Stanton and Croft division, district councillor for the Fosse Normanton Ward, and representing the southern fosse villages. Just set my time, okay. I strongly oppose this application, because m stop is not a suitable location for a rail freight interchange. The proposal takes HGVs off the road at Port, but overloads and unsuitable net road network here. Increases road traffic movement generates pollutions and will cause congestion, or bypasses prematurely being dismissed and traffic modeling has not yet been agreed with authorities. It is not even on a main train line. If this is such an ideal location, why has it taken five years to still not provide fundamental information? And why are we still waiting for crucial documentation to be provided right up to deadline dates, when there will be limited opportunity to respond particularly on topics such as highways modeling and sustainable travel. Why have answers to genuine questions not being forthcoming? If this is such a slam dunk of a business case? Where is the



evidence? I have numerous concerns but we'll highlight as many of as possible in the time given highways. The local national and rural infrastructure will not cope with more traffic the M 69. And junction 21 is at capacity and needs massive investments to sort lack of contingency plans when the M 69 is closed or block opening the sudden slip roads will have adverse effects on Sapkota and Stoney Stanton villages, the rural network may need up to 45 Junction mitad locations. The known mitigation proposals for villages or traffic calming measures at best cannot be enforced and are totally inadequate. The a 47 link road will change the rural landscape and overload and already problematic a 47 which has committed large development large scale development sheduled along its roots, the A 47 suffers traffic congestion daily residents have difficulty leaving farm entrances and village junctions. When the M 69 is closed traffic use this is an alternative route to junction 21 Fire Enderby representations the public consultation was totally inadequate residents attending exhibitions complained about vague deeds Hail, many were left confused as to what they were being consulted on, and truly not understanding the scale implication and impacts. Communities and counselors have been treated with indifference by the applicant because the scheme is not being determined locally. And we are not the decision makers, no signs of partnership working, no community liaison Liaison Group was offered. There are several examples of these operating within my division, which could easily have been replicated. The community fund offered is so low it is an insult and not reflected of the long term inconveniences that will be encountered by the numerous communities affected. It is a two way communication platform. If this is not instigated How will community voices be heard, problems addressed and resolutions delivered during the construction period and beyond other points, the rural area is being stripped of quality public rights of way and bridle ways. Walkers and riders now go from enjoying the countryside to urban shed experiences. The local area is known as asthma alley because of the number of people suffering from respiratory conditions. I am chairman of the old school surgery patient participation group at Stoney Stanton. The surgery is at capacity and will not cope with any additional pressures and little reference or consideration has been given to the traveler site at Aston first which is immediately adjacent to the site. The scheme will result in significant environment 60s on the landscape and be visible for several miles. significant loss of green fields open space woodlands, trees and hedgerows, approximately 440 acres of agricultural land will be lost contrary to the government's food security strategy. knob level crossing will experience additional downtime 14 minutes in the hour. It is essential that the operational workings of Croft quarry and the restoration is not prejudiced by the application train capacity should be guaranteed on the rail network. I conclude that the application I conclude by saying I have I object in the strongest possible terms to this application. Thank you.

37:19

Thank you counselor right. I could no ask the cousins on behalf of Stoney Stanton parish council to come forward please.

37:33

Thank you Can I request as a elected member of the Stoney Stanton parish council that I have the full eight minutes to speak rather than than just the five

37:42

unfortunately, we've gotten restricted to five

37:46

must be quicker than I speak on behalf of Stoney Stanton parish council a very nearby parish and settlement there'll be substantially affected by this proposal. I'm chair of the parish council as well as district councillor for for Stoney Cove, which includes Stoney Stanton Croft and potters, Marsden. And I believe in Stoney Stanton myself, I think it'd be safe to say that the proposal have a far well by far have the greatest impact, and has raised significant concerns on a number of topic areas to residents. I'm going to use my time here today to see queries to additional questions that have arisen during the course of the events, and matters to which the Stanton parish council do not consider there have been adequately addressed through the hearing sessions. Many of the outstanding concerns run to the heart of the proposal, and its ability to accord with the national policy statement for national networks, to which at present, it is considered that the proposal should be rejected to someone reviewing the proceedings to date, it feels very much as though the application has been submitted too early. And the applicant is simply looking to paper over and retro fill gaps in their evidence base on the matter of highways. A fundamental issue is the highways modeling. I'm somewhat dismayed that the modelling has still not yet been agreed and yet we're here at the examination discussing the matters, this matter simply has to be bottomed out. Otherwise it is it becomes impossible for the impacts of the development to be truly analyzed. Our written representation outlines a significant concern in respect of the potential under provision still have the highways movements expected versus the staff levels on site during the am peak. It is noted that it has been stated by the applicant that these are created using different approaches. But shouldn't the two systems roughly correlate our analysis suggests that the highway movements may be missed, represented by as much as 74%. As per our written representation, paragraphs 1.6 to 1.7. Any comments the applicant has on this matter would be welcome. A prerequisite of the site selection process is the ability to utilize the strategic road network, as per the NPS and then paragraph 2.45 2.45. Much has been made out about the importance of the location of the application site and its ability to connect directly to the network. Yes, simply instated by the applicant the key notes on the SRN is over capacity and no mitigation is proposed. Importantly, this includes the M 69. M one interchange, resulting in the traffic modeling rerouting vehicles on to lower order roads. This flies in the face of the aims of the national infrastructure projects and locational justification for this specific site. reference was made to there being mitigation schemes prepared for the EM one junction 21. But this has never been discussed with any of the statutory highway consultees. Why is this not occurred, as it should be the first option towards mitigation of the impacts of this development, with no mitigation to the motorway interchanges led to the model, showing the model showing a number of junctions on the lower order roads operating over capacity. Many junctions even though expected to operate over capacity as simply being ignored. As an example of this I refer to the roundabout in Stoney Stanton, which is junction 38. In the applicants assessment. With rat running vehicles, it is expected that the highways movements through this mini roundabout will increase significantly yet no mitigation is proposed. How can this be considered a robust solution? This is not an isolated solution. Many junctions have not been assessed or mitigated. Mitigation proposed the highway solution is simply flawed on alternative options and needs paragraph 4.26 and 4.27 of the NPS nn sets out a requirement for applicants to undertake an appropriate alternative and options appraisal discussion was undertaken through the hearing sessions about options practically being considered in Leicestershire given the economic report published to support rail link logistics park. However, it was also stated verbally by the applicant that sites further to the west north and south were considered

whereas the evidence within the submitted information as it seems to be missing. It has been stated verbally that the proposal will not compete with deft as it serves a different type of function. There are however many other rail link logistics boxes agency including East Midlands gateway birch coppice and household rail terminal clarification on whether there will be any competition with these centers would be useful to understand. Finally on need it has been indicated as well that this will act as a hub location serving the local industrial manufacturers as well as a center to combine rail freight with other locations. What other rail freight locations is the Hinkley hub expected to serve in this manner? much debate has been undertaken in respect of the incorporation of the CHP plant and the provision of only 49.9 megawatts of renewable energy on the site. It seems clear that there is additional roof space to be able to increase the level of on site energy production. Why has this not been increased? And will the applicant be willing to have an appropriate regulation attached allowing it to be reviewed and increased clarification as to why there is a backup reliance on outdated CHP systems needs also to be provided? There are numerous options for modern renewable systems allowing it to essentially operate as an off grid system of truly netzero credentials. Why is this not being proposed in terms of the growing need for energy on the site, though, through the rapid growth of electric cars and potential commercial vehicles? And as we conclude, please oh well, has the expected energy demand in energy demands for charging vehicles been robustly incorporated into expected energy demand? If not, then the reliance on the CHP will increase. And it is considered that the smaller scheme may well have addressed many of the concerns highlighted in respect of the proposal. It would not however, overcome the principal objections considered to occur due to the gaps in the evidence base or the incomplete highways assessment. Thank you.

43:32

And now ask counselor Michael Mulaney please step forward.

43:45

Thank you. Good morning, Michael Mulaney. I'm County and borough councillor for Hinkley DeMontfort. The community I represent in Hinckley I believe will be negatively impacted by the proposed Hinkley national rail freight interchange. So I'm speaking today to object to the proposals. An issue that has concerned many people locally is the likely impact of the scheme on Burbidge common and words the Burbage common and words are considered to be a valuable and much loved open space in the local area. And there's a real fear that the proposed development will have a negative effect on the local environment with units of up to 30 meters in height, blighting the local landscape. There are already concerns about the heavy volume of traffic through Hinkley and its local roads. This proposal is too likely to lead to many more car movements on local roads from staff causing even more car traffic congestion at peak times around Hinkley and whilst we would like people to be using public transport sadly, we've seen many reductions in local public transport in Leicestershire in recent years, and we cannot be confident that many of the people who work at the proposed site who are likely to be from outside the area are unlikely to use public transport are likely to drive themselves there and that will add already to the increased pressure on local road infrastructure. Many of the residents I represent have been active in campaigning against this welfare aid interchange, attending meetings, writing objections, including the safe Burbage common group, which has many supporters in Hinckley, and Bosworth and Blaby. They share my concerns that this proposal is going to have a negative impact on the local environment and on local traffic in the area. And therefore, I would urge you to not go ahead

with the planned Hinckley railfreight interchange. And I hope that when it gets to the Secretary of State for Transport, it's turned out thank you.

46:05

Thank you. And now ask Tim birtwhistle Please step forward.

46:19

Thank you and good morning. Mr. Timbre was a resident of the village of Barwell. As you know, I've made a number of verbal and written representations before this week of hearings and during this week of hearings, I don't intend to go over any of that again. Rather, I want to raise one issue under the heading of broadly visual immunity and one on strategic and overall thing on strategic need. And thank you for this opportunity. As an overall statement. I'd like to say that as a resident of Barnwell, I can say the people of Barwell until we extend Earl Sheldon Hinkley do not understand what this development will look like. They think it's a long way away. It's about a kilometre from the outskirts of the habitations I've mentioned and the applicants themselves consider those habitations to be quite a long way away. No one quite understands what you know, 120 250 meters high warehouses will look like and every time I try and visualize it, I try very hard to forget what I visualized. On the plans submitted by the applicant, there is one document that puts were all I think they call them visual receptors have been where they have considered landscape from the outside. Two of those have been Barwell and tour on the outskirts of Earl Shilton and I understand that the panel either has or will be visiting one of those viewpoints that being the junction of Red Hill drive and Sheldon Road in Barwell. The landscape as viewed from that viewpoint is of such local significance in historical significance that the fields immediately to the south of it have been covered, hunted and protected from any development which would interrupt the view of the people of Barwell, older towards Lutterworth just for emphasis the view at that point and from many other points you know, shields around Barwell is out of Burbidge common on the west stony stance and on the east and right the way over all the field villages and trees towards Lutterworth. from that viewpoint and from any other viewpoints or development of this size, well if I can keep it in relatively objective terms dominate the landscape and be the landscape. I was gonna say more but it's more subjective and emotive. And I've listened to comments from panel earlier in the week about statements like that. The point I'd like to make is I would like the people that are well, no children under the wider area to be more aware of what the visual aspects 30 seconds of this are. They are not and the applicant has not made people aware of it. Very briefly then on on the wider strategic need. I was bowled over as many were yesterday, by presentations on the applicants of the strategic needs of this development. I have a couple of questions from that, for the panel or perhaps wider for the applicant. Broadly if this is the only place for a facility in the whole of the Midlands, and there is such strategic need for it. Why do they need to build warehouses that will not have anything to do with rail freight? If it's going to be such a star in their portfolio, they should not need income from any other warehousing. Secondly, if it's so essential nationally, why are there no other developers sort of chomping at the bit to develop the same thing in the same place and if it is is so unique and this is the only place should it not be referred to the competitions and markets or authority. Thank you very much.

50:08

Thank you and I will ask Catherine bass stuff forward please.

50:26

Thank you, Catherine bass sounds thought sounds together. It's been a very interesting week so far and we've appreciated the opportunity to hear other interested parties talk about the proposed development and to hear the many different opinions, concerns and questions put forward to the applicant as well as their answers. Although at times, it does feel we come away with more questions than answers, we still feel we are lacking significant information, especially relating to the construction period, which in all the documentation deem is deemed as temporary. However, in reality, those living with it feel the phrase temporary is not appropriate for a period of around 10 years. Whilst the applicant has listed the working hours during construction is 7am to 7pm. Monday to Saturday, there is the possibility for additional startup and close downtime, which would then make it 6:30am to 8pm. Add to that the exceptions and the types of work that may take place outside of these hours, we could very well be experienced in 24 hour construction at various points of the construction phase. Should this occur, it would have an additional detrimental effects on those living locally. We already experienced overnight railworks annually. And on those occasions it's hard it's heard even at the very far end of the village. Despite asking both try attacks and Network Rail, we have still not been advised if this will be more frequent or not. Some of our questions and concerns may be due to the sheer amount of documentation and paperwork that the general public have to wade through to try and have an understanding of some of the technical technical items that everybody is talking about. For something that impacts is so much we have to fight to find every bit of information in a sea of reports and plans. However, what we do have is a community of people that feel very strongly about protecting our way of life in the village. And as such, we will try our best and do our best to represent ourselves throughout the process. Some of us may not have the technical know how in jargon, but we do have words with feelings behind them. And it can be very difficult to put again put together a case against the development based on technicalities and facts when our strongest case is coming from our local knowledge. We feel since the development was first proposed and throughout the application and examination process. The thing that has remained abundantly clear to us all is that it would have a devastating impact on the village of ELMS thought in almost every way. We wish we could be stood here today saying that we would welcome the opportunity to work with a developer to further discuss mitigation that could protect our way of life and village. However, we genuinely feel that there is no mitigation that can reduce that impact. And that the and it would have the village over that would have an impact on the village overall, and especially those that live in close proximity to the development. Thank you.

53:10

Thank you. Understand you wish to speak for three minutes anyway. And please don't repeat anything, Said.

53:22

Catherine bass resident of Bostock close. As a resident of Bostock close as well as sharing the concerns may inspire me and we met raised by many in recent days. I would also like to raise concerns that due to the location of the boundary of the DCI no mitigation is planned along the railroad track that sits behind Bostock place. It was discussed on Tuesday that the trains will be slowing well before they reach Boston up to a speed of 25 miles an hour. In order to enter the rail terminal at an even slower speed. At a length of 775 meters the time it will take each train to pass our area will increase and with

that we will see an increase in air pollution and noise. These trains will be operating day and night in addition to the passenger trains and that will continue to use the track. This will greatly impact our overall quality of life and our enjoyment of our homes and gardens. Myself and my neighbors are regularly required to clear the stream that runs across the back back of busstop close between the houses and the railroad track. As with heavy rainfall, the water level rises up to the back of the properties. We are concerned I am concerned that any changes in the watercourse upstream may have a critical impact on these water levels that Bostock close currently experiences Should this occur, our houses are at risk of flooding, and with recent flooding not only locally but in the wider area. It's a real fear that I will have to live with should this development. Go ahead. Thank you.

54:40

Thank you. We could no US David Harold, representing Stoney Stanton Action Group on this

55:03

Thank you. This is okay. Isn't it? So already on. Okay? So I represent the Stoney Stanton Action Group. And like ELMS thought but a little bit further away, Stanley Stanton will be developed by will be devastated by this development. But I have one main point coming from hearings that I've attended this week. Yesterday, we heard a very convincing subjective discussion about the marketing need a strong marketing need from the applicant. But I say given the unsolvable traffic problems that he and I would cause and the complete devastation of the raw nature of the area, which you've already heard heard about, wouldn't it be better to distribute the demand for freight we have been told about around the existing nearby RFIs such as East Midlands gateway, which nobody has told me that that can't be increased in size, and other gateways nearby. There's no nobody's mentioned trying to increase the capacity of nearby gateways to solve this problem, or to take up the demand. The other thing I would say, a different issue altogether, is during the consultation, we recognized lots of problems which have not been ignored by the applicant in Stoney Stanton and Sackett. And this is transport problems. And just in the as we will, we've seen that they've put some mitigations in Junction 38 was talked about which has no mitigations but traffic lights in Stoney Stanton traffic lights near to separate. These have not been consulted on I don't believe they're wanted. And we have no idea whether they will have a positive or negative impact whatsoever. And people are saying to me, what's this about traffic lights going to the people living in? The villages have got no idea. So the consultation about that has been absolutely appalling. That's all I've got to say. Thank you

57:20

so much. Wendy Furman, please, come forward.

57:34

I'll be very short and sweet. I'm a resident of Burbidge. I've lived here for 54 years. And as a member of public I do not feel I have been adequately consulted, or well informed with the developments with this proposal by tritec symmetry. I have tried to follow the developments closely but I found the online documents difficult to keep up to date with us there are so many they are lengthy, and some of the detail is vague or lacking. They're full of technical jargon that I do not understand. And information has not always been given on time. I couldn't find the construction traffic volumes for my road. In January 2020 22, I attended the public consultations at Stoney Stanton and Burbidge, both of which were



shambolic for reasons I have already referenced to my local MP Luke cabins. And in my first written representation, myself and others I spoke with came away from these consultations, dismayed, disillusioned totally dissolved, disheartened, believing the process merely a tick box exercise and already done deal. On this issue alone. The process should be most efficient and flawed and should therefore be rejected. I came to Tuesday's hearing here, and I still left poorly informed because there were so many unanswered questions. I and many local people believe try to assymetry are pushing this development through in an underhand way, using the pretense of building a rail hub to actually build huge warehouses. On Tuesdays public hearing, I tried tax Bozeman stated that the warehouses will be in use before completion of the rail terminal OSER only there is the need for flexibility. Why that utterly contradicts the whole purpose of the strategy to get freight off the road and onto the rail. What if for example, they do not build what the warehouse they do build the warehouses and then a few years on, decide it's not financially viable to complete the rail hub. Think HS two, not a single thing should go into a warehouse until a rail hub is operational. I do not believe a rail hub will survive. It will fizzle out as it will be too expensive to use and run and as a result we will be left with yet another catastrophic and ugly blot on our beautiful countryside. I have no objection to get in freight of 30 seconds. But if this proposal is permitted, it will bring untold misery for the local people. The high levels of pollution and traffic chaos will create immense distress. A rail freight terminal should not be built close to residential areas. This is the wrong area. On these grounds. I urge you the examining authority to reject this proposal in its entirety. Thank you.

1:00:31

Thank you. Now we have Mr. Eddie log who I go that is online.

1:00:44

Right, can you see me? Yes. My name is Eddie Larkin, have been a resident of cross for 51 years. And I think this rail freight terminal is totally in the wrong place. It's not on the main railway line. It's going to have a devastating impact effect on the traffic round the villages, as I've experienced over the last 51 years, it's increased tremendously. I think. I think it's a speckled trip. Proposal up will affect all of this area for years to come. Although railway terminals or main railway lines, I think it's because Quebec could be extended when electric power station is demolished. That's all I've got to say.

1:01:44

Thank you very much. Could now move on to an Ask Malcolm Lee pleased to come forward?

1:02:09

Morning, I am a resident of ELMS thought for 30 plus years. And the fundamental concern I have is basically their proposals. Right require the loss of 187 hectares of farmland and rural businesses. On the applicants own surveys of the area, it proved is well used by both people and wildlife. I can count seven footpaths and bridleways total in two and a half miles of walking facility that give both access and circular extensions to people's exercise on Burbidge common. It's been a very unofficial system for many years that Burbidge common for people who are either jogging dog or dog walking, or other activities. It seemed formal that verbiage common links out with those footpaths. Other people will have raised the access to and fro. And as you've heard this morning, a lot of people rate that as an important part of the local facilities. The area announced thought was being carefully conserved by local planning



restrictions over many years, certainly my 30 years, probably 50 years. Again, that's been perhaps a non formal agreement been frustrating to us individually on development. But to its credit and Blaby counsel know more about this, to its credit, it is preserved the area and with hankley dealing with the common it's linked up that we've then had a rural area bounded by the M 69. A 47. And Elton's thought roads. That restriction has been balanced by the growth elsewhere in Leicestershire, as you've heard some of it on brownfield bits as well aerodrome became became the original magnet park, but that has subsequently swallowed up farmland as it has expanded. Further north Barden Coleville has us the second has us old coal mines lines. So that's brown fields through do need regeneration probably in the center of Leicester, which is also where the better rail line facilities are with the old British Rail sidings. Finally, noise and ELMS Thorpe East Midlands gateway did have further noise analysis, including wind borne analysis. And I would suggest a Windborne analysis would be essential when LM stop is so close to the proposed rail freight on the outside of the site, not on the inside. Thank you.

1:05:49

Thank you could ask David more, please come forward to the desk?

1:06:10

I am Dr. David Moore and I am an interested party. I'm a chartered engineer and a fellow of the institution of mechanical engineers. I submitted a 38 page written representation on the 10th of October in respect of trade taxes, noise and vibration report. The approach and questions from the examining authority I heard yesterday strongly suggest that nobody with an acoustic background is properly understood either track access report or my written representation. In view of this, I'm concentrating here on just one of trike axis failings, which in itself is great enough to wash away all of the latter part of triplex is report and results. The areas I'm talking about here are of the order of 15 to 20 DB, which is a game changer. Much of Traxxas report depends upon the values of the existing noise levels at the noise sensitive receptors or NSRS. There are two key parameters here called background noise and ambient noise. TRAGICS report first gathers noise data at six noise monitoring positions or NNPS position besides the rail track or the road, and from which it derives those same two key parameters of background noise and ambient noise. Of course, these values are local to the track or road. Let's talk track here, try takes them apply both of these values directly to the NSR Rs. Now, for the background noise, this is an accepted thing to do. But for the ambient noise It is certainly not the accepted thing to do. And in fact, it is gravely wrong. This is because an attenuation must be applied to reflect that the NSR is further away from the track the noise monitoring position where the local measurement was made. Three of these NSRS for example, are located at approximately 430 meters away from the track. So an attenuation of 16 dB decibels needs to be applied. So the ambient noise attributed by tri Tex to those NSR Rs of 59.2 DB should in fact be 43.2 DB. This method methodological error percolates down through the remainder of trade taxes report, and in fact, would inevitably grow in dB stature because of the effect upon the rating values as a secondary are subsequently applied. So, a new noise report, I beseech you in the strongest possible terms, get try taxes report and my written representation in front of somebody with a strong technical acoustics background. Now will will be best while there is still time for Thai tax and interested parties to respond. And the proposed development is not yet built. I have only a three minute window and so who described only one thing. Thank you.

1:09:26

Okay, thank you.

1:09:32

And, finally, William Moore.

1:09:46

I'm William David Moore. The examining authorities questions on noise yesterday indicated a lack of understanding of the most basic elements of the key issues I have raised. The examining authority asked the applicant some questions which clearly stemming from my written representation, but what I wrote somehow seemed to have been misunderstood. Examining authority didn't seem to appreciate the difference between background levels, la 90s, and ambient sound levels la tos. Indeed, the examining authority was speaking about attenuating background levels when nobody had suggested that, and there's no reason for that to happen. As a result, points that I had made came to almost naught, and my most important point was lost altogether as I shall now describe. The noise and vibration report arrives at existing ambient noise levels at an SRS, which can only be correct if trains are passing immediately outside the front door of each NSR. But of course, they are not, and those existing ambient sound levels in the noise and vibration report are wrong. In fact, the median distance between each local NSR and the railway line is approximately 330 meters. I pointed this out in my written representation, received back from the applicant only that the noise survey method statement was submitted to and agree back baby District Council and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, you will understand that this response represents only a procedural justification and provides no form of technical justification whatsoever. I had hoped that assuming the examining authority had read my written representation, they will look they would understand not only the points I had made, but also that I'd have received no meaningful reply. Indeed, that being the case, the examining authority was my only hope to affect any change at all. However, we've reached a point in the process where something has to be done, because the applicants behavior in this area is wrong. And the view of what failed to happen yesterday, there's no sign it will be put right. The applicant won't accept they have done anything wrong. And the examining authorities questions yesterday, indicate the authority presently does not understand noise terminology, or the issues surrounding the noise report. With the applicant not making any changes, the only agent for change is the examining authority themselves. Over to you. Thank you.

1:12:33

Yeah, a delete request by Councillor Richardson from the county council.

1:12:39

Although on this case, he's mister, you're talking in a private capacity.

1:12:54

Thankfully, I knew there was a way forward. Just to remind you three minutes, so I will be extremely brief. I have sat here for the last three days for almost every minute of these. And when I wasn't here, I was watching online. And the bit I'd like to highlight is that this project has now been going on for some five or six years. And over the last three days, I think 50% of the questions and I haven't kept an accurate record, but probably at least that directed to the applicant have not been answered, or you've

got back is that you will get written information in due course, indeed, the discussion on the economy, nobody spends upwards of half a billion pound on a project without any idea of who's going to use it, etc. So soft marketing is not what happens in these. I spent 42 years working for a major bank. And I can tell you, that's not what happens on these areas. So we have heard from everybody, we've heard excellent presentations about the lack of information. So I know that you said right at the start, you can request the applicants come back on this. So my question is quite simply our would the applicant like to explain why after five years, they don't have the appropriate information or a very large amount of it? And would they like to do the right thing and withdraw this application to save time, effort and the huge cost of the public purse? Thank you.

1:14:20

Yeah, thank you. So that concludes the oral submissions.

1:14:27

We just checked there's nobody else who wishes to speak. Just 100 Last chance as it were. Thank you.

1:14:36

We move under agenda item five. As indicated earlier, we will now give the applicant the opportunity to respond if it wishes to

1:14:49

thank you Peter Frampton for Hampton town planning for the applicant. The applicant will consider the contributions made this morning and whether further response ances in writing should be made by deadline three. Clearly many of the matters raised including those by the local members of parliament have been discussed in this examination during this week. And further written submissions are to be made by deadline three, which is the 14th of November, Councillor Stewart, Bray said that he could see very little benefit from this scheme. The applicant is willing to provide a consolidated note drawn from the application document by deadline, three of the applicants consideration of the local benefits of HN RFI, if that would be helpful to the examining authority. Thank you.

1:15:49

Mr. Hampton. I think that would be I think it would also be useful if you could pull together a register of environmental actions and commitments throughout all the forests as the only outputs from the environmental statement in a single document there that's often provided to examining authorities and brings a set of a one stop shop for where although all those environment quip and some bade I was going to we were going to be asking for it in a in a written questions. So if I say that now it probably at facilitated speed can I put it like that?

1:16:23

Most certainly you cancer and it will be done.

1:16:30

Thank you. So thank you, everyone for your contributions today. If you wish to follow up and you think you have said for example, if you read a script and wish us to have that then please let us have that by deadline three, which is the 14th of November 2023. Just to say thank you again. There will be a compulsory acquisition hearing this afternoon, commencing at 2pm This morning's unwell hearing is now closed. Thank you