

From: [francis.gent](#)
To: [Hinckley SRFI](#)
Subject: HNRFI - Land drainage matters
Date: 13 November 2023 19:34:44

Dear Sirs

We have previously submitted the attached representations under identification number 20040268. Since our earlier submission, we have now had a discussion with BWB, the Applicant's Drainage Consultants, regarding our concerns about how the drainage of the site would operate in practice and in particular how the outflow from the site onto our fields would be managed in the long term.

BWB advised that matters relating to the long term management of the drainage system for the site should be included in the Section 106 Agreement.

We note from the Examination timetable that the draft Section 106 has not yet been submitted. We would request that the Planning Inspectors are made aware of our concerns as there doesn't appear to be any other mechanism to ensure that the Section 106 Agreement deals with securing the long term management of the drainage from the site.

Yours faithfully

F & J Gent

REPRESENTATIONS FROM F & J GENT FARMERS

We own and farm land at [REDACTED], which immediately adjoins the application site.

Our land falls within the area identified as Land West of Stoney Stanton, in respect of which we understand Shoosmiths Solicitors are submitting representations on behalf of a consortium of land promoters.

Our representations are submitted in addition to the observations or representations put forward by Shoosmiths Solicitors and/or the Consortium, and should be read as supplementary comments to those of the Consortium parties.

We are writing to express our significant concern regarding other aspects of the application, in the following respects:

1. Drainage

Having previously experienced large scale engineering project when the M69 was built across our land, we have serious concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on our fields to the east of the M69, and the outflow from the site onto our fields to the west of the M69. Some of our land to the east of the M69 drains under the M69 into the same watercourse that it is proposed to use for the drainage of the site.

We make no comment on the hydrology work undertaken by HNRFI's consultants, BWB Consulting, as we are not experts in hydrology. However, there does not seem to be much detail about ongoing operation and maintenance plans for the subterranean tanks or the attenuation lakes. As a result, it is difficult for us to determine whether the proposals contained in the application are adequate to protect our land or not. We requested further information from the Applicant in April 2022 but so far none has been forthcoming.

We are extremely concerned that insufficient information has been made available regarding how the Applicant intends to monitor and maintain the scheme that their hydrologist has drawn up. Experience of construction of the M69 showed that what might seem to be a small error on their part, had extensive impact on the productivity of our land, and we do not wish to see this being repeated with proposed HNRFI development.

2. Closure of gated level crossings to the east of the site serving U17 & T89 Rights of Way

We understand that the Applicant is proposing to close the gated level crossings for two rights of way that are not immediately adjoining your site, and in the case of the U17 footpath, this is some distance from their site. In both cases, the Applicant is proposing diversions.

We are concerned about U17 as this footpath crosses our land and is very well used. We confirm that we were approached by the Applicant with a proposal to divert the footpath at the level crossing westwards along the railway line, crossing the access bridge to Thorney Fields Farm, and then eastwards back to the point of the level crossing.

We consider this to be unsatisfactory, and request as part of any conditions to a Consent Order that a footbridge should be provided as part of the scheme over the railway to replace the level crossing because:

- people will climb over the fence and continue to cross over the railway tracks rather than using a lengthy diversion
- it will encourage people to use the metalled access drive owned partially by ourselves. This drive is used by ourselves and others as access for farm machinery. It is narrow and not designed for people on foot as well as agricultural machinery, thereby creating a safety risk
- we consider that the cost of a new footbridge will be insignificant in terms of the overall construction costs, and will provide a much safer solution than the Applicant's current proposals which involve putting pedestrians across a narrow high sided bridge which is the only vehicular access to Thorney Fields Farm.

3. Traffic

We have other concerns regarding additional generation of traffic in the neighbourhood and the landscape impact of the scheme, but these will be addressed by other objections that you receive.