

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Development Consent Order

Project reference TR050007

Applicant's response to HBBC and BDC deadline 3 submission on design matters

Document reference: 18.14

Revision: 01

9 January 2024

Planning Act 2008

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

Applicant response to the Blaby District Council (IP Ref. 20040018) joint response with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (IP ref.20039546) on design matters of the HNRFI DCO Examination (ref. TR05007) issued at Deadline 3 – November 14, 2023.

December 2023 v.1

General Response.

It is clear from the council's commentary that they do not fully appreciate the landscape and green infrastructure proposals that form a part of the application. That may be a result of information being split across a number of documents – the Landscape ES Chapter including Appendices noting in particular the Baseline Assessment and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Illustrative Landscape Strategy, Design and Access Statement, Design Code and LEMP.

There also appears to be some confusion around the role of the Parameters Plan and illustrative Plans in the application. The applicant is bound by the Parameters Plan but must deliver proposals broadly as set out in the illustrate landscape strategy as this is what the mitigation and assessment process is based on including the delivery of the 10% gain in biodiversity. Those plans are described as illustrative as some of the details may change; for example, the units may be aligned or configured differently to suit specific occupiers, car parking requirements may change or railport design altered to suit technology advances. However, the principles of the design as set out must still deliver public access routes, green infrastructure, landscape and visual amenity and mitigation and ecological mitigation including as much biodiversity as possible within the boundaries of the site. Furthermore, it is the local authorities who will be discharging the requirements and can ensure the original aspirations and commitments made are upheld at the detailed stage.

It is noted that the majority of the comments made in the Design Matters Response by the councils address the same three issues but described in different ways. A summary of the applicants key responses to these is set out below:

1. General Design Approach

By necessity for a scheme of this nature, no one discipline has led the design approach per se. A number of different factors have been key at different stages including rail requirements, operational requirements and landscape and ecological factors. A practical approach has been taken that goes beyond the boundaries of the site, recognising that the best practicable environmental option at a district or national level is to maximise the development potential of this site and avoid the potential need for further greenfield site use beyond the well contained boundaries of the current DCO. Therefore, while the traditional aspects of a 'landscape' led approach on a smaller scale mixed use development' are not central to this design, a different set of landscape benefits have been considered and taken into account including creation of 22ha of publicly accessible green space and a well contained scheme which minimises its impact on the wider landscape for the scale of logistics benefits it can deliver. Moreover, it should be noted that green and blue infrastructure account for 28% of the Main HNRFI and A47 Link Corridor area which, at over a quarter of the total area,

demonstrates the extent to which landscape and ecology have been a central part of the design development process. Also of note, whilst the parameter plan shows a central development area without green space to avoid creating additional constraints, a significant part of the area will constitute green and blue infrastructure with attenuation basins, structural planting, amenity areas, tree lined streets and green corridors all forming a part of the 'pink' zone'.

As many landscape and ecological features have been retained as is possible within the constraints of delivering an SNRFI, to defined parameters within a defined area whilst ensuring the necessary flexibility to ensure the development meets the needs of future occupiers. This is a clear approach which has remained constant throughout the application process. The design needs to be considered in the context of an SRFI and what is realistic for a development of that scale. There is not an option to deliver a smaller scale business park or mixed use scheme which can readily incorporate most key landscape features and respond to local character in terms of scale.

2. Loss of existing landscape features/consideration of landscape character

The local authorities are focussing on the features that are to be removed within the main development site but it must be noted that the many landscape and ecological features within the DCO boundary are to be retained. For example, of the 872 arboricultural features (individual trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows) surveyed, 312 are to be lost or partially lost. However, this leaves the majority – 540 features retained within the DCO boundary. As a result of the central nature of the features to be lost, a misconception has developed that the applicant has not respected the existing vegetation and features on site. That is not the case. Whilst the nature of the scheme does require the loss of more features than other types of development, the proposals have retained as many of the existing features as possible. Further, the proposals respect existing vegetation patterns in so far as they replicate the existing vegetation within the local area. For example, wet woodland and grassland alongside stream courses to respect the existing character in lower lying areas within Elmesthorpe Floodplain Landscape Character Area; woodland copses, scrub and meadow grassland to reflect the vegetation in the Country Park; and copses, ponds and hedgerows which are characteristic of the broader countryside of the Aston Flamville Wooded Farmland LCA and Stoney Stanton Rolling Farmland LCA. A summary of proposals that accord with the Landscape Character Area Opportunities and Guidelines is contained below:

- Provision of 22ha of new accessible green space;
- New hedge planting which will be managed with traditional 'Midlands-style' hedge laying to improve structure and biodiversity;
- Planting trees of appropriate size and species within open ground and hedgerows with opportunity to grow large spreading canopies and be the veteran trees of the future;
- Planting wet woodlands in lower lying ground to extend this local habitat type;
- Establishing a SuDs scheme to manage run-off and any pollutants from the development;

- Establishing new areas of meadow grassland; and
- Establishing new areas of woodland.

3. Detailed Design Matters

The local authority are looking for more detail and ‘certainty’ on a number of design matters. As noted above, this will be delivered at the requirements stage but in the meantime, the applicant is conscious that some of the detail that currently exists within the application is spread between documents and may not be fully appreciated by the councils. We have therefore prepared a more comprehensive Landscape Strategy Section within the DAS that pulls all of these strands together for ease of understanding and added some further detail to the Design Code Document that may assist the examining authority.

Remarks on Executive Summary

It is considered unfortunate, that Land Use Consultants Limited still feel that the updated Design Code, statements, and clarifications, put forward in the initial response, have not, in their view, yet been deemed acceptable in landscape design terms based upon their own review of the scheme.

It is not the case, that the Applicant has not taken onboard the comments made in the initial review in the manner in which they have been purported to have been made, but moreover the initial response set out to explain how, in the very specific case of an SRFI, the appraisal of the scheme against the ten characteristics of a ‘well designed place’ is a different process to that, of say, a residential scheme, which, as previously established, the National Design Guide is focussed upon.

The Applicant is committed to delivering a well-designed scheme, that seeks to respond in a positive manner to the existing landscape context, but it does need to be appreciated, that in the provision of an SRFI scheme, there are limitations, and this is recognised in NPS-NN, paragraph 4.30:

‘It is acknowledged however that, given the nature of much national infrastructure development, particularly SRFIs, there may be a limit on the extent to which it can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area.’

Response on Points raised as Issue specific Hearing 03 – Environmental Matters - November 1, 2023

Loss of Veteran Tree	
Points 1 & 2.	LUC’s commitment to their original standpoint on the Veteran Tree is acknowledged and the NPS-NN requirement fully understood, as is the need to demonstrate that its loss is unavoidable .
Points 3 & 4.	Reviews of the previous iterations of the masterplan, place the Veteran Tree in the centre of a parking area or within the estate road, and to retain the tree would not just require a reworking of the plan in a top down two dimensional way, but also

	<p>require retention and protection of its current natural habitat for a minimum of 15 times the diameter of the tree, including the levels and hydrological conditions to maintain the condition of the tree. This also, only pertains to the final state environment, with further construction and design restrictions going beyond these bounds.</p> <p>It is appreciated that the technical points surrounding the scheme have been understood, but just as important is the understanding that this isn't a scheme where the final detailed design is known, and the masterplans were produced to 'illustratively' show what the development could look like and hence why is a parameter led application.</p> <p>As was stated in the hearing, the retention of the Veteran Tree and further changes in the number and location of plateaus within the development zones would not allow the Applicant to satisfactorily respond to all occupier enquiries in a way that would not affect the operation, functionality, or safety.</p>
Point 5.	<p>Tree planting details will be provided as part of Requirement 22. The LEMP set out the tree species mixes and management for new planting. As noted in the LEMP and would be usual, woodland mixes will be planted as whips for the greatest chance of sound establishment. The masterplan while illustrative, is guided by the parameter plan which sets the area requirements for landscape proposals. The landscape and visual assessment is based on the mitigation as set out in the parameter plan and detailed in the illustrative landscape strategy. Whilst the exact locations may vary at the detailed stage depending on the configuration of the layout, the overall quantity and nature of planting is required to be broadly as described in the illustrative landscape strategy as that is the embedded mitigation that is relied upon for the assessment and the ultimate success of the scheme.</p>
Sense of Place	
Points 6 & 7.	<p>The current landscape character has not been disregarded, the Statements of Environmental Opportunity within NCA94 – Leicestershire Vales and the Landscape Guidelines associated with the relevant district Landscape Character Areas have been taken into account in the proposals and a number of aspects incorporated into the planting proposals in particular.</p> <p>However, as is recognised within the NPS-NN <i>'it may be that countryside locations are required for SRFIs'</i>. (NPS-NN paragraph 2.56) and as previously referenced; <i>'It is acknowledged however that, given the nature of much national infrastructure development, particularly SRFIs, there may be a limit on the extent to which it can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area.'</i> (NPS-NN, paragraph 4.30) and it needs to be recognised that an SRFI will be quite distinct from the pattern of nearby villages in terms of scale and design.</p> <p>The proposals that have been put forward, follow a detailed study that was undertaken, to establish the architectural typology within the locality, especially those of comparative use, to ensure that the proposals put forward for HNRFI are of the highest standard and appropriateness.</p> <p>The proposed building design is the result of years of evolutionary development work with the Applicant, that has culminated in a form, design, and application of material, that can respond to the location, environment, constraints, and occupiers' operational requirements in a positive way, as well as providing an aesthetic that can</p>

	<p>establish and create its own sense of place without replicating other surrounding logistic / industrial developments.</p> <p>Whilst the buildings will follow the same aesthetic theme, this does not dictate a monotonous design, the buildings will change in scale, mass and orientation as well as having constant active frontages and key focal points provided by the office locations. In addition, each will be set in their own landscaped environment, and accessed via a seasonally changing avenue and streetscape.</p> <p>By creating a clear distinction between the main HNRFI site and the surrounding publicly accessible areas, it allows for the necessary larger form and scale of buildings to be accommodated in a considered manner, appropriate to their function and operation, alongside the more ‘human-scale’ components of the development such as the landscaped green corridors of the new bridleway and the extension to Burbage Common and Woods.</p> <p>This simplicity, means that visitors to the site can make clear directional choices in terms of either entering the main HNRFI site to their place of work, or along defined routing and pathways laid out for walking, cycling or horse riding. Signage will be provided for information purposes, guidance and safe navigation, but as with all developments, familiarity for repeat visitors will render this unnecessary.</p> <p>Reasoning has already been provided, as to why the veteran tree and other landscape features cannot be retained in order to deliver an SRFI in this location.</p> <p>The illustrative landscape strategy sets out how the creation of new landscaped areas will tie the development into the existing area with new woodland, scrub and grassland linking to surrounding habitats.</p>
Wayfinding within the development and hierarchy	
Point 8.	<p>To clarify, this statement was made in the context of the examples set out within the NDG, which as already stated, is at its core, a document for residential development. The response went on to state how the principal infrastructure proposed for the development does display the characteristics of street hierarchy, and the Design Code (Ref 13.1A) identifies the differences between the A47 Link Road proposals and the internal estate roads. Importantly, it also recognises that these must fundamentally provide appropriate and safe ways and means for access by all means to their destination.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how, when purposefully, the number of access points and nodes along the A47 Link Road are limited, how this can be seen as anything other than making wayfinding as easy as possible for users, and as mentioned above, familiarity for repeat users will render the signage provision unnecessary.</p>
Point 9.	The detail requested will come forward pursuant to the Requirements, notably Requirement 4 ‘Detailed Design Approval’
Point 10.	See point 8.
Use of Materials and Architectural Style	
No point reference against this heading.	Reference has already been made, and recognised by LUC within their response, as to how the introduction of an SRFI within a countryside setting has its limitations, especially in terms of how it can respond to a local vernacular or context.

	<p>The suggestions made, and the Applicant understands the thought and reasoning that went into them, were not dismissed out of hand, and due consideration was given to them in the prepared response, and the reasoning why these weren't adopted in this instance explained in detail.</p> <p>The Applicant has confidence in the architectural style and how the palette of materials, and the application of them, that breaks down the mass of the building both horizontally and vertically, provides the best and most appropriate response in this setting, especially when utilised in conjunction with the illustrative landscaping proposals.</p> <p>It is true that AJA Architects have made use of other materials in their designs for other developments, as any Practice would for specific commissions, but not in their work on other SRFI's or large-scale logistics parks, and therefore the comment is misleading in this context.</p> <p>Where appropriate, within the landscape settings and smaller architectural elements, the use of local materials is not dismissed and this can be captured as part of Requirement 4 'Detailed Design Approval'.</p> <p>The use of graduated cladding was not ignored, but its application on large scale distribution units, because of its 'block on block' application draws the eye to the mass of the building in a horizontal way, and the use of colour, whether it be blue as suggested or another, because of the limitations of the colour palettes available always looks foreign in a landscape setting, something that is very evident at the development at Magna Park. Similarly, given the proximity of Magna Park to the site, if HNRFI is to have its own identity, this is something to avoid.</p> <p>The point made on the undulating roofline, was made against the suggestion that consideration could be given to a continuous parapeted eaves design, and in that context it is a more natural form that a straight line, and far from being monotonous, when applied to buildings of differing scale and form, provides change and interest, whereas buildings with a continuous parapet have a tendency to blur and be read as one mass.</p>
Detail within the Design Code	
Points 11,12 and 13.	<p>The Design Code (Ref 13.1A) has been updated again with greater detail and information and will form part of the Deadline 4 submission documents.</p> <p>It is worth reiteration that the Design Code and Illustrative Masterplan (ref 2.8A) have been submitted having regard to the National Design Guide proportionate to the decision taking for this DCO, and that additional detail will come forward pursuant to Requirements 4 (Detailed Design Approval).</p>

Comments on Applicants response to Deadline 2 and written representations

(a) LUC Comment on the Applicants amendments to the Design Code

Point 16.	Noted, no further comment.
Point 17.	It is submitted, that explanation of how this has been applied has been detailed, not only within the document, but also by the other responses that have been made in the original response at Deadline 2, the ISH and this further response.
Point 20.	The local authorities are focussing on the features that are to be removed within the main development site but it must be noted that the many landscape and

	<p>ecological features within the DCO boundary are to be retained. For example of the 872 arboricultural features (individual trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows) surveyed, 312 are to be lost or partially lost. However, this leaves the majority – 540 features retained within the DCO boundary. As a result of the central nature of the features to be lost, a misconception has developed that the applicant has not respected the existing vegetation and features on site. That is not the case. Whilst the nature of the scheme does require the loss of more features than other types of development, the proposals have retained as many of the existing features as possible. Further, the proposals respect existing vegetation patterns in so far as they replicate the existing vegetation within the local area. For example, wet woodland and grassland alongside stream courses to respect the existing character in lower lying areas within Elmesthorpe Floodplain Landscape Character Area; woodland copses, scrub and meadow grassland to reflect the vegetation in the Country Park; and copses, ponds and hedgerows which are characteristic of the broader countryside of the Aston Flamville Wooded Farmland LCA and Stoney Stanton Rolling Farmland LCA.</p>
<p>Points 21,22,23,27,28,29.</p>	<p>Whilst the nature of the scheme is such that it has not been possible to retain all features of landscape and ecological interest, as the landscape strategy illustrates, many features are being retained and a considerable network of new habitats and landscape features will be created which will provide a richer natural environment in and around the site. There has been no simplification of design proposals, the proposals remain as they were at the application stage and as set out in the illustrative landscape strategy.</p>
<p>Point 32.</p>	<p>The point made previously, was that the parameters plan did not seem to show the same evolutionary process as the illustrative masterplan did, however this is not the case, and the Parameters Plan did indeed keep in step with the evolution of scheme.</p>
<p>Point 33.</p>	<p>An SRFI requires a uniformity within which the Railport, serving infrastructure and development plots can be laid out within. Notwithstanding the larger scale that an SRFI dictates, and as was noted at the ISH, only smaller, non rail served developments, could seek to achieve this.</p>
<p>Point 36.</p>	<p>This point is not correct, and none of the previous iterations of the masterplan retained the veteran tree.</p>
<p>Point 37.</p>	<p>As has been previously stated, multiple plateaus, when the detail of the development is not yet known, would not allow the Applicant to satisfactorily respond to all occupier enquiries in a way that would not affect the operation, functionality, or safety.</p>
<p>Point 41.</p>	<p>Applications to achieve a BREEAM Excellent rating, will be made, specific to the individual developments, as this is how the process is designed to be, with the rating being attributable to a specific building. The detail of any application, will be subject to the characteristics of that development, but will, where appropriate make reference to elements outside of the individual developments demise, e.g. the provision of bus facilities. The Design Code will be reviewed to provide greater clarity.</p>

Point 42.	<p>The landscape proposals as set out within the illustrative scheme are subject to the rigour of the biodiversity net gain process which has ensured that all opportunities to maximise biodiversity within the DCO boundary have been explored alongside the natural landscape design development process of seeking to introduce and enhance characteristic landscape features within the local landscape.</p>
Point 46,47.48	<p>The local authorities are focussing on the features that are to be removed within the main development site but it must be noted that the many landscape and ecological features within the DCO boundary are to be retained. For example of the 872 arboricultural features (individual trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows) surveyed, 312 are to be lost or partially lost. However, this leaves the majority – 540 features retained within the DCO boundary. As a result of the central nature of the features to be lost, a misconception has developed that the applicant has not respected the existing vegetation and features on site. That is not the case. Whilst the nature of the scheme does require the loss of more features than other types of development, the proposals have retained as many of the existing features as possible. Further, the proposals respect existing vegetation patterns in so far as they replicate the existing vegetation within the local area. For example, wet woodland and grassland alongside stream courses to respect the existing character in lower lying areas within Elmesthorpe Floodplain Landscape Character Area; woodland copses, scrub and meadow grassland to reflect the vegetation in the Country Park; and copses, ponds and hedgerows which are characteristic of the broader countryside of the Aston Flamville Wooded Farmland LCA and Stoney Stanton Rolling Farmland LCA.</p>
Point 48.	<p>As many landscape and ecological features have been retained as is possible within the constraints of delivering an SNRFI, to defined parameters within a defined area whilst ensuring the necessary flexibility to ensure the development meets the needs of future occupiers. This is a clear approach which has remained constant throughout the application process.</p>
Point 60.	<p>Noted, no further comment.</p>
Point 61.	<p>Further details are provided in the updated DAS /Design Code</p>
Point 62.	<p>The point is noted, but this needs to be reviewed in the context of an SRFI and what is realistic for a development of that scale. There is not an option to deliver a small-scale business park or mixed-use scheme which can readily incorporate most key landscape features and respond to local character in terms of scale.</p>

Point 63.	The A47 link lies to the north of the Country Park and does not sever it. The option remains to increase the verge between the carriageway and the footway and provide increased segregation at the detailed design stage.
Point 64.	To be checked with BWB.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 67	The local authority appear to misunderstand the application when making these comments. The applicant is bound by the parameters plan, the proposals as set out in the illustrate landscape strategy, the embedded mitigation, the biodiversity net gain requirements and all of the requirements of the DCO. The changes to the wording of the design code submitted at Deadline 2 have been taken out of context and not in the spirit of which they were intended. The approach to the application remains the same. For the avoidance of doubt a landscape strategy document has been prepared which draws together all of the key landscape information in one place to ensure all aspects of the landscape character approach, landscape features retention, landscape proposals and management approach is fully understood.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 71.	The well being areas are captured within the design code (section 12.11), and the precise detail would be part of the Requirement 4 (Detailed Design Approval). The statement is correct in that the public routing, for those that are not visitors or employees of the main HNRFI, is not along the internal estate roads, and this is clear from both the illustrative masterplan, parameters plan, and PROW plans, with the routing being set out around the main development area. However, use of the footpaths and cycleways within the main development area is not precluded by the public should they so wish to use them.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 73.	As above, the changes to the wording of the design code submitted at Deadline 2 have been taken out of context and not in the spirit of which they were intended. The approach to the application remains the same. For the avoidance of doubt a landscape strategy document has been prepared which draws together all of the key landscape information in one place to ensure all aspects of the landscape character approach, landscape features retention, landscape proposals and management approach is fully understood.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 75.	It will be the local authorities who discharge the requirements of the DCO and will therefore be in a position to ensure adequate and expected details appear within the detailed landscape scheme in broad accordance with the illustrative scheme which formed the basis of the assessment. Species mixes are detailed in the LEMP and DAS submitted with the application.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 77.	There is a clear PRoW Strategy that has been discussed and agreed with the councils and there is no apparent confusion beyond the wording of this design response document. Permissive footpath and cycle routes offer direct access through the development for those who desire it, noting this will require multiple road crossings. A new offroad bridleway is proposed around the perimeter of the site within a broad green corridor with one signalised road crossing.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 80.	Text changes have been taken out of context, noting the species mix lists are within the LEMP and DAS and incorporate a variety of species of local importance and landscape character is promoted through a range of different proposals including

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of new accessible green space; • New hedge planting which will be managed with traditional ‘Midlands-style’ hedge laying to improve structure and biodiversity; • Planting trees of appropriate size and species within open ground and hedgerows with opportunity to grow large spreading canopies and be the veteran trees of the future; • Planting wet woodlands in lower lying ground to extend this local habitat type; • Establishing a SuDs scheme to manage run-off and any pollutants from the development; • Establishing new areas of meadow grassland; and • Establishing new areas of woodland.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 83.	This comment has been addressed in the previous notes under the heading of Use of Material and Architectural Style.
No specific point reference, but taken from note 85.	It is not a case of strengthening the Tritax brand, but moreover, that the Applicant has developed a form that meets the needs, and can be adapted to suit the widest range of occupiers, a material application that works well in breaking up the visual mass and scale of the buildings, and through the use of a range of monotone hues, works far better as a backdrop to a considered landscaping scheme than an introduction of colours, that in reality to align to the natural environment.

(b) LUC Comment on the Applicants response to Local Impact Report – LUC’s Landscape Design Review

Point 89.	The points are noted, however the response was to merely note that the detail contained within the review couldn’t be appraised or assimilated prior to its issue.
Point 90.	The note is not an acceptance of deficiencies, but an observation on timing and how the application couldn’t address the detailed points prior to its issue.
Points 93,94 and 95	It is accepted that the changes incorporated into the Design Code at Deadline 2 introduced a number of inconsistencies and misunderstandings. All documents have now been subject to a full review and wordings updated to reflect the applicants clear position with regard to design which has not changed.
Point 99.	The point is noted and agreed.

Point 100.	By way of clarification, is the note stating they believe that the NPS or NDG should carry the greater weighting? By way of confirmation, the Applicant isn't applying a greater or lesser degree of importance on either document, and that it believes that the application addresses both in an appropriate way.
Point 105.	Agreed
Point 106.	Agreed, and it is submitted, that in the context of the application for an SRFI and the absence of a known detail, that it provides this.
Point 107.	It is clear from the council's commentary that they do not fully understand or appreciate the landscape and green infrastructure proposals that form a part of the application. That may be a result of information being split across a number of documents – the Landscape ES Chapter including Appendices noting in particular the Baseline Assessment and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Illustrative Landscape Strategy, Design and Access Statement, Design Code and LEMP. To address this, an updated Landscape Strategy Section has been included in the DAS which draws all of the relevant aspects together in one place.
Points 111, 112 and 113.	This isn't a case of semantics, but that the use of function or functionality is applied as a negative connotation in the review of the scheme, and that it shouldn't be seen as one of the key drivers for the basis of the development. It is agreed, that function should not be prioritised to the detriment of all other considerations, but it is a fundamental consideration in the planning of an SRFI.
Point 117.	The point misleads, as the Applicant doesn't state that it isn't successfully integrated, rather that because of its countryside location, it will be distinct from the neighbouring villages, by reason of it being an SRFI and capturing the characteristics of village design within it aren't appropriate.
Point 118.	The scale of the development zone is proportional to delivering a successful SRFI in this location.
Point 119.	The point has already been made in that for smaller developments and non-rail related schemes, it is possible to respond to the existing grain of the landscape, but not in the case of an SRFI, which requires the larger development plateaus for safe, functional, operational purposes.
Point 120.	Where appropriate, within the landscape settings and smaller architectural elements, the use of local materials is not dismissed and this can be captured as part of Requirement 4 'Detailed Design Approval'.
Point 123.	See point 118 and 119 above.

Point 124.	The scheme has been developed by a full team of professionals, experienced in developing schemes of this type throughout the UK, and is not the result of a single imposed vision.
Point 125.	By necessity for a scheme of this nature, no one discipline has led the design approach per se. A number of different factors have been key at different stages including rail requirements, operational requirements and landscape and ecological factors. A practical approach has been taken that goes beyond the boundaries of the site, recognising that the best practicable environmental option at a district or national level is to maximise the development potential of this site and avoid the potential need for further greenfield site use beyond the well contained boundaries of the current DCO. Therefore, while the traditional aspects of a 'landscape' led approach on a smaller scale mixed use development' are not central to this design, a different set of landscape benefits have been considered and taken into account including creation of 22ha of publicly accessible green space and a well contained scheme which minimises its impact on the wider landscape for the scale of logistics benefits it can deliver. Moreover, it should be noted that green and blue infrastructure account for 28% of the Main HNRFI and A47 Link Corridor area whjch, at over a quarter of the total area, demonstrates the extent to which landscape and ecology have been a central part of the design development process. Also of note, whilst the parameter plan shows a central development area without green space to avoid creating additional constraints, a significant part of the is area will constitute green and blue infrastrure with attenuation basins, structural planting, amenity areas, tree lined streets and green corridors all forming a part of the 'pink' zone'.
Point 128.	Not sure how the statement misleads when it just confirms that the Landscape Design Review comments have been responded to and in what way.
Point 129.	To confirm, all of the points were addressed in the initial response, and changes made in line with the response.
Point 132.	Noted
Point 133.	The response went into detail to explain, how, the proposals, in the context of an SRFI, has addressed the 10 characteristics of a well designed place.
Point 137.	Agreed
Point 138.	See responses above relating to species and landscape character.
Point 141	It is correct that the development will create its own sense of place, as this is inherent in the creation of a new SRFI in this location. It is not the case however, that the current and neighbouring characters have been disregarded, merely that replication of such character within the main HNRFI site is not appropriate to a well designed scheme of this type.

Point 142.	Clarification is sought on why it is believed that this goes against guidance, so that an appropriate response can be provided.
Point 143.	<p>By creating a clear distinction between the main HNRFI site and the surrounding publicly accessible areas, it allows for the necessary larger form and scale of buildings to be accommodated in a considered manner, appropriate to their function and operation, alongside the more 'human-scale' components of the development such as the landscaped green corridors of the new bridleway and the extension to Burbage Common and Woods.</p> <p>This simplicity, means that visitors to the site can make clear directional choices in terms of either entering the main HNRFI site to their place of work, or along defined routing and pathways laid out for walking, cycling or horse riding. Signage will be provided for information purposes, guidance and safe navigation, but as with all new developments, familiarity for repeat visitors will render this unnecessary.</p>
Point 144.	Many of the landscape features are being retained and new planting is designed to respond to local character. The nature of the development is such that a new 'sense of place' will be established which will draw on larger scale features such as woodlands, ponds and meadows.
Point 147.	This point has been addressed in our previous note on response on Points 8 and 9.
Points 148,149,150,151	These points have all been addressed in our previous response on Points 8 and 9.
Point 158.	Noted.
Point 159.	The applicant does not consider the planting scheme to be inadequate. Yes, there are some significant visual impacts but that is to be expected for a scheme of this nature. Notably they are contained within 1km of the site and the effects are relatively well contained.
Point 162 to 184	Comments repeats of previous comments which are addressed in matters above.
Point 187	Where appropriate, within the landscape settings and smaller architectural elements, the use of local materials is not dismissed and this can be captured as part of Requirement 4 'Detailed Design Approval'.
Points 188 & 189	It is not a case of imposing the Tritax brand, but moreover, that the Applicant has developed a form that meets the needs, and can be adapted to suit the widest range of occupiers, a material application that works well in breaking up the visual mass and scale of the buildings, and through the use of a range of monotone hues, works far better as a backdrop to a considered landscaping scheme than an introduction of colours, that in reality to align to the natural environment.
Point 192.	Noted

Point 193.	It is submitted, that in the context of the application for an SRFI and the absence of a known detail, that the level of detail provides sufficient information to inform and guide future submissions pursuant to Requirement 4 (Detailed Design Approval.)
Point 194.	This point has been addressed in our previous note on response on Point 118.
Point 197.	The SUDS and overall drainage strategy is a holistic site wide consideration, and it is only the detail of how it will be applied that will be undertaken on a plot by plot basis.
Point 198.	Reference to the provision of a SUDS compliant drainage scheme has been made within the Design Code within Section 5 – Sustainability.
Point 201.	Agreed.
Point 202.	<p>By creating a clear distinction between the main HNRFI site and the surrounding publicly accessible areas, it allows for the necessary larger form and scale of buildings to be accommodated in a considered manner, appropriate to their function and operation, alongside the more ‘human-scale’ components of the development such as the landscaped green corridors of the new bridleway and the extension to Burbage Common and Woods.</p> <p>Whilst the buildings will follow the same aesthetic theme, this does not dictate a monotonous design, the buildings will change in scale, mass and orientation as well as having constant active frontages and key focal points provided by the office locations. In addition, each will be set in their own landscaped environment, and accessed via a seasonally changing avenue and streetscape.</p> <p>This simplicity, means that visitors to the site can make clear directional choices in terms of either entering the main HNRFI site to their place of work, or along defined routing and pathways laid out for walking, cycling or horse riding. Signage will be provided for information purposes, guidance and safe navigation, but as with all developments, familiarity for repeat visitors will render this unnecessary.</p>
Points 207 and 208.	<p>To reiterate the previous response in respect of the loss of the veteran tree in this response:</p> <p><i>‘The HNRFI proposal, and the Parameters Plan that has been prepared, have defined the vertical parameters of the scheme based upon an engineering review and design that started with the rail element of the works and the connection to the existing Felixstowe to Nuneaton line. This has the least flexibility in terms of its vertical alignment and geometry, and therefore defined the levels for the Railport and the development sites where a direct rail connection can be attained. Once this parameter was set, the neighbouring areas then had to relate to these levels, and work with them in a complimentary manner in all three dimensions.</i></p> <p><i>The engineering design for the site, also took into account the need to tie into the existing levels around the perimeter of the site; have a scheme that worked on creating a cut/fill balance for the earthworks to avoid the need to remove material from site, whilst creating development plateaus that provide flexibility in the ultimate position of the boundaries of the individual development plots, and the location of the infrastructure that serves them.</i></p> <p><i>Also, and using the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ as a guide for the Parameters Plan given that all the details of the development are not yet confirmed, limits of deviation</i></p>

	<p><i>have also been set out within it, to allow for the movement of specific parameters to provide the required flexibility when responding to individual occupier enquiries. Within smaller scale developments, where smaller, non-rail connected, buildings are more appropriate, there is a greater ability to respond to the existing site levels. However, the requirements of an SRFI, with the provision of a rail terminal and larger building footprints, mean that significant level changes within the terminal itself or the buildings and their plots is not acceptable in order for them to operate effectively.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, Veteran Tree (T486) cannot be retained in its current location, and its loss is unavoidable if TSH is to deliver an SRFI scheme based upon the Parameters Plan, with the engineering of the site levels and the flexibility required within the development plateaus that has informed it.</i></p> <p><i>The dead wood from the felling of veteran T486 will be placed in the natural areas to benefit wildlife. Replacement woodland and tree planting across the development including large trees. The proposed mitigation strategy would provide significant additional tree planting, including approximately 20,000 new trees within woodland areas and approximately 600 individual trees as street trees and in amenity areas, as depicted in the Illustrative Landscape Strategy (document reference 6.3.11.20). The trees, including some large trees, will provide structure for the development; create habitat connectivity to provide amenity and micro-climatic benefits and ensure succession to the existing tree stock. The new planting has potential for longevity within the landscape and will enhance the species diversity of the site, whilst also contributing to the Green Infrastructure for the area.'</i></p> <p>In addition, responses provided within this document, go further in explaining how its loss is unavoidable in the provision of an SRFI in this location.</p>
Points 209, 210 and 211.	See points 207 and 208 above.
Point 212.	Repeat of point above – tree size will be determined at the discharge of requirements with variations in size depending on type and timing of planting and location.
Point 216.	LUC's position on this point is noted, however the Applicant still submits that this assessment doesn't take the value of the function and operation of an SRFI fully into account.

