

Post Hearing Submissions and Response to Deadline 4 Submissions
ELMESTHORPE PARISH COUNCIL
9th February 2024

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Elmesthorpe Parish Council attended ISH6 on Wednesday 24th January in person.
- 1.2. This document contains comments on information received, or questions raised post Deadline 4 and ISH6.

2. Sustainable Transport

- 2.1. Elmesthorpe Parish Council still remains concerned with regards to commuter traffic; particularly when considering the immature sustainable travel strategy.
- 2.2. The site proposes to operate 365 days per year: without dedicated public transport provisions provided by the applicant for the site's employees, issues with sustainable transport would be experienced on weekends, bank holidays and public holidays.
- 2.3. The applicant should provide several options of dedicated public transport provisions to support their employees. Alternatively, if the site is unable to sustain its own green travel requirements on public holidays, bank holidays and weekends, consider ceasing or reducing operation on these days.

3. HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy: ***17.4B Hinckley NRFI HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy***

- 3.1. Within the HGV Management Strategy (and in other documents), Elmesthorpe is consistently omitted from maps (see appendix 1) and descriptions of the site. Paragraph 2.19 describes Elmesthorpe's existence on the B581 as 'intermittent residential frontage.' The village is incredibly close to this site and the reporting of the site location is disingenuous.
- 3.2. Paragraph 5.24. We consider it imperative that Elmesthorpe Parish Council is included in this list of Parish Councils to be provided with the details of the Site Management Company in charge of investigating breaches.
- 3.3. The routes described within the HGV Management Strategy are welcome however the enforcement appears to require further detail. Residents in the surrounding areas should not suffer long periods and high instances of breaches before penalties and action are enforced. This is particularly important when breaches of HGVs through the narrow villages present such a safety risk to vulnerable pedestrians and road users. These routes are undesirable for a reason; we aren't merely wishing to inflict fines because we don't like the idea of HGVs on the roads, we are considering the very real possibility that life-changing events will likely happen, as a direct result of a poorly enforced HGV Management Strategy.

- 3.4. We are currently still unclear, how many breaches an occupier, or an individual, are able to make before fines are enforced.
- 3.5. We are still unsure how frequently data will be reviewed to identify offenders.
- 3.6. We are unclear exactly who will be enforcing these fines, as well as whom the benefactors of these fines will be.
- 3.7. These ambiguities make it difficult to understand how effective this strategy may or may not be.

4. Noise

- 4.1. Elmesthorpe Parish Council requested information from the Applicant on 23/01/24 ahead of ISH6. We requested signposting to details regarding freight train time assumptions in order to help inform our understanding regarding anticipated timing for peak train and operational noise; particularly at night. Information was received on 06/02/24 however only detailed the assumptions for Eastbound trains and therefore we are still awaiting complete information. We reserve our comments on this matter until this information is received.
- 4.2. **18.13 Applicant's response to deadline 3 submissions [Part 9 – Noise].** The applicant's Response Number 4 states: "For receptors to the north, noise from the rail freight interchange will influence the future noise climate. However, the existing noise climate in this area is dominated by road noise and rail movements. The proposed operations include HGV movements, rail movements and engine noise from reach stackers and gantry cranes, all of which are in-keeping with the existing noise climate."
- 4.3. Elmesthorpe is immediately to the north of the proposed site. The Parish Council rejects the assertion that the current noise climate is *dominated* by road noise and rail movement. The predominant sounds in the area are low levels of background traffic noise, birdsong and general peacefulness, occasionally interjected with passing rail traffic.
- 4.4. Engine noise from reach stackers and gantry cranes (along with other associated operational noise) are absolutely not in-keeping with the existing noise climate, and to make such a claim is baseless.
- 4.5. We still remain deeply concerned about the impact of prolonged construction and 24 hour general operational noise, on the residents of the village and the effect upon their lives, educations, health and livelihoods

5. Visual Impact

- 5.1. Elmesthorpe Parish Council have requested from the Applicant signposting to details regarding the proposed height of the A47 Link Road and consequent heights of proposed lighting. The proposed A47 Link Road will be raised to prevent it from being flooded by the local watercourses. This was requested on 23/01/24 ahead of ISH6 and information has been received on 06/02/24. Unfortunately, there is no design on lighting for this part of the scheme yet and therefore we are unable to make a representation upon the effect of the A47 Link Road's lighting scheme on residents, local habitats or wildlife.
- 5.2. **6.3.11.12a Hinckley NRFI ES Figure 11.12 Night-time Views and Photomontages.** Photo Viewpoint 20 is the view from the M69 bridge B581, perhaps the most important and telling photo viewpoint of them all. This viewpoint doesn't correspond with the viewpoint 20 supplied at **6.3.11.16 Daytime Photomontages** (April 23) so it appears the applicant has opted to either change the angle of the photo and point the theoretical 'camera' away from the proposed site, or the wrong images have been included. Standing on the M69 bridge on the B581 as per the daytime photomontages viewpoint 20, would show significant change at night. With the current error or omission in information supplied, no-one is able to see the massive scale of change in the character of the area, or the effect of the lighting on those living just 300-350m from the site itself on Stanton Lane (B581/Burbage Common Road junction).
- 5.3. We still remain genuinely concerned about the visual impact of this proposal, especially considering the incredible proximity to residential areas of Elmesthorpe.

6. Construction

- 6.1. The Parish Council have further requested details of what is entailed within Works Plans 8, 21 and 22. This was requested on 23/01/24 ahead of ISH6 and was received back on 06/02/24. Due to the timescales involved before Deadline 5, we will reserve our comments on this matter until Deadline 6.

7. 18.13 Applicant's response to deadline 3 submissions [Part 8 – Parish Councils]

- 7.1. Response Number 3: The stress and anxiety being experienced by Residents of Elmesthorpe that the Parish Council communicated at OFH1 has been interpreted as being associated with the NSIP Planning Process. For clarity the stress, anxiety and other problems described during our oral representation are associated with the constant, overwhelming worry that residents feel at the possibility of living with the devastating effects of having a NRFI in their small, quiet village. Despite the Applicant's statement that "every technical topic area is linked to people, their health and wellbeing," residents feel like every real and valid area of concern, has been wrongfully dismissed: achieving quite the opposite effect.

- 7.2. Response Number 7: Elmesthorpe Parish Council notes the result of the preliminary road safety audits and the concluding action of moving the location of the new proposed T89 uncontrolled crossing to further north along the B581. We welcome this decision and trust the dDCO will be revised accordingly.
- 7.3. Response Number 9: The applicant has explained why the chosen site is exceptional when compared to the other sites explored within the very limited area set at the genesis of the project. The applicant has not yet managed to explain why no other site in the whole of the nation (which must be considered when creating a nationally strategic infrastructure), cannot deliver similar benefits as this site. An alternative site elsewhere in the country, that may already have stronger, existing surrounding infrastructure in place with less constraints.
- 7.4. Response Number 10. Sub-point 4.5. Mitigation at New Road/Hinckley Road/Station Road B581 has now been explained as to “ensure traffic moves more efficiently...whilst enhancing pedestrian safety.” Up until this point, the mitigation proposed (replacing the mini roundabout with a traffic light signaled junction) was described as to introduce delays to make the route undesirable to HGVs. The planned mitigation hasn’t changed, so we are unsure how the effect has now changed.
- 7.5. Response Number 16: Having read the response from the Applicant it is quite clear that their main concern with regard to the colour palette of the buildings, is that they fit their company branding and look stylish to reach “the required levels of appropriateness” associated with a large scale development. There appears to be little willingness to genuinely consider how this will assimilate with the surrounding character and environment. It is not considered enough effort has been extended to integrating this development to its surroundings when the applicant states that ‘it allows the natural elements of the environment to change throughout the year and make their own statement.’ One could surmise that if certain colour schemes must be used to be appropriate for an SRFI development of this scale, and those colour palettes are so inconducive with assimilation to the existing site surroundings, then the chosen site is inappropriate.

8. PRoW

- 8.1. Elmesthorpe Parish Council provided the Applicant with details of the commonly utilized, and enjoyed, circular route by residents. It incorporates Burbage Common, Acorns Café and Children’s Play Area, passing by the village pub (and currently the local Farm Shop which stands to be demolished entirely). The section of the walk along Station Road B581 is less than ideal but does not stand to be altered by the proposed development therefore is disregarded in this comparison. The current walk continues down a peaceful Bridlepath Road past the land settlement homes, through Burbage Common, returning back along Burbage Common Road surrounded by open fields on

either side of you until you arrive back at Station Road B581. At appendix 2 you can see this route, at 4.13 miles/6.65km.

- 8.2. The Applicant has provided us with the details of the two alternative circular routes that will be available once the proposed RFI is completed. Please see appendix 3.
- 8.3. The first alternative circular route is 5.45miles/8.77km (incorrectly annotated as 8.74km on their map). This route travels mostly down the A47 link road and is an undesirable route. The increase to the existing route is +1.32miles/2.12km
- 8.4. The second alternative circular route is 6.35 miles long/10.2km. This route is more comparable with the amenity experienced with the current circular walk, and would be more desirable in terms of the surroundings within the limitations of the new surroundings. The increase to the existing route is +2.22miles/+3.57kms
9. The increase in the length of the alternative PRowS is really quite long, and for some, now too long. As well as the decrease in amenity value of our PRow, they are now more inaccessible to those with mobility issues, small children, poor health or simply just the time constraints of daily life.

Summary

We thank the Examining Authority for the opportunities to be heard, time and considerations extended to the Parish Council throughout the Examination so far.

As the village, and people, that will be severely affected by *all* associated adverse effects, Elmesthorpe Parish Council must oppose this application in the strongest way.

Appendix 1

17.4B Hinckley NRFI HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy

Figure 1: Main HNRFI Site location



Edited to annotate Elmesthorpe on the map:

Figure 1: Main HNRFI Site location



Appendix 2



