

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 Deadline 4 Submissions [part 7 – Action Groups]**

Document reference: 18.17

Revision: 01

**9 February 2024**

---

Planning Act 2008

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

## Elmesthorpe Stands Together

No	Elmesthorpe Stands Together	Applicant's Response
1	<p>It's been a very interesting week so far and we have 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 like we come away with more questions than answers , we still feel we are lacking significant information relating to the construction period which in all the documentation 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 as 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday ,their is the possibility for additional start up and close down time which would then become 6.30am to 8 pm . Add to that the list of exceptions and types of work that may take place outside of these hours we could very well be experiencing 24 hours construction at various points in the construction phase should this occur it would have an additional detrimental effect of those locally. Refer to document CEMP DOC REF 17.1. Point 1.21</p>	<p>The Applicant amended Requirement 16 Construction hours in the deadline 4 submission of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference: 3.1C, REP4-027).</p> <p><b>Construction hours</b></p> <p><b>16.</b> —(1) Construction works relating to the authorised development must not take place on Sundays, bank holidays, public holidays, nor otherwise outside the hours of 7:00 to 19:00 on week days and 7:00 to 15:00 on Saturdays in the phase of the authorised development which includes the earthworks as detailed in the written phasing scheme submitted and approved pursuant to requirement 3. Construction works relating to all phases of the authorised development must not take place on Sundays, bank holidays, public holidays, nor otherwise outside of the hours of 7:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday and 7:00 to 13:00 on Saturday.</p> <p>(2) The restrictions in paragraph (1) do not apply to construction works where these—</p> <p>(a) are carried out within existing buildings or buildings constructed as part of the authorised development;</p> <p>(b) works to the railway including demolition of Burbage Common Road Bridge and installation of the replacement bridge across the railway forming part of the 'A47 Link Road';</p> <p>(c) works to the highway agreed with the relevant highway authority;</p> <p>(d) are carried out with the prior approval of the relevant planning authority;</p>

No	Elmesthorpe Stands Together	Applicant's Response
		<p>(e) are associated with slip form working;</p> <p>(f) deliveries, movements to work, maintenance and general preparation works but not including running plant and machinery for a period of one hour either side of the above times;</p> <p>(g) any oversize deliveries or deliveries where daytime working would be excessively disruptive due to normal traffic operation;</p> <p>(h) removal or protection of overhead powerlines;</p> <p>(i) are associated with an emergency;</p> <p>(j) overnight traffic management measures; and</p> <p>(k) completion of an operation that would otherwise cause greater interference with the environment/general public if left unfinished.</p> <p>(3) Any emergency works carried out under sub-paragraph (2)(i) must be notified to the relevant planning authority within 72 hours of their commencement.</p>
2	<p>We already experience overnight rail works annually and on those occasions it is heard even on the far side of the village, despite asking both Tritax and network rail we have still not been advised if this will need to become more frequent</p>	<p>This information was provided at Deadline 3 and was responded to in the responses to Deadline 3 (document reference: 18.13, REP4-125, Response number 24) as well.</p> <p>Network Rail have advised that this section of track is considered average with the level [amount] of this type of works, as it is already a Category 1 route for maintenance purposes. With the forecast increase in tonnages these activities will only increase marginally.</p>

No	Elmesthorpe Stands Together	Applicant's Response
3	<p>Some on 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 items that you're all talking about, for something that impacts us 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 and our village and as such we will try and do our best to represent ourselves throughout this process, some of us may not have the technical know how and jargon but we do have words with feelings behind them and it can be very difficult to put together a case against the development, based on technicalities and facts when our strongest case is coming from our local knowledge.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that necessarily the DCO requires the Applicant to prepare extensive reports, assessments and plans to provide sufficient detail of the proposals. In recognition, the planning issues raised by HNRFI, TSH has undertaken two public engagement exercises, in addition to the statutory consultation. TSH has at all times, been willing to assist in identifying the source of information within the application submission.</p>
4	<p>We feel that since developments were first proposed and throughout the application and examination process the thing that has remained abundantly clear to us all is that it will have a devastating impact on Elmesthorpe in almost every way. We wish we could be stood here today saying that we would welcome the opportunity to work with the developer to discuss further mitigation that could protect our way of life and Village however we genuinely feel that there is no mitigation that can reduce the impact that it would have to the village overall and especially those that</p>	<p>The Government has stated within National Planning Policy National Networks (NPS-NN) that there is a 'critical need' to improve the national networks (NPS-NN paragraph 2.2) and a 'compelling need' for an expanded network of SRFIs (NPS-NN paragraph 2.5.6). The Government expects that 'investment decisions on strategic rail freight interchanges will be made in the context of a commercial framework' (NPS-NN footnote 61).</p> <p>The NPS acknowledges (paragraph 4.30) 'that given the nature of much national network infrastructure development <b>particularly SRFIs</b> (emphasis</p>

No	Elmesthorpe Stands Together	Applicant's Response
	live in close proximity to the development.	<p>added), there may be a limit on the extent to which it can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area'. The Applicant has prepared the proposals for HNRFI as a 'good design' which meets the principal objectives of the scheme [as a SRFI] by eliminating or substantially mitigating the identified problems, by 'improving operational/conditions and simultaneously minimise adverse impacts' (NPS-NN paragraph 4.31). The Applicant acknowledges that HNRFI will necessarily result in substantial change to the local area in which it is located. The Applicant believes that the residual impacts have been minimised, by satisfying the compelling national need for an expanded network of SRFIs and through mitigation measures secured by management plans and requirements.</p>

**Stoney Stanton Action Group**

No	ExQ Ref	Stoney Stanton Action Group	Applicant's Response
1	Q1.11.5	<p>The Stoney Stanton Action Group considers that the scope of the data used for estimating trip numbers should include Occupation 1: Managers, Directors and Senior Officials; Occupation 2, Professional occupations; Occupation 3, Associate professional and technical operations. The reason for this is that, regardless of the relative percentages of people in each occupation category, estimations of the numbers of journeys to and from the site and related to the site should include all people who are employed at the site or who travel for any reason associated with the site in order to get a complete picture. Therefore it is not appropriate to exclude these categories.</p>	<p>The Managerial roles were excluded within the original Trip Distribution document signed off by all parties prior to the model run. Further engagement with LCC NDI consultant team however, confirms that Census JTW data for similar sites, DIRFT and Magna Park are used in the analysis of commuter travel distances, combined with planning uncertainty logs used within the PRTM. These take account of likely trips on the network and include a number of managerial staff, this will be in the region of the 10%. Trip generation also is based on similar SRFIs with corresponding levels of managerial role and therefore managerial roles were not excluded in the overall analysis.</p>