

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hinckley SRFI](#); [transportinfrastructure@dft.gov.uk](mailto:transportinfrastructure@dft.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** Re: Hinckley SRFI. Further Submission Interested Party Reference number: 20037713  
**Date:** 05 February 2025 13:52:45

---

[REDACTED]

I am concerned, following the Chancellor's recent announcement about prioritising infrastructure applications, there will be pressure on the Transport Secretary to ignore the clear recommendation from the Planning Inspectorate to turn down Tritax's application and not abide by existing protocols.

To agree this plan would mean ignoring the many reasons that the Planning Inspectorate have cited as to why this is an unsuitable development, none of which have been adequately addressed by the applicant's latest submission.

I wish the following to be considered by the Secretary in arriving at a conclusion on this planning application.

My specific concerns are as follows.

#### 1. Road Safety in Sapcote.

I believe that their suggested 'improvements' are in fact a step backwards and increase the risk to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. There is a clear pinch point in Sapcote village and increased heavy goods traffic using the road are likely to mount the curb or collide with each other as well as putting the lives of pedestrians and cyclists in danger.

If there is not to be a Sapcote bypass the mitigation assurance given by Tritax is worthless.

I understand this is a major concern flagged up by Leicestershire Council but Tritax have not taken heed of it. Even now they have not addressed the highlighted collision risks or the narrowness of the road in Sapcote in places, nor have they considered worst case scenarios in their traffic and safety analyses.

#### 2. Narborough Railway Crossing.

Tritax claim that up to a 45 minute crossing closure in an hour is the norm for this industry. The Planning Inspectorate have said that this

is unjustified and beyond acceptable levels.

The current volume of rail traffic at this crossing already causes significant delays. Any increase to this will inevitably create more pollution from waiting cars as well as frustration for motorists and pedestrians.

Tritax's modelling of the crossing is over optimistic as it assumes trains will pass at the crossing minimising the duration of a closure. This ignores any delays in freight or passenger trains and therefore the build up of train traffic.

Quite frankly I find their approach to this concern somewhat frivolous.

What's more they have been unwilling to engage in sustainable travel which I believe is essential in projects of this type.

If the project goes ahead in its current form it will lead to higher pollution and noise in the area, with the long-term implications for health. I also wonder whether the frustration caused by long waiting times might lead to people 'taking a chance' to cross while the barriers are down.

### 3. M69's junction with the M1

This is already a busy junction at certain times so when the extra traffic from the Rail Freight Terminal is added to this, it will become even more over saturated with the concurrent increase in the safety risk.

Furthermore, I consider Tritax has been unwilling to employ the appropriate traffic modelling methodology as recommended by Leicestershire County Council and National Highways which takes account of factors and ontraffic patterns that occur at more complex junctions (such as queuing on the slip road) and better reflect real world conditions.

I also wish to question the validity of the data they have collected as it was taken at times which do not reflect the true traffic picture such as during major holiday periods and lockdowns. I do wonder if this was a deliberate attempt to manipulate the data.

### 4. Aston Firs Travellers Site

Some if not all of residents on this site will be recognised as being

part of an ethnic minority with specific rights under Equality and Human Rights Legislation and will be particularly adversely affected by this development due to the location of their site. They will be significantly disrupted during the building phase of the development with noise and air pollution as well as the loss of some amenities. This was recognised by the Planning Inspectorate and remains an issue as Tritax have not done enough to mitigate the harm caused by the development.

## 5 Sustainable Transport Strategy

The amended strategy does not properly deal with the balance between rail and road freight. Indeed, there is no guarantee or any emphasis to move road freight to rail in spite of the development being called a Rail Freight Interchange. There needs to be a greater commitment to this aim as well as a measurable target set and monitored otherwise the whole concept of it providing an environmental benefit is nullified.

## 6 HGV Routing Strategy

I am concerned about their operation of this strategy. I recognise it indicates penalties for breaches but it is not clear who will monitor and enforce these penalties to ensure HGVs do not use inappropriate roads. This strategy is too ambiguous and needs a significant improvement in strategy.

## 7. Breaches of Human Rights

Those residents that will be in place in Plot 73 during construction will face potential harm, particularly as there appears to be no proper safeguards to minimise the impact of construction on them or pay compensation. I believe this breaches their right to peaceful enjoyment of their homes.

## 8. Impact of Increased Traffic

The significant increase in volume of traffic in the area, which is next to Burbage Common, a much used natural common and animal sanctuary, will result in a deterioration in air quality and an increase in noise pollution. This will adversely impact the quality of life in the area local to it.

The Planning Inspectorate highlighted this in its report

## 9. Criminality

Evidence indicates that such a significant development will attract criminality. I see no evidence of Tritax addressing this element at all.

## 10. Behaviour of the Applicant

I am concerned about the approach the applicant has taken during the whole of this process which makes me question their suitability to deliver this project in an appropriate way.

The public consultation was a farce and had to be redone.

There has been little public engagement.

Paperwork was late.

They have done their utmost to do the absolute minimum. Examples of this are

- public consultation
- their choice and timings of the traffic survey,
- their HGV routing strategy,
- not addressing the security issues,
- a disregard of the impact during construction on the Travellers site and other properties affected
- their revised solution to the Sapcote traffic issue
- their approach to the impact on Narborough rail crossing

I urge the Secretary to turn down this application.

Brian Tristam

[Redacted Signature]

---