

---

# HINCKLEY RAIL FREIGHT TERMINAL

## Summary

Sapcote Parish Council

UR: 20039514

Oct 2023

---

## 1. Introduction

1.1 Sapcote Parish Council has been working closely with CPRE Leicestershire who will address the wider points we wish to make.

1.2 These comments address the direct impacts on our village and our residents who feel:

1. they will be adversely affected by increases in traffic from the development itself and from the additional traffic which will result from the opening of South-bound slip roads on the M69 and
2. they will suffer a loss of amenity in terms of enjoyment of the local countryside and open spaces.

## 2. Relevant Representations Commented on:

4. The direct and indirect traffic impact would be serious.
5. The major change of introducing additional slip-roads to the M69 Junction 2 would have detrimental impacts.
6. Access to the site by public transport and other sustainable modes would be likely to be limited.
7. There would be impacts on the landscape, biodiversity and amenity of the area

## 3. Transport

### 3.1 Sapcote Description

#### a. Roads

3.1.1 Sapcote has four major roads for entrance and exit to/from the village: which meet near the centre of the village.

3.1.2 Sapcote is predominantly residential, with few shops or other businesses. The number of HGVs using the village as a through route to Hinckley, Burbage and the B4114 has increased in recent years, especially when there are delays/closures on the M69.

3.1.3 Some fifteen residential roads join the B4669. Residential properties near the centre do not have off-street parking.

3.1.4 There are only two designated pedestrian crossing places, one close to the Recreation Ground, one beyond the central junction.

3.1.5 The village's central junction (B4669/Church Street/Stanton Road) is particularly difficult for road users. On-coming visibility is limited, especially on the B4669 heading east and turning right on the blind corner from Church Street.

3.1.6 East of the junction the road narrows to 5.4 metres before gradually widening to approximately 5.8. If two large vehicles 'meet' it causes delays.

3.1.7 The pavement also narrows to 0.8m making it difficult for pedestrians to pass or for pushchair users.

3.1.8 Manual for Streets gives guidance on suitable width for urban streets, allowing which allows two HGVs to pass at 5.5m at slow speeds on straight roads without parked cars. This section of road would fail even the laxest interpretation of MfS.

3.1.9 The Co-Op shop, situated on that corner, has limited parking so cars park on Church Street, further causing congestion.

3.1.10 There is an adjacent refuge on the B4669 where children cross to and from school. The school crossing warden has reported several near misses and worries that more traffic is an 'accident waiting to happen'.

3.1.11 Further east, Sharnford Road provides a cut-through from the B4669 to the B4114 and Park Road/Cooks Lane provides a short cut to Sharnford Road.

3.1.12 The village is a well-used cycle route, both for individuals and groups, as confirmed in STRAVA cycling 'heatmap'. Use of PROWs by cyclists is limited so most use the road network.

3.1.13 In terms of safety, Crashmap (5 years) shows a serious accident at the Grace Road junction. The longer accident record suggests that junction and the central junction are the most common accident spots.

3.1.14 There have been two fatal cycling accidents close to the junction of Leicester Road with the B4114. In 2020 a young man was killed and another in 2022.

b. Recent Developments

3.1.15 Over the last ten years there have been approximately 500 new homes built in the village. As there are few facilities and no full bus service this has increased traffic and parking issues.

c. Sapcote All Saints Primary School (Cooks Lane)

3.1.16 The school has doubled in size over recent years. The vast majority of parents walking children there travel along, or cross, the major roads.

3.1.17 Smiles Children's Nursery (Hinckley Road) has limited parking. Staff and parents dropping off children park on the road during working hours, causing congestion.

3.1.18 Two residential care homes also require emergency vehicles access.

d. Sapcote Garden Centre

3.1.19 Sapcote Garden Centre has grown in popularity in recent years. Despite increasing car parking, queueing vehicles cause significant congestion on Hinckley Road.

e. Sapcote Recreation Ground and Pavilion

3.1.20 This well-used facility attracts families, dog walkers and local sports teams. It is accessed from a small car park on Hinckley Road. Smiles Nursery has no green space so staff and children cross Hinckley Road to make use of it.

## **3.2 Impact of Development**

3.2.1 There are very significant increases in traffic projected on the B4669 following development of the HRNFI.

3.2.2 The ES Transport Chapter includes projected highway increase on specific links. We could not find a map locating those so cannot say which of the B4669 Leicester Road sites most closely relates to Sapcote.

3.2.3 Points 43 and 46 see traffic increases of 40-60% in 2036, and Point 92 nearly 20% in the 'with-development scenario' Traffic rises above 12,000 aadt on all those sections.

3.2.4 The Junction Assessment does not include the B4669 junction with Church Street but the junction with Grace Road/Sharnford Road (J40) shows a 27% increase in traffic in the a.m. peak (1189 to 1514 vehicles). This is discounted as within the junction's capacity but suggests link capacity through the village is likely to be exceeded.

3.2.5 Perhaps more alarming HGVs increase at those points from between 50-100 to 300-400.

3.2.6 We anticipate further traffic increases on the unmodelled Sharnford Road, as well as the Park Lane/Cooks Road cut-through.

3.2.7 It is not clear how many HGVs would be the larger (and more dangerous) OGV2 vehicles and how many articulated, with the added risks (particularly to vulnerable users) associated with trailers.

3.2.8 The width of the B4669 at the village's centre, may put off some larger vehicles but also makes their presence more dangerous. Even smaller HGVs are not suitable for that stretch of road.

3.2.9 We could not find information on how many additional HGVs would be associated with the site and how many redistributed traffic but this large increase suggests the route would fail the NPPF test of safe and suitable access.

3.2.10 These modelled increases assume the HRNFI development traffic largely uses the M69 Jn 2 but we already see lorries diverting if the motorway is heavily congested or out of use. HRNFI HGVs may well also use this route.

3.2.11 That extra traffic would include local people travelling to HRNFI, increasing noise and pollution, particularly in the centre of the village where houses are close to the roads, and also at night.

3.2.12 Overall, the impact on Sapcote appears very significant. As one of the villages most affected by HNRFI we think the impact should have been more fully assessed, taking account of the location's sensitivity and the presence of vulnerable users.

#### **4. Landscape and Amenity**

4.1 Sapcote villagers are also concerned about the impact on the landscape, While views of the development would eventually be mitigated (to an extent) by new planting that wouldn't completely hide the buildings, particularly at night when light would spill from the site.

4.2 HNRFI would also impact on access to services. Sapcote villagers rely on Hinckley for many essential services so any deterioration in the B4669 or the M69 Junction 2 would impact adversely on daily lives.

4.3 More specifically, Sapcote enjoys access to the countryside from a number of Public Rights of Way (PROWs). In particular, the two which link to Sapcote Road, then cross towards the motorway.

4.4 A further footpath extends towards Aston Flamville and the motorway island. A bridleway from the B4669 links to the bridleway which crosses the motorway towards the proposed HNRFI site.

4.5 All these, as well as several others, criss-cross the adjacent countryside, providing access for families, ramblers and dog walkers. They are likely to be directly impacted, both visually and by noise and dust.

4.6 They are also close to the village so we would anticipate higher usage than those assessed within the site boundary.

4.7 HNRFI (and the access road) would also impact on Burbage Common.

4.8 The interruption in the footpath network would deter Sapcote residents from walking to the Common.

4.9 There would also be a major effect on horse riding (both on bridle paths and quiet roads). Horses do not like noise, certainly not HGVs. Building work alone would stop riders using that area.

## 5. Conclusions

5.1 CPRE set out wider concerns issues in relation to Transport, Climate Change and Need which we endorse.

5.2 The more local environmental issues which concern us are:

1. the increase in traffic, particularly HGVs.
2. the impact on congestion and safety in our village and surrounding roads
3. the impact on the landscape around our village and
4. the loss of amenity and enjoyment of the countryside, including the setting of Burbage Common.

5.3 Until a fuller assessment is done of the impact on Sapcote and other local villages we believe the proposals should be rejected.