

Burbage Parish Council- Written Representation

Transport

Introduction

Transport is a major concern for Burbage residents. Figure 1 below shows the schematic road network in Burbage. Whilst the internal road network within the village provides other routes, these are only a problem if the main streets, shown on this schematic map, are congested.

This important network of roads within the village includes 12 junctions and 24 links which make up the network.



Figure 1 - The Burbage Road Network

Residents are extremely concerned that they still do not fully understand the impacts, of the proposed Rail Freight Terminal next to Burbage common, upon the village road network.

Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Transport and Traffic (APP-117)

It is surprising that nowhere in this main chapter does Tritax Symmetry provide a statement of the traffic volumes which will be generated by the development. It is recognised that as the scheme is based on the building of speculative warehouses and that detailed traffic volumes can't be described or calculated, however, it is known that they are required to provide 'worst case' traffic figures to enable impact assessments to be made. These traffic volumes will also be essential for the local population to be able to consider and form an opinion about the proposed development. It is evident that the Environmental Statement has been targeted at the technical requirements of the 'professional' bodies who will contribute to the application process, rather than engaging the general public in an informative way. This approach is evidenced below by the increasingly vague and

obscure way information is presented, an approach which is carried forward from the public consultation material.

Highway Links

The chapter describes the methodology used to select which highway links will be subject to detailed analysis. The selection process determines 101 links will be thus selected. The reader will be expected to form a judgement of whether the list of links chosen is reasonable and appropriate.

Each of the links are numbered and these numbers are used to reference further the analysis carried out by Tritax Symmetry assessing the impacts on these links. Here again obscurity is evident from the presentation, as whilst some links are described in sufficient detail to reasonably understand the link intended, many more are not so well described:

- Links 4 & 5 'Aston Lane near Sharnford' – What is the difference between the two?
- Links 6, 36, 38, 82 & 84 'Main Street' Main Street where?
- Link 7 'Dunton Road', is this Broughton Astley, Leire or Ashby Magna?
- Link 10 'Stapleton Lane', is this Barwell, Dadlington or Kirby Mallory?
- Link 16 'Sharnford Road', is this Sapcote or Aston Flamville?
- Link 28 'Park Road', is this Hinckley, Earl Shilton or Sapcote?
- Link 35 'Main Road', Main Road where?
- Link 37 'Ashby Road', Ashby Road Hinckley, Barwell, Stapleton, Kilsby, Osbaston or Tamworth to name a few?
- Link 42 'Stanton Road', Sapcote or Elmesthorpe?
- Link 44 'Long Street', Stoney Stanton, Bulkington or Atherstone?
- Link 51 'Station Road', is this Hinckley, Kirby Muxloe, Croft, Stoney Stanton, Broughton Astley, Earl Shilton, Stoke Golding, Elmesthorpe or Desford?
- Link 56, 87 & 90 'Hinckley Road' are these Burbage, Burton Hastings, Desford, Leicester Forest East, Leicester, Sapcote, Earl Shilton, Stapleton or Stoney Stanton?
- Link 65 'Twycross Road', is this Burbage, Sheepy Magna, Sibson, Bilstone or Snarestone?
- Links 68, 69, & 70, 'Grove Road', are these Burbage, Blaby, Whetstone or Leicester?
- Link 75 'Sheepy Road', is this Atherstone, Twycross or Sibson?
- Link 77 'Local Road', very difficult to even guess!
- Links 80, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89 & 98 'A5 Watling Street', which sections?

The above list is not exhaustive of the links which are not adequately described. Given there are so many links which can't be confidently identified, analysis of the resulting tables on severance, Annual Traffic Flows, driver stress, delay levels and facilities is meaningless.

We have made an assumption that both links 63 and 64 'Newstead Avenue' & 'Welbeck Avenue' relate to Burbage streets. If this assumption is correct, we can't understand how these streets have been singled out for inclusion over other streets in Burbage, as both are not in any way 'through routes' in any scenario of congestion or impact from new development in the local area. Again if this assumption is correct, it gives rise for concern about the models of the local road network used for decision making.

Whilst ideally we would like to understand the impacts of both the link road and the development traffic on the Burbage road network (Figure 1), as a minimum we need to understand the impacts on the following links:

- Sapcote Road, Burbage
- Church Street, Burbage

- Lychgate Lane, Burbage
- Lutterworth Road, Burbage
- Windsor Street, Burbage

We can't be sure if the links below are the Burbage Roads, however, if they are, these are not the critical links which require analysis for the community of Burbage to fully understand the impact of this proposal:

- Twycross Road, Burbage
- Welbeck Avenue, Burbage
- Newstead Avenue, Burbage
- Grove Road, Burbage
- Crownhill Road, Burbage

We have searched the area for another Crownhill Road, without success. It is therefore assumed the figures in table 8.27 do refer to the Burbage Crownhill Road.



The map here shows this road is one of a small self contained section of residential housing with no through route, albeit a circular route is possible from Herald Way, via Troon Way and Broadsword Way, back to Herald Way (130m along Herald Way).

The table suggests that the 2036 total daily traffic on Crownhill Road will fall from 1,616 vehicles to 1,256 as a result of the development being approved. Further it suggests that HGV journeys will fall from 16 per day to just 2, if the development is approved.

The inclusion of these links with traffic impacts from the proposed development only increase our concerns that the modelling is not correct validated.

Highway Junctions

Unfortunately, the analysis provided by Tritax Symmetry in the Environmental Statement considers only five of Burbage junctions as warranting comment.

These five junctions are believed to be:

- J5 – Rugby Road / Brookside Junction, Burbage
- J13 – M69 Junction 1, Intersection with A5 & B4109 Rugby Road
- J20 – M69 Junction 2, Intersection with B4669 and the new link road to the development site
- J42 – 'T' Junction of Wolvey Road, Burbage with the A5
- J45 – 'T' Junction of Lychgate Lane, Aston Flamville with the Hinckley Road/Sharnford Road

The analysis of the junctions, carried out by Tritax Symmetry, is extremely difficult to follow, given the very low resolution of the map provided. Given the low quality of the map and supporting information Tritax Symmetry have provided to explain the impacts, we can have only minimal confidence that the locations have been correctly interpreted.

In table 7-2 of APP-117, for each of these junctions only the total junction flow is quoted (Without Dev & With Dev) for both the AM (08:00-09:00) & PM (17:00-18:00) Peak Hours. The flow on each leg of the junction is not separated out and therefore it is very difficult to understand from this table the resulting change in traffic flows which would affect the village of Burbage.

[New Link Road – M69 Junction 2 to Leicester Road, Hinckley](#)

The Development would introduce this new link road as part of the scheme of implementation. The new road will run very close to the open landscape of Burbage Common on a raised embankment for much of this route by the common. The environmental and amenity impacts of this new road will be considered in the Ecology section of this representation.

The introduction of this road on the local highway network will be profound and have a major impact on the flows of traffic both North/South and East/West. The modelling which has been carried out by Tritax Symmetry would suggest that these impacts would be entirely beneficial to the traffic flows in the Burbage area with material reductions in most traffic flows.

It is our opinion that far more validation (including engagement with local people) of the modelling of the affects of the introduction of this new link road should be carried out. This is because the area has a combination of current constraints such as low bridges, narrow HGV routes through the village, and congested A5 sections which together form a unique scenario for traffic flows, both with and without this link road. There has been no attempt to engage with the public on this modelling validation. There seems to be a view from the Tritax Symmetry consultants that they only have to submit their traffic input forecasts into a Highway Authority model for ‘the answer’ of the resulting highway flows to be produced. These results will then highlight junctions for attention, and thus the development plans can be approved.

Local people are extremely concerned about a development of this scale and are very sceptical that traffic volumes through our village will be reduced. Given the lack of declared traffic volumes in the Transport Chapter, we turned to the appendix to discover if more details can be found.

[Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Appendix 8.1 Transport Assessment](#)

For the lay reader, the key element to understanding the information presented in a traffic statement is the clarity of the presentation of information. In paragraph 8.80 of APP-117, the methodology is set out that three scenarios will be investigated:

- Do Nothing - Without Development (WoD) inclusive of committed development.
- Do Minimum - Without Development With Access Infrastructure (WoDWS).
- Do Something - With Development (WD): including the Access Infrastructure.

Further the paragraph emphasises the importance of understanding the flow changes associated with traffic redistribution from the link road addition. However, in this chapter there is NO further discussion or reference to the ‘Do Minimum’ WoDWS.

Therefore, the main chapter (APP-138) is re-explored for details of scenarios mentioned there.

In paragraph 7.25 Tritax Symmetry introduce further scenario definitions:

- Without Development (WoD)- Do Nothing
- Without Development (WoDWPA) with Proposed Access Infrastructure – Do Minimum
- With Development (WDWPA) with Proposed Access Infrastructure – Do Something

Unfortunately, having introduced both WoDWPA and WDWPA in this document neither is referenced again.

Whilst in Paragraphs 8.79 -8.84 there is reference to scenario 'WoDWS', the paragraphs introduce scenarios 'WoDWos' and 'WDWS' which the reader is left to try to interpret.

In trying to understand the impact of the introduction of the link road, paragraphs 5.92-5.96 offer the best opportunity. Unfortunately, the captions for figures 5-8 and 5-9 introduces labels of 'WoDWInf-WoDev' of which the reader is again left to deduce the meaning.

These four figures are the only information available to the public to attempt to understand the impact of the local road network of the introduction of the link road. None of the other tables showing traffic flows on links or junction traffic flow, show the scenario of 'with the link road, without the development'. During the formal consultation Tritax Symmetry were challenged on the resolution being provided for the public to understand, and they dismissed the request for higher resolution maps as not being possible.

Our following commentary attempts to show the lack in the level of detail, from which Burbage residents are expected to understand the impact on traffic flows of the link road introduction, within and around Burbage. The presentation of this information to the public, at this resolution, is considered to be an insult to the engagement process and challenges the transparency of the process.

It is believed, these figures show the modelling the AM & PM peak hour changes with the thickness of the Red lines show the level of increase and the thickness of the Green lines showing the level of reduction, when compared with the current road layout. Within the broad conclusion that traffic with Burbage is reduced, there appears to be pockets of increase within the middle of the village; are these anomalies of the modelling?

To illustrate this point on the next figure, a single link has been highlighted with a blue dashed circle. We believe this street is Bullfurlong Lane, a residential cul-de-sac (of forty properties), which continues via an un-made track to a single farm. This is one of a number of roads on these diagrams, in which following the introduction of development shows increased traffic. It is difficult to understand how any material impact could be modelled for this street.

The general reduction, to traffic in Burbage, is fundamental to Tritax Symmetry not providing any highways mitigation within Burbage. Anomalies within modelling results can give an indication of more fundamental errors in the modelling process. These maps again reduce the ability of challenge or understanding, as the direction of increases or reductions are not visible.

Of particular concern to Burbage are the following issues:

- The impact of traffic through Aston Flamville and the 'T' Junction on Sapcote Road
- The impact of traffic on Lychgate lane and the crossroads in the centre of the village adjacent to Burbage Library.
- HGV traffic through the village especially Church Street.

Turning to figures 5-10 & 5-11 it has been deduced that these show the traffic impacts including the development traffic, although confidence of this assumption is low given the captions are the same as figures 5-8 & 5-9, save for the position of the year 2036.



Figure 5-8: AM 2036 WoDevWInf-WoDev



Figure 5-9: PM 2036 WoDevWInf-WoDev



Figure 5-10: AM WoDevWInf-WoDev 2036



Figure 5-11: PM WoDevWInf-WoDev 2036

Development Trip Forecast

It is noted that the ExA has requested a revised trip forecast explanation from Tritax Symmetry and more detail review of these figures may be necessary once the forecasting methodology has been fully explained in the revised documentation from Tritax Symmetry.

Reading the current documentation, it seems from table 6-8 that the total combined LGV & HGV 24-hour daily totals are 12,772 arrivals each day and 12,664 departures each day. Given that these forecasts are averages for the full operation in 2036, it would be expected that on average the number of arrivals each will balance to the number of departures, otherwise a 'stock' of vehicles at the site will develop over time.

Modal Split assumptions

We note that the ExA have questioned Tritax Symmetry on the use of the correct MSOA given the split of the site over two zones (Blaby 010 & Blaby 012) however, we would request that a sensitivity is carried out using the zones for Burbage & Hinckley given the proximity of the site to the boundary of the zones.

Private Car Journeys

The data presented does not quote a daily total for private car journeys to and from the development, stating only the peak AM and PM volumes. At present the document does not describe how the peak hour figures are derived, noting that a revised document has been requested, further comment will be made after that is received.

Total Peak Hour Journeys

We assume from table 6-8 given, the total peak hour figures are:

	AM Peak Hour (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak Hour (17:00-18:00)		
	Arrive	Depart	Total	Arrive	Depart	Total
LGV	899	117	1,016	351	922	1,273
HGV	208	219	427	235	259	494
Total	1,107	336	1,443	586	1,181	1,767

It is essential that we understand what percentage of this daily peak hour flow will arrive via the Burbage road network, and hence travel along Sapcote Road to join the site entrance at the roundabout M69 Junction 2. At present we have not been able to determine what this figure is.

For residents in Burbage and South Hinckley, the Sapcote Road route is the obvious first choice for the AM arrivals. We believe other locations, such as Wolvey, Bulkington, Nuneaton, Atherstone, Tamworth may also choose a route through Burbage, particularly in the event of peak hour queues to exit M69 north bound Junction 2. We are unsure of the assumptions made in the modelling.

Traffic Disruption

Traffic disruption due to accidents in the Burbage area are sadly common place. The A5 has for many years seen tragic accidents which have delivered terrible consequences, even in the last month. Such situations are to be, wherever possible, engineered out of the road layout and locally campaigns have been active for years to address sections of the A5 such as the High Cross, cross roads, the Smockington Hollow junction, and the Stretton bends. We are extremely concerned that additional traffic is not created on this highway until the improvements which are being currently considered as part of the next round of strategic highway improvements (RIS3). The section being considered is the section between the M69 Junction 1 and Tamworth. This section has been flagged for upgrade for well over 20 years, and is still not committed by government. If the scheme, which we would welcome, is brought forward, we would seek that the section between High Cross and the M69 is included in any scheme, as this section continues to have safety issues and will be subject to increased traffic if this development proceeds.

In addition to accidents, there is a low bridge in the area which is infamous from time to time as the 'most bashed bridge in the country'. Whilst plans are in place to address this bridge, we await to see the timing and full details of the scheme.

Whatever improvements are made, disruption will continue from time to time and we request that disruption scenarios are modelled to ensure the local road network is reasonably capable of withstanding such scenarios. Turning to Burbage traffic issues specifically HGV vehicle travelling through the centre of the village on the B578 is currently inappropriate, however, we are told there are no suitable alternative routes. We would strongly request that, should the development receive approval, that this route (B578) carried an HGV ban as the proposed scheme would provide an alternative route for HGVs between the A5 and the Sapcote Road, following the additional south facing slip roads being commissioned.

Bus Services

In table 4-2 and also paragraph 4.71 reference is made to the bus service X55 between Hinckley and Leicester. This service was withdrawn 1st October 2022 – 6 months before the date the Transport Assessment was finalised and needs updating appropriately.

Further more recently Arriva has withdrawn services 1 & 2, whilst it is acknowledged that this is post the document being published, it does need to be considered in the light of the assessment of public services for the proposed development.

The traffic assessment is deficient due to the reduced public bus services now available.

Site Selection & Need

The site selection chapter (APP-113) in paragraph 4.15 lists the consultation feedback received. However, the resulting changes to the site selection commentary for each of the sites is minimal, with no material change to the summary commentary of the selected sites and no acknowledgement that the sites originally reviewed should be revisited. The chapter to a greater extent is a reissue of the consultation report.

For all of the consultation received by Tritax Symmetry about the amenity value of Burbage Common and Woods, the special role these areas play in the wellbeing of residents of the urban areas of Burbage, Hinckley, Barwell & Earl Shilton, not even a passing reference has been added to the selection criteria on such feedback.

In the Ecology paragraph (4.117) a reference to the distance of the SSSI to the site of 600m has been added, missing from the consultation version. We consider the distance of 600m is misleading as in certain locations the boundary of the development is adjacent to the boundary of the SSSI.

In all of the formal consultation documentation, and now repeated in the application, Tritax Symmetry essentially lean upon the twin strands of Government Policy, which identifies as policy the need for new SRFIs, and the general case, that hauling a shipping container across the country is 'greener' by train than individual HGV vehicles on the strategic road network.

We are not challenging these generic points and objectives, however, any application for a new SRFI should make the specific case on the merits of the location being proposed. This is even more important as the number of SRFI are approved or are in the pipeline of potential schemes. Whilst having a number of Rail Freight Terminals in the Midlands should not be a barrier to further terminals, it does provide an increasing obligation on such proposals being justified by specific, referenced need, not only from generic logistics markets, but also directly from industry, demonstrating the need for raw components to be delivered to the manufacturing locations.

Much play has been made upon the 'Golden Triangle' for warehouse locations as evidence of need. This concept is again generic and aimed at camouflaging a lack of specific and demonstrable need. It should be remembered that one of the original unique characteristics of the Golden Triangle is the ability for HGV vehicles to reach 80% of the UK within a four-hour drive, a benefit repeated in the first round of scoping study. Such benefits are at odds with all more recent objectives of SRFIs being close to the market they serve.

Key points from documents APP-358 & APP-358;

- a) There is circuitous feedback in a number of published studies which make reference to the HNRFI, each using the fact that the terminal is planned as evidence of need.

For example; APP-113 4.13 “Other studies which have since emerged as the HNRFI has been in development. Each study demonstrates the case for delivering an SRFI in the location selected, they are as follows. Midlands Connects. This study outlines the Freight Routemap for the Midlands referencing directly HNRFI.

- b) APP-113 (4.13) also quotes the Williams Rail Report – “Great British Railways The Williams-Shapps Plan for Rail. This plan provides a need for rail freight development, stating that rail freight is essential in securing economic, environmental and social benefits for the nation.” Again this is generic rather than specific confirmation of the benefit of rail freight. This report also makes the statement **“It [The Government] will also explore ways to enable future Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges to be located more appropriately around the country.”**
- c) Whilst there are many words, much is repeated phrases in the document.
- d) A very great deal of the documents promote the concept of more rail freight terminals as per the policy statement, rather than concentrating on the specific benefits of the Hinckley location.
- e) Document 16.2 seeks to demonstrate the need by market analysis of B8 warehousing and reports from the various council market analysis with comments that they are all on a different basis and therefore difficult to compare – surely a £800m investment proposal would commission specific and appropriate market analysis
- f) There is no market segmentation of the B8 intended use in the intended market area, we would expect the different uses of B8 activity has a material impact upon the need for a rail freight terminal
- g) There is no analysis of the number of containers currently being driven from deep sea ports to the market area which could provide tangible evidence of need.
- h) A number of statements are made that “HNRFI is uniquely placed”, with very little explanation of why or why other locations are not so blessed.
- i) There is reference to a “dive-under” connection at Nuneaton, how much reliance is placed on this connection which is not approved or being promoted by this application. Given this connection is not approved, what is the impact if the connection does not proceed.

Air Quality

Residents of Burbage are concerned as to the impact on air quality this development will have. The applicant state that, in their opinion, that the impact on air quality at a time of peak construction traffic vehicle movements will be determined as ‘not significant’, being described as ‘temporary’. This may be so, but no real figures are give as to a reliable air quality assessment when the site is up and fully running in 2026. We anticipate that the high volume of LGVs and HGVs, with an estimate of some 3000+ traffic movements into and out of the site at peak times, will only exacerbate the poor air quality for residents living in the Sapcote Road area of Burbage. Besides a ‘normal use’ approach to air quality assessment, the study should also include an assessment of the impact of traffic congestion upon air quality, for example when the M69/A5 is blocked.

The proposed road across Burbage Common to link up with the A47 will do little to reduce air pollution. It is anticipated by the developer that the majority of traffic leaving the site will use the M69 when heading towards Leicester and its environs. However, due to the level of congestion at the M69/M1 junction, especially during peak am/pm times, when traffic can be queuing up to 2

miles before the M1/M69 junction, it can be envisaged that traffic leaving the site, especially during peak time, will use the A47 route to Leicester, causing further congestion on this route.

Ecology

The residents of Burbage recognise the importance of Burbage Woods and Aston Firs SSSI as a natural amenity for the local population. With the area of woodland being directly adjacent to the proposed development, then it can be perceived that the development will have a significant impact on the wellbeing of this natural area. Not only will the site in itself pose a significant threat to the local ecology of the area, but the proposed road link from the site to the A47 would have an adverse effect on the local flora and fauna. We disagree with the assessment that the site and the site identified within the plan that is covered by the Development Consent Order (DCO) as being described as “typically of negligible ecological importance”. Our conclusion is that there has not been a sufficient, year-long ecological survey to assume that the wider site can be described as “negligible importance”. We also believe that any mitigation to protect the ecological value of the area will have limited impact due to the poor assessment made as to the effect any mitigation proposal will have.

Social Amenity Impact

‘Social amenity’ refers to facilities and services that enhance the quality of life of a community. Examples of social amenity include parks, schools, libraries, public transportation, and more, which refers to something that promotes something that enhances physical, social and mental wellbeing.

The applicant expects that the construction phase will have a negative impact on the health and mental wellbeing of local residents due to changes in air quality and noise pollution. However, the applicant anticipates that these effects “are not anticipated to be significant”.

Despite reassurances being given by the applicant that an area of publicly accessible green space will be provided to compensate for the loss of open space due to the size of the development and road link to the A47, there is no indication as to the quality of this new space. This is important, as good quality open space is known to improve both mental and physical wellbeing. In a study conducted by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, residents were asked to identify their favourite open space within the Borough, with Burbage Common being identified as the most popular, along with Market Bosworth Country Park (Hinckley and Bosworth Open Space and Recreational Facilities Study 2016).

There is limited discussion in the documentation as to the impact the fully operational site will have upon employee habits for travelling to work. Currently, there is limited public transport that could potentially access the site. The site is located in a rural setting some distance from the nearest habitation, making the site an unsustainable location for commuting to work. With an estimated 8,400 - 10,400 employees using the site, it is envisaged that the majority of these employees will be using their own transport to access the site. Another assessment gives an even higher figure of 12,000 employees. As previously mentioned, this development, will only exacerbate the situation of congestion in the surrounding area, especially the M69 and B590 and B4669. This application will therefore have an overall negative impact on the physical, social and mental wellbeing of local communities.

It is understood that the applicant has provided information on a health profiling exercise of local communities. However, it is unclear as to the locations where these health profiles were undertaken, but it appears to be concentrated on more rural areas than the key urban areas that will be impacted by this development, namely Burbage, Earl Shilton and Narborough. Therefore, the

parish council recommends that a full impact assessment is undertaken in those areas that will be significantly impacted by this development.

Threat to Green Wedge

The area of land which surrounds Burbage Common and Woods, form the core of the 'Green Wedge' policy in the Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan 2006-2026. A key objective of this policy is to preserve the identity and provide separation of settlements particularly between Barwell, Earl Shilton, Burbage and Hinckley. However, the boundary between Hinckley & Bosworth and Blaby councils prevents the inclusion of the villages of Elmesthorpe and Stoney Stanton in this objective, given they are in another administrative area. This separation of administrative boundaries does not remove the community aspiration that a separation is maintained between all of these settlements.

For some considerable time, there has been concern expressed by both Burbage Parish Council and Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council about the cumulative impact on Burbage and other communities within Hinckley & Bosworth of all the proposals contained within the emerging Blaby Local Plan. As can be evidenced from the attached plan (see Appendix 1) from the 2021 consultation of the Blaby Local Plan. This clearly shows the overall potential impact and the fact that the sites ticked were, at that time, assessed as potentially developable.

Whilst the new Blaby Local Plan has been delayed, the most substantial development now emerging is the proposal being considered for 5000 dwellings identified as Land West of Stoney Stanton (STO 026). Taken together with the Rail Freight development, and all the other potential sites, there could effectively be total development of what is now open countryside and farmland all the way from Earl Shilton to Stoney Stanton and Sapcote, a prospect which fills Burbage residents, who care about the countryside, with alarm. We ask that given the DCO of this scale is taken outside local planning decisions, the risk of the loss of separation is taken into consideration by the ExA.

Conclusion

In conclusion, at the preliminary meeting of this examination, all three highways authorities expressed their concerns at the traffic assessments carried out by Tritax Symmetry, even though these authorities have been working over six months beyond the formal public consultation carried out by Tritax Symmetry. We believe the modelling is still showing validation errors which undermines public confidence in the forecasts for Burbage and that this situation must be remedied before decisions can be made on the impact of this development.

Further, whilst this proposed development may offer some benefits to the local area with respect to potential employment opportunities, although Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council district has an below-national level of unemployment, so employees will have to come from elsewhere outside of the district. This singular benefit is far outweighed by the negative impact this proposal will have upon the landscape and visual setting of the site, ecology and the SSSI at Aston Firs, traffic and transport, and the physical, social and psychological of communities within the surrounding area.

