

Further Submission of information against the Trytax Symetry Proposal

I would like you to accept this further addition to my previous submission regarding the Trytax Symetry planning application. I offered my main concerns as maintaining usability and freedom of access and movement on the one road that runs from Earl Shilton through Elmesthorpe and on to Stoney Stanton, called Station Road Elmesthorpe. I am adding a further insight to the same subject. I ask that you bear with me on the first part of the information because indirectly and directly I believe all this information relates to the development and access issues.

We the residents have been dealing with Trytax Symetry for quite a while now and we have been faced with their 'Smoke and Mirrors' approach to providing answers to direct questions. At the first meeting with them they presented Station Road, our one and only access in and out of the village as a short straight road. When challenged by residents to the fact of dangerous 'S' bends and corners they refused to walk the road. At the next meeting Elmesthorpe was not shown on any of their maps. Is this standard practice on presentations where you have no means of mitigation to remove contentious issues? They also at these meetings stated that the government wish to remove HGV'S from the roads in favour of Rail. They would remove 1000 HGV'S per day, yet 12 miles away 'Magna Park' is now developing phase 3, the Magna Park North and when completed will be one of the biggest distribution Hubs in Europe. Warehouse distribution is one of the fastest growing development areas in the country. See www.ons.gov.uk **The rise of the UK warehouse and the "golden logistics triangle"**. We never seem to get the true story from Trytax, they are an investment company and can make a better profit buying and developing farmland than purchasing development land. We then have the claim of around 8,000 workforce, the need at one of their presentations for 7,500 car parking spaces. Taking 1000 HGV's off the road to put 7,500 cars on the road does not enhance green credentials. You will have heard at your meeting at the Tiger's Ground from almost all bodies represented, Highways, Local and Parish Councils answers are not forthcoming. I worked for many years in a subsidiary of a PLC, and listed companies are meticulous in understanding their market. They know both Global and UK potential, we keep asking what amount of the market will be undertaken at this Hub, this is not commercially sensitive. They must know their projection or how do they know workforce numbers. They stated at their presentation that this hub would be used to supply the motor industry with component parts in the North of England. We all now know that market will be changing Electric Vehicles need fewer components than combustion engines. The Motor Industry is already concerned that now only one in four EV's are being bought by the general public whilst contract vehicle numbers are static with people holding on to their vehicles for longer. Under the 'Rochdale Envelope' system of applications my understanding is that the applicant needs to be fairly concise in the necessary planning requirements for his business. Why then can they not provide simple answers to our questions. The integrated rail plan for the North and Midlands is no longer in the format it was originally intended and perhaps this could force a change of direction in the Trytax business plan. We have no insight into ultimately what they will be doing because they have made no attempt to involve the community in any aspect of their company business.

They will claim that their vehicles will not need to use our road but we realise having lived in the area for more than 70 years and witnessed similar proposals that when needs must human nature takes the priority. We now return to the use of our arterial road. After each meeting and further submission we interested parties receive documentation which in many cases is 150 pages long. Many residents have families who take up their time, older residents are unfamiliar with information

presented in technical format, they are so concerned that they try their best to maintain their stoic resistance to this proposed development.

I, who am familiar with this type of detail read a document whereby the applicant, if gaining approval would rip up this area by whatever means they choose, widening or narrowing roads, moving ancient footpaths and bridleways. Changing bridges, closing crossings and even taking priority with their machinery on the Highways. They have the ability to provide such detailed information in order that they achieve their aims. The issues of a access to our road is in the detail above. They claim 'Carbon Neutral ' is their mantra yet need 7500 cars to come on site. We the residents cannot 'mitigate ' against this or where they choose to go but you could ask if they had considered as many industrialists did when Earl Shilton was a centre of Footwear and Hosiery Manufacturing did, which was to bring the workforce from outlying villages to their site on Coaches. Instead of 2500 cars per 8 hour shift, 50 coaches would provide the same manpower per shift and would ease potential congestion of the surrounding road network. Further to this in the document I have been reading there is a requirement on Trytax to undertake a schedule of any necessary groundwork that might be undertaken with details of vehicles to be used and their expected passage along necessary roadways. With only three roads available, A47 bypass access, Sapcote to the M69 and Station Road Elmesthorpe , why can they not make their favoured passage known to residents.

Why with a potential for many years of site clearance and development should residents live with the prospect of Heavy vehicles clogging up the only road that provides any means of necessary use and security for emergency help. Come clean Trytax and allow people some respite from constant worry and insecurity. Elmesthorpe is likely to be the most affected by this project and there are so many issues unexplained and unresolved. Most of the mitigation made by the applicant is just box ticking, you cannot swap a walk with your grandparents along 100 years old bridleway watching the nature and listening to birdsong with patch of amenity grass to stop and drink whilst you walk along looking at a fence with few sapling trees and listening to the clatter of gantries and noise of lorries. There is not one mitigation that we the residents can use to guarantee our quality of life. If the cars and lorries do decide to use our road because of other traffic congestion we are left with "I told you so", it is not enough. This proposal is clearly in the wrong place and is unnecessary.

My final point is that we were advised by our parish council to focus on the main aspect of the proposal that we were concerned about and that later we could expand into other areas of concern. Your statement at the Tiger's Ground said this was not the case. Whilst you might receive some duplication of concerns by allowing full participation it would allow your board to appreciate the overwhelming dissatisfaction with this proposal, allowing yourselves to make a balanced assessment.

If after the closing date residents are graded into 150 the road, 100 the bridleway, 400 Burbage Common, then it becomes a simple process of ignore the smallest number and allow additional mitigation against the higher numbers. This would devalue the entire process.

Kevin J Grewcock

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]