

Additional comments on items raised in my initial representation:

- 1) It is extremely difficult, if not impossible for the private individual to make further comments on issues they have raised by the deadline of the 10<sup>th</sup> October due to the inadequacy and incompleteness of Tritax's submission.
  - 1.1) As a consequence the examining authority has had to request further information from Tritax, with Tritax having to submit an additional 27 documents in September/October 2023, eight of which were only available on the 5<sup>th</sup> October.
  - 1.2) The additional/updated documents do not have any visible version control identifying the changed items, making it impossible to identify what is new or replaced.
  - 1.3) The replacement documents have not even had their date updated e.g. "Additional Submission - 6.2.11.5 Hinckley NRFI ES Appendix 11.5 Schedule of Landscape and Visual Construction Effects - Rev 018 (Clean) - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority " which still quotes October 22
  - 1.4) With the examining authority continuing to accept such poor-quality documentation at their discretion at such a late stage, the public and other representative bodies are unable to comment fairly due to the workload from the continuing "moving target".
  
- 2) The possibility of trains queueing on the mainline is acknowledged in "Environmental Statement Volume 2: Appendices ES Appendix 3.1: Rail Report Document reference: 6.2.3.1" section 3.11. I previously raised this as a concern in my previous representation (3.3)
  - 2.1) Presumably some level of queuing is unavoidable as trains will have to be signalled into the HNRFI off the mainline, but in worst case scenarios this could lead to high levels of noise, vibration and pollution for extended periods.
  - 2.2) Queueing trains would be in close proximity to the 20+ properties on Bostock Close along with my own Grade II listed property of Wortley Cottages.
  - 2.3) None of the various monitoring points listed in the application are remotely near where such queuing would occur and the impact to us has been ignored.
  - 2.4) Even if queuing did not occur, normal operations will have an adverse effect, as current train operations already cause noise and vibration being experienced.
  - 2.5) Protracted vibration is of particular concern due to the listed building nature of my property.
  
- 3) The bus service information in "Additional Submission - 6.2.8.1 Environmental Statement - Appendix 8.1 - Transport Assessment Rev 07 (Part 1 of 20) - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority" is significantly incorrect even though it was only submitted on the 12<sup>th</sup> September 2023, and gives an incorrect perspective of public transport.
  - 3.1) The X55 bus service mentioned therein was stopped by Arriva back in September 2022.
  - 3.2) The X6 bus service only stops at the nearest stop (approx 1km) to the HNRFI development at  
Sapcote, adj Caravan Park (from Coventry)  
05:50      06:52    09:12    11:12    13:12    15:12    17:42  
Sapcote, opp Caravan Park (from Leicester)  
07:12      08:28    10:37    12:37    14:37    16:47    19:05    19:45

3.3) As I previously pointed out in my earlier representation (5.1) the 48 and 158 services do not pass anywhere near the proposed HNRFI site.

#### 4) Footpaths

This expands on my previous comments in my earlier representation

4.1) It is noted that the review of footpath usage was carried out in **2018** prior to Coronavirus. Usage of the local footpaths has soared since then, and although now some form of 'normality' has been restored, usage remains higher than before. It would seem a review is overdue before any decisions are made.

4.2) The accuracy of some of the footpath analysis also seems questionable.

I enclose the following two examples that illustrate this, but unfortunately, I have been unable to physically review all paths to see their reported accuracy. However, my memories having walked most of the documented paths seem at variance with a lot of the comments stated.

For example, looking at the summary table in Annex 2 of Appendix 11.2 Public Rights Of Way Appraisal and Strategy:

For footpath T89/1 it states that in both winter and summer that "Overgrown field vegetation. Stile from Station Road impassable, very little sign of use." Whereas the photographs I took show:



Certainly not impassable and a clear grass path, obviously walked, can be seen running across the field to the pedestrian level crossing of the railway line. Coincidentally this is one of the paths that is being proposed to be closed.

Also V23/1 which says "Poorly worn desire line/vegetation suppression defines some of the route. Parts entirely waterlogged" whereas :



The path can be clearly seen going right to left across the field.

4.3) Undue emphasis also seems to be put on the fact that the signage of footpaths is poor, as if this indicates little usage of the path, which is not the case. These paths are used predominantly by locals who know the paths well without needing recourse to signage. Any self-respected walker that happened to be out of area would be using an OS map or GPS anyway!

Similarly negative comments re water logging is no obstacle to even the casual walker – use wellingtons or boots!

#### **4.4) Regarding Tritax proposed mitigation**

Little investment for the benefit of walkers seems to be offered.

For example, the proposed diversions involve the walker having to travel further and then retrace their steps to be able to continue their route.

A particular example of this is the diversion of the footpath near to Thorney Field Farm, where the footpath is diverted along the railway line west, over the existing farm bridge (no cost to Tritax!) and back east along the railway line to the same point on the opposite side, whereas the investment in a new pedestrian bridge over the railway line would avoid this.

Footpaths are either being diverted through the site, alongside the M69 or alongside the railway line, none of which offer a particularly attractive alternative to the current situation. It is this creation of new paths that is being highlighted as an “improvement” by Tritax. It is hoped that any landscaping is imaginative, extensive, attractive, and noise reducing. Ongoing maintenance of the paths and litter picking, especially on the M69 side, should be provided by Tritax or the ongoing owners.

4.5) There is little detail for how long path diversions will be in place. Given the extended 10 year period that the development will take this needs to be urgently reviewed. It is not acceptable for the Burbage Common area to be inaccessible from Elmesthorpe for a protracted period. Any closure should be in terms of days or weeks not months, even if this means repeated works by Tritax to enable this.

Like the requirement for the M69 junction and that the proposed relief road must be in place before development takes place, a similar situation should be ensured for new/diverted footpaths.

4.6) Consideration should be made to the fact that the most popular footpath routing around Elmesthorpe is for people to walk a circular route down Burbage Common Lane, then either through

the common or over the existing railway bridge and back up the Bridle Path Road. Diversions and new paths should specifically allow for this to continue in some amended form. In addition, as previously stated, any temporary closures should be minimised to allow for a circular route to be viable.

#### **4.7) Danger to the Pedestrian**

One proposal that is of serious concern from a pedestrian safety perspective is the introduction of an uncontrolled (i.e. not zebra or signal) tactile paved crossing on Station Road by the eastern side of Bostock Close. This is part of the proposed rerouting/closure of footpath T89 to use the existing pavement over the B581 road railway bridge as an alternative. Very close examination of the plan "HRF-BWB-LSI-D2-DR-CH-00100 Document 2.4B Highway Plans Sheet 2" shows that this involves a dropped pavement on the south side of Station road opposite Bostock Close, toward the base of the railway bridge. The bend in the B581 at this point prevents a clear view of the road westwards in the Earl Shilton direction. In fact only 100 yards of the road or so can be seen, only allowing less than 5 seconds of visibility assuming that traffic is travelling at the statutory speed limit of 40 mph (very unlikely to be less!). This will result in pedestrians starting to cross Station Road only to find oncoming traffic as they reach the middle of the road. If this crossing were to be moved a little left toward the western side of Bostock Close, then I believe this danger could be avoided. There have already been too many deaths and serious injuries at this point without deliberately introducing more risk. The view in the other direction is similarly dangerous as the hump backed nature of the bridge hides oncoming traffic, and my suggested relocation of the crossing would at least increase the distance to the apex of the bridge.

I would recommend that an onsite viewing of this should take place to ensure walker safety!

View towards Earl Shilton from proposed site of crossing:



View from suggested position:



5) Finally I would still endorse all the points made in my previous representation.