

## Introduction & Summary

[REDACTED]. I drive through Elvesthorpe and Stoney Stanton daily, and see the struggles the villages have with traffic already. I also used to live near Fosse Park and drove up and down the M1 daily in my previous job, so I have first-hand experience of the traffic problems on Junction 21 of the M1, and the impact that any congestion has on surrounding roads in the Fosse Park, Enderby and Narborough areas.

In my view, this project is completely ill-suited to the location. The traffic it will create will make the local roads dangerous and over-crowded; it will destroy the rural feel of the area, wildlife habitats and peaceful woodland used by the community. Finally, it will create an eyesore on the landscape, emitting light and noise pollution 24 hours a day, ruining the enjoyment of the area for us, our neighbours, and the local community.

It is my view from talking to Tritax at the Public Consultations, that they have no regard to the local area. They sent staff who could not answer our questions, could not provide any relevant data, and gave misleading answers regarding the impact of the development.

From the figures Tritax have provided, it is clear that this development is going to be a Rail Freight Terminal in name only, and it's proximity to the rail line is simply being used to justify a logistics park.

It is my opinion, which I shared with Tritax, that if it is nationally important to develop a Rail Freight Terminal in this area, then it would make more commercial sense to build a rail link to Magna Park in Lutterworth, already one of the biggest logistics parks in Europe and is still expanding, although that would obviously not suit Tritax. That view is open for debate however, due to the number of existing Rail Freight Terminals already within a 30 mile radius of the proposed site.

## Traffic

The roads of these rural villages cannot support the increased traffic during the construction or operational usage of the HNRFI. The roads in Stoney Stanton already suffer with the volume of traffic at peak times, plus the size of the vehicles that already use the roads (farm traffic and HGVs from Calor & Cobley Transport) often make it dangerous for other road users and pedestrians. The company are trying to 'shoehorn' this project into a quiet, rural setting, surrounded by a collection of small villages, who cannot sustain this level of infrastructure.

Further afield, the impact on the M1 and M69 has been under reported by the developers. The existing junction at Sapcote doesn't allow access to the Westbound M69 to prevent drivers using it as a rat run when the southbound Junction 21 is backed-up, which it often is. The feeder lane from the M69 to the northbound M1 is backed up for several hours a day from the volume of the traffic, notwithstanding accidents or lane closures. Tritax were not able to answer questions at the Consultations as to how the vehicles they would be putting out into the network would affect these junctions, nor how they would ensure the HGVs would not use the local roads in the event of traffic jams. They have also minimised how construction traffic and employees of the site will impact the local traffic network.

## Burbage Common

This site will be built immediately next to Burbage Common. It will destroy existing woodland, rural landscapes and wildlife habitats in it's construction. Additionally the noise and light pollution created

during construction and operation would impact both any wildlife that remain, and the public enjoyment of Burbage Common in the future. There is nothing like this space within the local area, and despite the Tritax staff trying to insist that they would replant green spaces along the boundaries, they would not compare to what is already there. In another example of the Consultation not being open and honest, I would also like to state for the record that we observed Tritax staff telling elderly residents that the development would not be built close to Burbage Common, despite this being plainly not true.

#### Visual Impact, Noise and Light Pollution

The visual impact of the development has not been considered from our viewpoint in Barwell, high on Shilton Road, looking down over Hinckley and Burbage Common. We raised this at the Public consultations, but again were met with misleading statements from the staff there.

On Shilton Road there is a Significant Viewpoint marked as "Red Hall Top" on Ordinance Survey maps, which is an area of land kept clear of development, allowing views across the valley. This was marked as Viewpoint 25 on the map they had at the Consultation, but the photos were missing at the Consultation meeting. I was assured that the photos from that viewpoint were on their website, but there were no photos on there from that viewpoint, and the website has now been taken down. I have to also say that all the viewpoint photographs they did have on their website were all taken at heights and directions sympathetic to the developer's objectives.

This viewpoint is of significance as the protected views have been referenced in planning applications with Hinckley & Bosworth Council, who have rejected submissions to protect the viewpoint. It is also very similar to the outlook from all the houses on the south side of [REDACTED] at ground level. This is amplified when viewed from the second storey bedrooms of our homes, and we will look straight across at the proposed development.

We raised our concerns about the visual impact at the Consultations, to which we were told there would be some saplings planted to screen the development. I asked why couldn't they use mature trees, as we couldn't wait 20 years for them to grow and mature. The answer to this is cost only, as while mature trees are harder to establish than saplings, with the right maintenance program they can be successful.

We were very concerned about the light pollution from the site, and had a quite detailed conversation about the lighting direction, and the sensors used to switch the lights on and off during the night. From that conversation it confirmed our fears that the measures taken to reduce light pollution vertically into the night sky, will not mitigate against the light pollution we will experience due the relative height of the proposed site. In addition the sensors switching on the lights will mean that that lights will be turning on and off all night, every night, visible directly from our bedroom windows. These are obviously just the lights that will be installed when the development is operational, there will be no such measures in place during construction, with large floodlights likely to be used throughout the construction phase of the project.

I also believe that from an environmental point of view, any light pollution in this area will have significant consequences. This is a rural area which is extremely dark at night, giving clear viewing of

the night sky, and allowing wildlife to follow their natural instincts. There are many species of nocturnal animals that we have observed near our property, including bats, badgers and several species of owls, of which it could be expected that there are many more in the surrounding area.

In conclusion, this is the wrong development, in the wrong location, being pushed by a company that has shown little regard for the thoughts and feelings of a community throughout the process. Despite having their data and “benefits” discredited, with opposition from every council, MP and the majority of residents, they have blindly carried on with a project that only suits their interests. Even the businesses that they say will benefit from this project won’t even use it, so approving this project would be destroying valuable countryside for a white elephant, and I urge you to reject it.