

TRANSCRIPTION_OFH1_Session1_30102023

Tue, Oct 31, 2023 8:39AM • 49:08

00:06

Good evening, everybody. It's now six o'clock and it's time for this hearing. To begin, I would like you to welcome all to this open floor hearing for the Hinkley National Rail Interchange project. Can I just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly? Good. Can I also confirm with the case team that the live streaming and recording event has also commenced? Yes, thank you. Right. My name is Ronnie Jackson and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm now going to ask my other panel fellow panel members to introduce themselves.

00:48

My name is grim sword.

00:50

I'd been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the panel to examine this application.

00:58

Good evening, my name is Matthew heron, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel to examine this application.

01:05

Thank you very much. Together we constitute the examining authority of this application. Mr. Harun is going to lead today's hearing so I will hand over to him.

01:16

Thank you, Mr. Jackson. I'll deal first with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Can everybody please set all devices and phones including smartwatches to Silent The toilets are out of this room on your left and along the corridor. And there are no planned fire drills today. So if the alarm goes off, please treat it as a real emergency and follow the green emergency exit signs to the muster point outside in the carpark. So this meeting will follow the agenda published on the national infrastructure planning website on the 23rd of October 2023 examination Library Reference en V five hyphen double 01. The agenda is for guidance only. And we may add other considerations or issues as we progress. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made. Today's hearing is being undertaken in a blended way, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue. And some of you are joining us virtually using Microsoft Teams. And we will make sure that however you have decided to join today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate. A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the Hinkley national rail freight interchange section of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing has

finished. And a transcript will also be made available with her which will utilize AI technology. So we're going to ask you to come up to the table this one before us at the front here to say your piece to us to ensure the recording is as good as it can be. Please ensure that you speak clearly into the microphone, stating your name and who you are representing. The microphones are simply operated by turning the button on the right hand side on and off. A link to the planning Inspectorate previously notice was provided in the notification for this hearing. We assume that everybody here today has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how personal data of the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Please speak to Emily Davis, if you have any queries about this. If you don't wish to have your image recorded or broadcasted on the live stream, please let us miss Mrs. Davis, or Mr. Parker now, and we asked the production company to display a different image. Please note we do need to record your speaking as this is part of the formal record of the hearing. are reminded that if you wish to speak wish to ask any questions outside of the scope of this meeting, then the aforementioned Emily Davis and Stephen Parker, are the people you should approach. These are at the rear of the room, I believe. I would ask that you not speak directly to any of the examining authority panel in the interest of fairness and impartiality. Before we come to the main business off today, can I just have a quick word about the hearings this week. All those up to and including Thursday. That is the second open floor hearing on Thursday morning. The three issues specific hearings tomorrow and Wednesday and the compulsory acquisition hearing on Thursday afternoon will be hand held in this blended form and thus you will be able to attend if you wish to. However the issue specific hearing on Friday morning and the on the draft development consent order will be entirely online. There will be no nowhere here to attend and watch. If you were anticipating coming to speak, then please have a chat with either Emily Davis or Stephen Parker so they can sort you out with the relevant Microsoft Teams link. Alternatively, you will be able to watch the hearing live on the internet. As with all hearings, the live stream can be linked to from the National Infrastructure webpage. So moving to agenda item two, which is the purpose of this open floor hearing. This is an open floor hearing and it does not have a subject matter control agenda. This means that you can bring up any matter arising from the application that is also important and relevant to the decision taken under the Planning Act 2008. If you bring up matters that are not important and relevant, I will interject briefly to explain this and may ask you to move on. However, in general terms, your time in this hearing is your own to say what you wish. The convention that has evolved for open floor hearings and national infrastructure is that inspector of the inspector here is anyone who has written in and requested to be heard first, and then has his other interested parties who have attended and requested to be heard on the day. We will invite two parties to speak based on the order on my list, which we'll come to in a minute. all interested parties who wish to make oral representations or have been invited to attend and participate in this hearing if they wish. Participation is subject to the control. To my power to control this hearing, sorry. Right, we have set different speaking times for different people. These include three minutes for individual interested parties, five minutes where one interested party speaks on behalf of a number of interested parties, and eight minutes for membership organizations and formal groups. This is a standard rule used in most open floor hearings to ensure that if lots of people attend the available time is divided fairly between speakers. However, please note that if we have questions which arise during your submission, or we put questions to the applicant during your submission, we will stop the clock. So yes, we will be timing you. The the time spent responding to these or hearing the applicants response will not count against your speaking time limit. For those who have three minutes, we will advise you when there are 30 seconds to go. For those with

either five or eight minutes, we will let you know when there is around 60 seconds to go. So we've made provision for a further open floor hearing on Thursday morning. But please note that we only intend to allow you to speak once and not at both open floor hearings. However, if sorry, if having left today, you feel that you have missed something. The opportunity is there to allow us to follow up your submissions in writing at deadline three. And this is Tuesday the 14th of November. The applicant will be given the opportunity to respond to comments made today at the end of the hearing. There is no obligation for it to do so. And it can also respond in writing at deadline three on as I mentioned 14th of November. So moving to Agenda Item three, I'm now going to run through those who have asked to speak today and this will be in the order that we will hear them I will also say that the time that we think you should have. So if you feel that we have got it wrong. When you get to your time please let us know we won't count any of that against you and your your speaking allocation so we have Terrence Richardson the leader of Blaby District Council, which will give five minutes there is Josie Blackburn of Sackett Paris County Council. We will give three minutes of Morgan Sackett parish council, another three minutes. Gerald Kells subcut Paris Council, we will give three minutes if you wish to speak. Councillor David Bill Burbidge parish council, we will give five minutes to speak. Becky Roper of onslaught parish council, we will give three minutes. Counselor Paul Williams, we will get five minutes. Mr. Tim Russell, we will give three minutes. Richard Allen counselor for Earl Shilton, we will give five minutes, Mr. Catherine bass Alsop stands together, we will give five minutes, and those who have indicated that they may wish to speak including Shirley Elfi, Anthony Elfi, and Mary Louise show and we will give three minutes. So moving to agenda item four. Can I therefore please ask Terrot Terrence Richardson to move to the front. Thank you.

09:39

Thank you chair. I originally spoke to this committee back on the 12th of September on the first day of the examination. And quite frankly, I don't think we've moved on much since then. The paucity of information which has still come out of tritec symmetry is staggering. Now, I'm a councillor for the reason I believe in democracy. And any procedure must be seen to be fair, and it must be seen to be open, and it must be seen to be democratic. And certainly that was outlined in Nolan principles many years ago. And clearly, that is not the case here, in that in order for residents, businesses, listed bodies to actually make their objections or make their points of view as the case may be, they need to have the information on which to make those points. And that clearly hasn't been forthcoming. I mean, as a council, we put forward our views on the the adequacy of the consultation, and clearly it was found to be wanted. Now, I appreciate that the first time I spoke you'd received information the night before, which I know you weren't to amuse with a notice further information has come in which none of us have really had the time to go through. Information such as on novel crossing, which I know is a major point has come in which shows the original information put forward has been refuted by the own applicant themselves, to find the stand it correctly. And of course, they did all those things during the yet another half term week, something I mentioned to this committee when you visited now overcrossing that you did in the school holidays, which seems rather strange time to do it. So I feel there's no option really, but to ask yourselves under the infrastructure plan, examination procedure, rules, 2010 rule 17, to actually put in place a timescale for the applicant to provide the information which everybody who wants to comment on can then do to do otherwise, actually, is to take away people's democratic rights to actually come to this committee and present their views either for or against, otherwise. And if we go in to do this sort of thing, it must be democratic. And clearly, from the Secretary of State's point of view,

one would hope he would want to know that residents have been given the chance to actually be consulted. Now, it was interesting actually fact that I do have a supporter in this. My views on this in trying to tax symmetry free themselves. And while they may not know it, but I was reading their website today. And it says, quote, unquote, over the past few years, we've undertaken three rounds, consultation, issue 1000s, of letters to local communities, held multiple face to face meetings, and spoken with businesses, politicians and vulnerable groups. Yes, they have spoken to them. But my understand is a consultation. It's a two way process. And therefore you can't consult with someone unless if you asked him for information. They don't have it or you don't get it. I'm still waiting for information I requested in excess of two years ago, to come back from tritec symmetry, which still hasn't. But the key I think, to try to act symmetries position on this is the last sentence. It says as a result, we've amended the plans and will continue ensuring that the voices of local residents are heard. So trying to tax themselves actually would surely welcome a long pole was to get all of the information available out to residents, because that's what they themselves, say on their own website. So at least try attacks our support, in my view, that this is a flawed process, the information hasn't come out residents haven't been given the adequacy of information to consult on and to actually put their views forward sensibly. And it is a completely undemocratic process, which residents will not be able to buy into because they won't have had that opportunity and if nothing else, when I studied English law, citizens of this country had the right to the second side, citizens of this country had the right to understand what was being presented to them and the opportunity to port forward and comments. That has not been done. And I would urge this committee, as I know you probably already have account size to vote rule 17 Thank you.

14:07

Thank you may please now hear from Josie Blackburn subcut parish council, thank you.

14:34

Could I just request that my colleagues from Sackett parish council also joined me at this time? Is that okay? Yes. Thank you.

15:01

So we have actually prepared something together and Mr. Morgan will be speaking who is our Chair of our parish council in

15:09

evening. So one of the things we wanted to point out from a parish council perspective we wanted to allude to appendix one of our submission, which is the new bus stop zebra crossing right in the center of the village. That's where our local shops are. That's where the children of all the schools congregate the to get their buses is the sort of the main trail through to the local primary school. I wanted to get your thoughts on on the submission and the mitigation that has been proposed in that area that you'll you'll know the roads are less than six meters wide in three or four places throughout the bends around there. The lorries under the ATVs under the vehicles buses, they have to use pavement as it as it stands to get from point A to point B and around the center of the village. As it stands according to table 8.19 of the environmental statement chapter of transport. If the model is correct, with the use of them the new juncture of the M 69. It would still put an additional 400 HGVs through the village

16:31

to load on that I think it's up to about 400 bigger than that

16:40

so around 400 additional HGVs currently the we have a lower interest rate in school go through the village two or three times a day various buses we would the amount of HTV traffic that goes through the village at the moment and additional up to or up to an additional 400 Will will put us in a bit of a standstill if I'm honest

17:09

in addition to the mitigation that's been submitted the bus stop is directly opposite a residential entrance of which any residents exiting their road there there's already mirrors reflective mirrors in place so they can see oncoming traffic or traffic to the right community from the MCC nine my so they already can't get out of their road. So to put a bus stop directly outside of their access or their exit from their road is I don't think that's been looked at with a any due diligence has been completed when that's been put in place. 30 seconds left

17:57

I'm not sure any anything's been any case when given to cyclists in the village. I know Sackett as a village and surrounding areas, there's a lot of keen cyclists. So one of the things you wanted to look at was the wisdom mitigation for road cyclists in the village. There wasn't you want to you're gonna pick a piece of that. And then to just to finish off what I did receive a question for Mr. Nick Payne, who asked if we would like teams or a face to face meeting we did request a face to face meeting we were told that they would get back to us in due course some time has passed now and we've heard nothing back from Mr. Nick Payne to it although we haven't been given that opportunity yet to speak to them face to face.

18:45

Just asked Mr. Payne is from the applicant is it gives us the name that it needs

18:51

to get paid for on tryouts actually. Thank you. Yeah, I think we've I think mines done, isn't it?

19:04

Thank you, sir. My name is Gerald Kells, and I'm a consultant, I've been advising that coat as well as CPRE. You will hear some more from us. For me tomorrow, I suspect with CPRA. But Satco were keen to, for me to say my concerns about the information that we have in regard to SAP count the traffic data, the lack of information on pedestrian movements, cycling movements, and therefore very simply the question as to whether the NPPF test of faith and suitable access can be assessed and whether we are in a position or Fatcow Council we're in a position to have the information that was needed to properly respond to this application. So that those are the concerns that they are meet with breath. You will hear some more from me about cycling and other things. I suspect tomorrow, I would just add one other point sabko parish council may made clear to me that they were not consulted about the

mitigation. And that no, there was no discussion with them about whether this mitigation was appropriate for the addition of 300 HGVs a day. Thank you

20:40

I will hold all three of you now done with with lovely, thank you very much

20:57

thank you if we could have Councillor David bill, please.

21:20

Could you press

21:20

the mic please? Thank you.

21:23

Right. That better? Right. I speak as Chairman of Burbidge parish council, and I am also a former borough councillor, and a present serving member of the Leicestershire county council. I have been involved with this proposal for about five years. The first point I want to make is that I come from a railway background and need no persuasion about the benefits of rail freight. My severe doubts about this proposed location is that it is not on the West Coast Main Line and will thus have no easy connection to London and the South Coast. Despite earlier assertions, there are no immediate plans to improve connections at Leicester or at none Eaton. The site has clearly be chosen as it is close to the convergence of motorways, it is less clearly a road based project. Second point I wanted to make is that there has been a total lack of adequate public consultation. As earlier speakers have confirmed. Many questions will put at the public events, but no adequate answers were received. The fact that answers to the points raised in representations were only made available on Friday is testament to the rejection of any attempt to engage with the public or indeed public authorities. Thirdly, of immense concern to me, in my various roles has been the failure on the part of the proposers to agree outcomes with any of the highway authorities, we read in the documentation that there was an agreement on the message to be used. But it is clear that with the red, amber and green representations on the on the proposals that most of the proposals come out to be red or amber. The fact that there's been no agreement at all with any of the highway authorities makes it difficult for me to understand how they are we can proceed from this point. And this is now I do very much agree with my colleague, Councillor Terry Richardson on this point. Fourthly, a particular concern is that even if the submitted traffic impact information is acceptable. There is no mention of the fact that at least once a week, there are serious accidents on the M one the M 69. And the a five accidents which often result in total road closures for considerable periods of time. To give one example, if and when the M 69 southbound is blocked. HGV traffic exiting this site will use local and inadequate roads through Burbidge to access a five southbound to Magna Park. You hope you will appreciate that the residents in Burbidge have got serious concerns should and should have serious concerns about this impact. And lastly, as we stated in our written submission verbage parish council has to be concerned about the potential accumulative impact of this site taken together with all the other developments to the east of Burbidge. If this and all the other proposed developments proceed, there will be continual development from Earl Shilton through to

shapcott and Stoney Stanton the countryside and farmland 60 seconds left and thank you that the countryside and farmland which are so much part of the local scene will be gone forever

25:52

Thank you can we please have her back Eropa um, so parish council

26:04

like to All right, if our chair joins me, as well please. Yes, there's

26:18

I'm Becky Raipur on behalf of salt parish council. My left here is Tony Greenwood. He's our chair. I will be speaking representing the parish council this evening. I'm Sophie's village that stands to be affected by nearly every single area of concern raised with regards to this application. There are many issues that also parish council I have raised both to the applicant and to the examining authorities who are representations. Many of these issues are technical and tangible in nature, which we will visit further in the upcoming hearings this week. However, this evening, there's a more human side that we should like to raise on behalf of our village. The effect of the H notify application on the mental health and well being of the residents of arms SORP has already been significant and noticeable. Residents are stressed, worried, depressed and incredibly anxious of what is to come above average, our homes, our livelihoods and the surrounding areas. We all have genuine and serious concerns about living with both construction and operational disruptions and the resulting effects of those of us within the village. Not only is our way of life now endangered but there is a very real possibility of an assault being physically separated from our beloved Burbidge common and restricted from access to essential services during construction, such as our children's primary school and our doctor's surgery. This is an entire village of people who stand to have their lives irreversibly altered in a very detrimental way. And we sincerely ask that the examining authority takes this into consideration with the weights that these people our people deserve. We are real people and this will crush our community. Thank you

28:16

Thank you terms of interested parties. I note that Barbara Lee's had mentioned that she may wish to speak I didn't mention it at the beginning. Would you like to come up now? For three minutes?

28:48

Oh, yeah. Good evening. My name is Barbara Lee's I have lived in ELMS Thorpe for 32 years. I'm very upset and dismayed as Becky has just mentioned about this development situated immediately adjacent to Burbidge common and woods and an asset which is an SSSI. I believe that when this proposal was first suggested that the looked at the local plans for Leicestershire, the Leicester and Leicestershire partnership, who suggested that Southwest Leicestershire was in need of more development of this nature. Since that was published, which was 20. Before 2014 There has been an additional development of both Magna Park North Magna Park South and Hinkley Park, which has seen the loss of more than 1000 acres of agricultural farmland. This landscape surrounding Burbidge common is the only agricultural landscape that it faces onto this will be lost forever. Together with the footpath that go round it the bridle ways and access for people walking, both from ELMS thought Farwell, Earl Shilton and other surrounding villages and towns, there will be no of aspect where it will

not be viewed from I feel in the surrounding area because of the topography of the landscape. A more recent publication by the Leicester Leicestershire economic, economic plan 2021 To 2030 has mentioned the importance of agriculture to Leicestershire and the fact that nearly 48,000 people are employed in agriculture is specifically mentioned in a separate publication of 2021 for important local producers in Leicestershire, which includes Woodhouse farm, Tamworth pigs, which will be lost with this development. This is mentioned alongside such well known names as Stilton long Clawson. Stillson I think the safety also needs to be considered of the siting of the lorry parks so close to ELMS thought plantation and the attendant risks that there will be from that in terms of human waste being left in the surrounding areas. Despite the fact that there will be facilities there it is well documented that this is a problem around dedicated lorry parks. I also would like to say that I felt the consultation was flawed. The the letters that were distributed were often illegible with the keys to the maps that could not be read. I brought this up on two occasions and had no response. My mother who was 98 at the time, was unable to read the map or the key and I struggled to read it with a magnifying glass. I will hope to mention more about that. And okay, thank you. Thank you for listening.

32:23

Thank you, Councillor Williams, please.

32:39

Good evening. My name is Paul Williams and I'm a borough councillor for one of the two wards in Burbidge and also a Burbidge parish councillor. This thing this evening, I'm going to limit my comments to three topics, traffic site selection and need and the immunity impact. I believe it is important that we should make the point that these planning decisions are very much about the engagement of the public and the transparency of information, which is provided. Compared with a detailed planning legislation that underwrites the process for the decision. I consider the consultation carried out by the applicant to be flawed from the very outset. At the formal conservation consultation event in Burbidge. I expressed my concerns that the amount of traffic information that was being presented to the local community for them to understand the impacts was poor, and very difficult for the general public to understand. I emailed tritec symmetry explaining my concerns. But unfortunately, they replied to say that their system does not allow them to provide information at higher levels of details, and that the tables in the reports provided the necessary information. After this, the detailed application documents also fell short of this clarity. We heard at the preliminary meeting that the three highway authorities were not convinced the necessary modeling had been completed for this application. We therefore had incomplete modeling, on top of inadequate communication of the results of inadequate modeling. In the very short time, I've had to review the comments from tritec in their deadline to response there again falling back on the information is in the tables and answer which does not chime with my experience. This approach this proposal has been very long time in preparation, which means any report that has been prepared during that period makes reference to the fact that a rail terminal is proposed at Hinkley. It is without doubt that the booming in warehousing will force the market to need more warehousing. However the applicant is quoted these report references to the need rather than evidencing actual low little commercial specific need. We should all recognize that local infrastructure requires local sacrifice but we do not believe the need has been proven that this site meets that requirement. And the site selection document, hardly any weight was given to the harm of the neighboring immunity or Burbidge common woods. In 1847, the less than Mercury heading was the road down staking laid leads to

Burbidge common and wood, it is one of the most sequestered and most romantic and in charting in the Midland counties. In 1929. The Lester mail ran the headline Hinkley beauty spot saved after a gift of land to the community by the Rotary Club in 1937. The Hinckley Rotary Club gifted further land as a coronation gift to the town for King George the sixth. I make these points to demonstrate how much long standing love there is for this area, which will be harmed by such a large industrial setting, immediately south east and east of the Burbidge common and woods. I understand that Burbidge covenant wood does not have the National Park status, but it is our beauty spot and its setting will be immeasurably harmed by this development. Try taxes not falling and on acknowledging the amenity value of the common in the application, and therefore any mitigation is equally diminished. The applicants community lose letter this summer spoke about a new 50 Acre Wood being proposed called Ingles bridge would this the seconds left appears to be a collection of left over parcels of land created as a result of the development rather than any specific designed perfect purpose for public benefit. Further, I could not even find a reference to engulf Bridgewood. In the environmental statement, I asked that the full social standing of the common Woods is taken into account, including the harm to the setting, and that the mitigation provoked is judged upon the full wake of this community value. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Tin birtwhistle. Thanks.

37:46

Thank you this might be brief. Can I raise a procedural issue or process issue? Going back to comments you made introductory times about attendance at these meetings? I haven't understood from all the documentation. We're only allowed one slot at Open Meetings. I thought I had registered to speak up both. I'm quite happy to speak at both. On the other hand, if you consider it will be unfair on those that have understood their documentation to say you couldn't I'm happy to cede my place now and return on Thursday to the second meeting.

38:21

Winter if you want to get up you I'm afraid you aren't doing you get the one slot in English you wanted on Thursday. That's absolutely fine.

38:28

rather do that as

38:36

Richard Allen, please.

38:46

Good evening. Thank you. I'm Councillor Richard Allen, chairman of our Shelton Town Council, Bergen County councillor for Oh, Shelton. Thank you for giving the opportunity to speak. I'd like to highlight the immense impact that this development would have on the residents of El shorten as well as neighboring communities. Should these proposals progress any further. In local planning guidance, we have policy dm 10, which includes consideration of adverse impact on neighboring community. I hope that this concept can be considered in circumstances such as these And the evening and overnight, trains traveling between Hinkley and Leicester can be heard quite clearly across all children. With 24/7 operation of a gigantic distribution facility, the additional noise and light pollution will be significant and

constant. The developer has suggested that this can be mitigated by planting really water forest of giant redwoods. I'm deeply concerned about the impacts of additional traffic on the local road network, including the AK 47 around On the eastern side of L. Shelton, which forms the perimeter of the proposed L. Shan, sustainable urban extension, which is up to 1600 new homes. I'd also like to express grave concern about the way the developers have approached this project, with a budget and blanket attitude from the start. This includes the miserable public consultation events, where the venues were too small to accommodate all of the residents who wish to view the proposals or make comments. This was a disaster that exacerbated by the inability of those staffing the events to provide any form of answers to the residents questions about their proposals. Most concerning, as is the developer's apparent reluctance to effectively engage with local agencies. Most notably, as has been mentioned, the local highways authority. The developers have addressed the county council and borough councillors. And on both occasions under questioning, they maintain that the highways assessments have been done, and that traffic will be reduced. It was therefore concerning when at the county council session, the head of the highways department felt completely compelled to intervene, advising members that the council had not at that point, even agreed to inputs to the traffic modeling with the developers, that alone completed any actual modeling. Given the developers own figures that around 90% of new traffic generated will be by road, which a crate equates to one HGV moment every 30 seconds, plus the traffic generated by those employed on site, which again, those numbers seem to vary week by week. This seems a shockingly cavalier attitude to the effects their development will have on 1000s of local residents for many years to come. I'd like to conclude by saying that I actually support proposals for such railfreight interchanges in appropriate locations. But this is not one of them. These reject this application. Thank you.

42:21

Thank you, councillor and Mrs. Catherine, her base please.

42:33

Thank you. I have a slight procedural question. I was wondering if I was able to talk because I'm still stands together on Thursday and as myself as an interested party as I live locally to the

42:44

affected party.

42:48

Will there be comparable issues or separate issues,

42:51

separate issues due to my localities? I live personally as opposed to the village I think on that basis then that would be except like I'd like to do that on Thursday then please. Okay.

43:11

So anybody else here or online who wishes to speak this evening?

43:21

We have 100 online.

43:23

Let's fill them all.

43:27

Thank you and good evening. And I do apologize. I had to miss the first 10 minutes so I'm only catching up. So if I may. This is a very brief statement. And it involves fundamentally the inadequate traffic modeling of the proposal and the applicants consistent avoidance of acceptance that their traffic modeling is insufficient and is not covering a wide enough geographic area. The geographic reach of consultation communication is fundamentally inadequate. I actually live in Whetstone which is outside their consultation area and it will be impacted by every extra minute that the neighbor station railway barrier is down. It is as simple as that we already have queuing every time the barriers down try to access suggested it will make no difference whatsoever that is simply incorrect. Not only will it to fit Whetstone all the south Leicestershire villages channel and funnel through very limited access to the Warren M 69 Four spark junction and that barrier is critical to the smooth ish flow of traffic already that we have. I am deeply concerned about the M one M 69 junction and the suggestion that it won't be impacted. The M one M 69 junction is already a nationally recognized pinch point by highways England to suggest anything else but it will not be impacted cannot possibly be correct, it will and it will be heavily impacted. We have unemployment, very low unemployment in the baby district area with workers, I understand for this development expected to be drawn from the wider Coventry area. And that basically suggests that we, the local residents that surround this appalling application and proposal will bear all the impact or the social impact or the traffic impact, and we will have no socio economic gain that I can conceivably Think of it this time. That's it, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

45:44

Thank you. Now, is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Okay, on that basis, I'll move to Agenda Item five. So as I indicated earlier, we will now give the applicant the opportunity to respond but wishes to do so.

45:59

I asked it.

46:10

Good evening, Peter Frampton from Frampton town planning, speaking on behalf of the applicant to che sh have listened to the contributions which have been made this evening. And we will consider whether further responses are justified in writing for deadline three. And clearly, the matters that have been ventilated this evening. A lot are to be addressed in the issue specific hearings later this week. But there is a point that I do wish to just respond to in this session. And that's the submissions made to you by Councillor Richardson and others have picked up on that theme. Try to access submitted an application for a DCO which has been accepted for determination. And a very extensive consultation support has been provided to the inspectorate for the USC exam examining authority to all the matters raised in the three consultation exercises. And we heard from Councillor Richardson on the 12th that the suggestion the application didn't include transport impact or mitigation of transport impacts. That is

with respect, not correct. There is mitigation proposals within the application. They are there for members of the public and other interested bodies to read and understand. We will no doubt in presenting our case tomorrow. Ventilate those matters further. Thank you.

47:50

Thank you. I'll now hand back to Mr. Jackson for agenda item six.

47:58

Thank you, everybody who has been here this evening for your contributions. If any of you wishes to follow up anything you have said that, for example, you read a script and wish just to have that script, then please let us have that by deadline three, which is the 14th of November. As I said earlier, there will be a another open floor hearing this Thursday morning. We look forward to see at least two people who have been here tonight on Thursday. And that's at 10 o'clock in this in this room. So that so there is that opportunity again. Now move on to item seven to sleep. Thank you again. There'll be an issue specific hearing tomorrow morning commencing at 10am I suspect last all day but starting at 10am on traffic and transport. And then the other issue specific hearings later on this week. The compulsory acquisition hearing on on Thursday afternoon. Thank you everybody for your attendance. This evenings overflow hearing is now close.