

# HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

*Written summaries of speeches  
from Open Floor Hearings 1 and  
2 (ref. TR05007) on behalf of  
Councillor Terence Richardson  
(ref. 20038351).*

**Deadline 3 - November 14, 2023**

**Speech from Open Floor Hearing 1 - 30.11.2023**  
**Cllr Terry Richardson – Leader of Blaby District Council**

Thank you chair. I originally spoke to this committee back on the 12th of September on the first day of the examination. I don't think we've moved on much since then. The paucity of information which has still come out of Tritax Symmetry is staggering. I'm a Councillor for the reason I believe in democracy, any procedure must be seen to be fair, and it must be seen to be open, and it must be seen to be democratic. Certainly, that was outlined in Nolan principles many years ago. Clearly, that is not the case here, in order for residents, businesses, listed bodies to make their objections or to make their points of view, they need to have the information on which to make those points, and that hasn't been forthcoming.

As a Council, we put forward our views on the adequacy of consultation, which was found to be inadequate. I appreciate that the first time I addressed the committee you'd received information the night before, and since then we have had notice of further information, which has come in and none of us have had the time to go through it. Information for the Narborough Level Crossing, which is a major point, has come in which shows the original information put forward has been refuted by the Applicant themselves. The applicant did all those things during yet another half term week. This is something I mentioned previously to this committee, when you visit the Narborough Level Crossing, you did this during the school holidays, which seems a rather strange time to do it.

As such, I feel there's no option but to ask yourselves under the Infrastructure Planning, Examination Procedure Rules 2010 rule 17, to put in place a timescale for the applicant to provide the information, then everybody who wants to comment on the Proposed Development can then do so. It is people's democratic right to come to this committee and present their views either for or against. Otherwise, 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.

It was interesting that I actually do have a supporter in this. My views on this are reflected by Tritax Symmetry themselves. Whilst 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 of consultation, issued 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 understanding is that consultation is a two-way process, and therefore, you can't consult with someone unless you have all the information. The applicant doesn't and I'm still waiting for information I requested in excess of two years ago, to come back from Tritax Symmetry, which still hasn't.

The key I think to the Applicants 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. The Applicant themselves would surely welcome a long pause to

the examination process to allow them to get all of the information available to our residents, because that's what they themselves, say on their own website.

In my view, this is a flawed process, the information hasn't been provided and residents haven't been given the adequacy of information to put their views forward sensibly. It is a completely undemocratic process, which residents will not be able to buy into because they won't have had that opportunity. 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 put forward comments. Therefore, I would urge this committee to trigger Rule 17, thank you.

**Speech from Open Floor Hearing 2 – 02.11.2023**  
**Terry Richardson – County Councillor**

I have sat here for the last three days for almost every minute of these, and when I wasn't here, I was watching online. The bit I'd like to highlight is that this project has now been going on for some five or six years, and over the last three days, I think 50% of the questions and I haven't kept an accurate record, that have been directed to the applicant have not been answered, or the applicant has stated that they will get written information submitted in due course.

Regarding the discussion on the economy, nobody spends upwards of half a million pounds on a project without any idea of who's going to use it, etc. So soft marketing is not what happens in these cases. I spent 42 years working for a major bank, and I can tell you, that's not what happens on these areas.

So, we have heard from everybody, we've heard excellent presentations about the lack of information. I know that you said at the start, you can request the applicants come back on this. So, my question is quite simply, would the applicant like to explain why after five years, they do not have the appropriate information or a very large amount of it? And would they like to do the right thing and withdraw this application to save time, effort and the huge cost to the public purse? Thank you.