



The countryside charity
Leicestershire

Charity Number: 1164985

HINCKLEY RAIL FREIGHT TERMINAL

Comments for deadline 6

CPRE Leicestershire

Unique Reference: 20038675

(With Sapcote Parish Council (UR 20039514))

February 2024

Appendix: Roseacre Decision (Extract)



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Mrs Charlotte Dyer
Herbert Smith Freehills LLP
Exchange House
Primrose Street
London
EC2A ECG

Our Ref: **APP/Q2371/W/15/3134386**
APP/Q2371/W/15/3130923
APP/Q2371/W/15/3134385
APP/Q2371/W/15/3130924

6 October 2016

Dear Mrs Dyer

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78

APPEAL A: APPEAL MADE BY CUADRILLA BOWLAND LIMITED

**EXPLORATION SITE ON LAND THAT FORMS PART OF PLUMPTON HALL FARM,
WEST OF THE FARM BUILDINGS, NORTH OF PRESTON NEW ROAD, OFF PRESTON
NEW ROAD, PRESTON, LANCASHIRE APPLICATION REF: LCC/2014/0096**

APPEAL B: APPEAL MADE BY CUADRILLA BOWLAND LIMITED

**MONITORING SITE LOCATIONS IN A 4KM RADIUS OF THE PROPOSED PRESTON
NEW ROAD EXPLORATION SITE, NEAR LITTLE PLUMPTON, PRESTON,
LANCASHIRE APPLICATION REF: LCC/2014/0097**

APPEAL C: APPEAL MADE BY CUADRILLA ELSWICK LIMITED

**EXPLORATION SITE ON AGRICULTURAL LAND THAT FORMS PART OF ROSEACRE
HALL, TO THE WEST, NORTH AND EAST OF ROSEACRE WOOD AND LAND THAT
FORMS PART OF THE DEFENCE HIGH FREQUENCY COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE
(DHFCS) SITE BETWEEN ROSEACRE ROAD AND INSKIP ROAD, OFF ROSEACRE
ROAD AND INSKIP ROAD, ROSEACRE AND WHARLES, PRESTON, LANCASHIRE
APPLICATION REF: LCC/2014/0101**

**APPEAL D: APPEAL MADE BY CUADRILLA ELSWICK LIMITED MONITORING SITE
LOCATIONS IN A 4KM RADIUS OF THE PROPOSED ROSEACRE WOOD
EXPLORATION SITE, OFF ROSEACRE ROAD AND INSKIP ROAD, ROSEACRE AND
WHARLES, PRESTON, LANCASHIRE APPLICATION REF: LCC/2014/0102**

Conclusions Highway Safety and Traffic issues – RWEW Appeal C

12.498 The Risk Assessments provided by RAG and LCC do not take account of the duration of the traffic flows. Nonetheless, they do identify inherent physical deficiencies in the preferred route that would have obvious implications for highway safety. Those concerns have not been adequately addressed by the proposed mitigation. Although historically the accident record has not given cause for concern, the prospect of accidents occurring in the future must be considered in the light of the the nature and volume of the traffic which it is proposed to introduce, and the potential for conflict between road users that would arise with this new situation.

12.499 Whilst the actual duration of the highest HGV flows would be relatively short, the volume and percentage increases in HGV traffic, in particular the OGV2 vehicles, that would arise at those times would be high. This, combined with the deficiencies of the route, would be likely to result in a real and unacceptable risk to the safety of people using the public highway,

including vulnerable road users. The selected route is therefore unsuitable for its intended purpose.

12.500 In the absence of satisfactory mitigation measures, I am unable to conclude that the use of the preferred route would represent a safe and sustainable approach. The proposed development would have a serious and very significant adverse impact on the safety of people using the public highway. The demonstrable harm that would result has not been eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level. The development would not be in accordance with JLMWLP Policy DM2 or CS Policy CS5. Safe and suitable access to the site would not be achieved and the proposed improvements would not be effective in limiting the significant impacts of the development. I conclude that the residual cumulative impacts of development would be severe and the scheme would be contrary to para 32 of the NPPF.