

I have read the recent written submissions and still remain deeply concerned about the traffic data/modelling, particularly at the M69 Junction 3 and the A5 stretch of road past Hinckley. I am confused by the Applicant's response to the points I raised in my submission 5 about traffic data/ modelling: the Applicant states "all strategic models were agreed by the Transport Working Group" yet according to National Highways the final review of modelling outputs reports can only be possible once traffic input flows (relating to the PRTM and furnishing matters) are resolved.

In response to Leicestershire County Council's submission 6 regarding the M69/ J21 data the Applicant states "the modelling demonstrates the magnitude is negligible in both scenarios and whilst the junction operation is worse without the committed LUE improvements, the impact on queues and delay remains marginal. Hence, the impact is not considered to be 'severe', and it is maintained that highway mitigation is not justified". I cannot accept this view. There is already congestion at this junction during peak times, with frequent tailbacks on the M69. There will surely be an increase in traffic as a result of workers coming from and going to the HNRFI site through that junction, on top of the HGVs going in and out of the site. This is in addition to the increase in traffic numbers as a consequence of the housing developments that are planned in Burbage and other local areas. I only see potential chaos!

From what I can see the planned A47 Link Road will have minimal effect on alleviating any traffic congestion on the A5 and M69 highways. In all the discussions had so far regarding traffic volume I cannot see any other solution other than a massive investment by Tritax themselves, or the Government, to improve the M69 Junction 3 and a massive injection of cash to improve the A5. WITHOUT THESE BEING IN PLACE FIRST THIS DEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT PROCEED. Regarding the Construction Phase I was dismayed to read the Applicant has now changed the work times to Monday-Saturday 7 am- 7 pm (changed from 3 pm on a Saturday) with time beforehand and afterwards to prepare and review. Saturdays should not be included at all – surely local residents have a right to enjoy their gardens, a walk in Burbage Woods or the Common, without the incessant background noise of machinery? Our quality of life should not be reduced for the planned extended period of 8 years.

Regarding Noise and Vibration, I have read the British Standard BS5228 Part 1 and 2, the Control of Pollution Act (1974) and the Environment Protection Act (1990). I have also read much about the negative impact of Noise and Vibration on Health. It is becoming clear to me that Tritax are underestimating operational noise, and probably construction noise too. So I ask: is there a procedure to halt all operations should the works exceed the agreed parameters and mitigations? (eg the daily readings for noise, vibration, dust, air quality being higher than they should be). Or in other words what would happen if the data that Tritax has presented, in order to get the proposal agreed, is found to be incorrect once the construction work has begun, and when the site is operational?

Finally, as a lay person to this kind of application process I would like it noted that I have been astounded by the poor manner in which Tritax have represented themselves through the pre-application and the examination phases. I have followed the Examination Process to the best of my ability and Tritax Symmetry have come across as arrogant and dismissive when various elements of their application have been rightfully challenged. At times their attitude has appeared disdainful towards Interested Parties. On several occasions Tritax Symmetry have submitted their written responses late. They have sometimes ignored repeated requests for more information from Interested Parties, or only given partial pieces of information. In some instances, the Applicant has given the IPs little or no time to review, respond, suggest amendments to the Applicant's lengthy written submissions, or they seem to be asking an IP to sign an agreement where there has been no agreement. Much of their information appears lacking in detail, and to have been rushed through at the last minute in order to meet the deadline. In my opinion Tritax Symmetry have failed to participate in this Examination Process in a fair and transparent way.

I reiterate my view that this application should therefore be rejected.