



The countryside charity  
Leicestershire

Charity Number: 1164985

---

## HINCKLEY RAIL FREIGHT TERMINAL

Comments for deadline 8

CPRE Leicestershire

Unique Reference: 20038675

(With Sapcote Parish Council (UR 20039514))

March 2024

---

### 1. Introduction

1.1 This note addresses submissions by Tritax to Deadline 7 related to the Route Management Strategy. It has been prepared jointly by CPRE Leicestershire and Sapcote Parish Council to address the specific issue of HGVs through villages.

1.2 We have already made comments in relation to the changes to the RMS (Revisions 12 and 13) so these comments need to be read in conjunction with our Deadline 6 and 7 response on those issues.

1.3 We would also ask the Inspectors to note that, in our view, none of these documents answer our key concerns.

1.4 Significant changes continue to be made at this late stage to the RMS and to the convoluted process of HGV management proposed by Tritax.

1.5 It gives us little confidence in how these measures will eventually be rolled out. We are not convinced that residents, who will suffer the impact of additional traffic, particularly HGVs, will have any effective means of securing meaningful mitigation if there are unacceptable impacts on their villages and communities.

## 2. Response to Deadline 7 submission

### ***Applicant's response to Deadline 6 Submissions [part 5-Non-Statutory Bodies] Document reference: 18.20 Revision: 01***

2.1 In response to our concerns about the ability of parish councils and others to address the issues of HGVs going through their villages the response to our Deadline 6 submissions explains that:

*2.11 on... Breach figures have been updated in the HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy submitted at Deadline 6 (document reference: 17.4D, REP6-015) and carried through to Deadline 7 (document reference: 17.4E). These were originally set according to percentages of the expected flows. However, this was not deemed onerous enough to deter drivers from the route. The revised figures are absolute and averaged across the three-month reporting period, though monitoring will enable focus on specific days, should multiple breaches be recorded.*

2.2 There still appears to be a reliance on average HGV figures, and it is unclear how much of the detailed monitoring will actually be shared with Parish Councils. It is also not clear to us why averages will in reality be more 'onerous'.

*2.17 on... The Travel Plan Co-ordinator will have responsibility for reporting to the local authorities in order to minimise the burden on the public purse. Contacts details for the Travel Plan Coordinator will be provided for local people and Parish Councils can express concern about HGVs. As above the document has been updated to confirm that copies of the reports will be provided to Parish Councils.*

2.3 It is unclear what will be done if Parish Councils express concerns to the Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC), especially if it relates to overall HGV increases. In reality, there may be little that can be done.

### ***HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy Report Prepared by: BWB Consulting Ltd Document reference: 17.E Revision: 14***

2.4 Turning to the revised RMS, the process is still opaque, (albeit, we had some difficulty matching this approach with the comments above from document 18.20.)

2.5 It appears copies of breach reports will only be provided in certain circumstances and will in the case of background HGVs in Sapcote will only provide overall average flow data for HGVs (as set out in Para 6.1), even though there may well be unacceptable spikes in overall HGV levels.

*6.1 These reports will be issued quarterly for the first year of occupation and annually thereafter for the duration of the HGV Strategy Steering Group. Reports*

*will be forwarded to Parish Councils if there is a breach in their Parish and Sapcote Parish Council for data on average HGV figures through their Parish.*

2.6 The RMS, as now written, does suggest in Para 6.60 that fines may be applied to repeated individual breaches by companies. These may be absorbed by the company if that is a preferable option, and they will be able to appeal these breaches presumably by providing a justification acceptable to the TPC.

*6.60 Then, Table 4 shows the suggested HNRFI daily breach thresholds for each site management stage. The thresholds apply to the whole 850,000sqm development and Stages 1 and 2 would be divided proportionately between individual occupiers based on net plot area. An example of this is provided in Table 5. The thresholds need to be breached on an averaged daily flow across the reporting period to be escalated to the next stage or in the event of cumulative breaches of 4 or more per occupier, then Stage 2 is triggered.*

2.7 However, it is also made clearer that the RMS itself will only be reviewed or mitigation considered, on the basis of average breaches, (Para 6.61).

*6.61 The daily breach thresholds in Table 4 apply to the whole development but would be divided proportionately between the individual unit occupiers based on net plot area for Stages 1 and 2. As previously mentioned Stage 3 triggers an assessment of the HGV Route Management Strategy and is not applicable for Occupiers as set out in paragraph 6.54. An example based on 95,225sqm unit on the illustrative masterplan is shown in Table 5 for the Pailton Route.*

2.8 Para 6.62 goes on to say that Parishes may be sent the breach reports only in specific circumstances.

*6.62 The TPC will issue details of all breach notifications in a HNRFI HGV Review report to the HGV Strategy Steering Group, which comprises the Developer, Site Management Company, Blaby District Council, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council Highway and Warwickshire County Council Highway Authorities on a quarterly basis from first occupation and annually thereafter for the. Reports will be forwarded to Parish Councils if there is a breach in their Parish, which will include a report for Sapcote Parish Council with data on average HGV figures through their Parish. Additional requests may be made by the local planning and highway authorities*

2.9 Para 6.58 explains that Parish Councils will not be on the steering group or involved in discussions on the RMS revision or measures. They will be 'consulted' when those measures are put forward.

*6.58 The assessment of the HGV Route Management Strategy will be undertaken by the TPC who will make suggestions of further measures and/or revision of the HGV Route Management Strategy. These will be agreed with the HGV Route Management Strategy Steering Group and Parish Councils will be consulted upon for any stage 3 mitigation measures proposed in their villages*

2.10 What remains clear to us is that the proposals will lead to significant traffic and HGV increases through Sapcote and other villages. Not all of this is directly from the development. A significant amount results the change to M69 Jn 2 slip roads. We still do not consider the mitigation proposed to deal with that is likely to resolve the issue.