

From:



Subject:

Proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Terminal, PINS reference TR050007

Date:

22 August 2024 21:37:26

Re: The proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange; PINS reference TR050007

FAO: Louise Haigh MP, Secretary of State for Transport
cc: Alberto Costa, MP for South Leicestershire
22nd August 2024

Dear Ms Haigh,

First of all, congratulations on your appointment as Secretary of State for Transport.

I am writing both as a resident of Stoney Stanton, a village that would be greatly impacted by the proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI) development, and also as Chairman of the Stoney Stanton Action Group.

We are aware that the examination of this proposal by the Planning Inspectorate has finished, and that their Recommendation Report is now with you. We are also aware that you will make the final decision about whether the proposal is allowed to proceed or not.

We implore you to refuse permission for this proposal to go ahead, as it will have a major negative effect on our area in many ways without bringing any real benefit to the country.

The reasons for our objection have been raised with the Examining Authority. Issues raised include:

- Dramatically changing the nature of the whole area for the worse. The site will be at the centre of a small ring of 9 rural villages / hamlets / part of a market town. The inclusion of a major rail freight terminal and massive warehouse complex in this position will reduce the quality of life and peaceful enjoyment of the local countryside for an estimated 92,000 people.
- Traffic. To my knowledge the Examining Authority never gained an agreement from either National Highways or the Leicestershire Highways Authority that the proposal was acceptable. A multitude of traffic issues were raised during the Examination which did not seem to be resolved. For instance, even with all of the quoted modelling that took place, we cannot see how our local M69 roundabout could, in the peak hours, take traffic which equates to additional vehicles (above existing traffic) arriving at the roundabout every 2 seconds including an HGV every 7 seconds with consequential knock-on in our local villages and also at either end of the M69.
- The site is adjacent to a much loved beauty spot and also two SSSIs. Burbage Woods and Common are enjoyed by local people. What might not be said by many others is that there really aren't that many alternative beauty spots for local people to go to without recouring to car journeys or public transport. Placing a large industrial complex next to this accessible green area is the denial of a local resource and should not be allowed.
- Bio-diversity - of course much has been said about damage to the local ecology and bio-diversity. With respect to the local woods, which are designated SSSIs because of their ancient nature, any changes, especially to the water table - is likely to have a huge detrimental effect. If this proposal is allowed to proceed then the damage done will never be able to be repaired or adequately off-set.
- No need for the development. Great play has been made of the fact that this is on the East - West Felixstowe to Nuneaton (and Birmingham) line, however freight is already carried along that line to freight terminals in Birmingham and to the new East Midlands Gateway between Leicester, Nottingham and Derby - which is much better located with regards to road access, it is capable of expanding and would have a lower impact due to existing infrastructure.
- Our area is overcrowded with warehousing - e.g. Magna Park, DIRFT, many sites along the A5, Northampton Gateway, East Midlands Gateway, Prologis Coventry etc.. Concentrating warehousing in the centre of the country may benefit logistics companies but, along with the HNRFI proposal, this has the effect of concentrating huge amounts of HGVs in one area.
- The new NNNPS suggests other locations should be considered in order to develop a national network of sites: "...there remains a need for appropriately located SRFI across all regions to enable further

unlocking of benefits" (3.103)

- The often stated "reduction in HGV miles". Whereas there may be, in some respects a reduction, the applicant has made exaggerated claims (during consultation), claims that are double accounted (already claimed by other developments) and claims that are not backed up by any clear calculations - just numbers other people have used. The impact on our area will be to grossly increase the number of HGV miles to the detriment of most people living here.

We hope that you will take into account the opinions of all of the people living in this area - many of whom have lived here all their lives, all of the local and district councils and the county council, who also object to the proposal, when making your decision about this application.

Yours sincerely,

David Harrold



This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
