

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hinckley SRFI](#)
Subject: Tritax Symmetry - Hinckley - Interested Party Reference number: 20040928
Date: 06 January 2025 13:11:08

[REDACTED]

Good Afternoon

We write regarding the proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange development and the Planning Inspectorate's recent report highlighting significant concerns about the project.

Why has this not already been rejected in full, considering the impacts that Tritax Symmetry admit to? The new mitigation for minor roads in the area will do nothing to alleviate the underlying issues, as the villages (Sapcote) cannot be made suitable for HGVs.

The A5 already has a bottleneck in the Hinckley area, both at the A47 junction and the M69 Island. This bottleneck often results in traffic diversions through Hinckley and Nuneaton. With current infrastructure there is a limit to what can be done to mitigate against this.

With regards to benefits quoted, ie providing employment, there is not a shortage of this type of work in the area and a lot of this work is currently being done by people travelling into the area, adding additional strain on the road system.

There is the question of need, with other facilities in nearby locations, (Crick, Rugby, Tamworth).

We have limited access in the area to green space, as we are rapidly being overtaken by warehouse facilities and additional housing. The impact on Burbage Common would be devastating. This would have a severe knock on effect on people's mental and physical health.

Concerns regarding flooding on very wet ground. This could cause flooding to the local area.

As the previous Planning Inspectorate was minded to refuse the application and only insubstantial changes have been made to the plan, there is no reason to now approve this or push it for further review. It should be rejected in full. This facility is simply not required or suitable for this location.

Regards

Natalie and Stephen Waddle

[REDACTED]