

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hinckley SRFI](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on Tritax additional information of 10th December 2024  
**Date:** 31 January 2025 15:23:33

---

My name is Bernard Yeomans with Interested Party ref. no. 20039408.

I agree with the Examining Authority that the HNRFI should be refused. This development would blight Hinckley and the local area to

the detriment of the population and wildlife.

I would like to raise the following points:

### **Traffic**

There will be a significant increase in traffic in the Hinckley and adjacent areas. The A5 even now suffers from major congestion, with

flow interruptions at the Longshoot junction, Dodwell's island and M69 island. No mitigation will sort this out since these are bottlenecks

due to existing East /West through traffic and local North/South local traffic.

Prohibited and advisory routes pertain to HGV vehicles. They will carry goods in bulk to and from the HNRFI. There must also be vehicles

that will distribute these goods from warehouses on the site. It can be expected that these will be LGV (up to 7.5t) and white vans which

will be free to pursue any convenient routes for quickest access to their destinations, leaving all roads in the area vulnerable to

increased volumes of traffic. As an example, in my own locale, Lychgate Lane is a perfect rat run from the A5, through Burbage and

Aston Flamville to the HNRFI. It has a 7.5t weight limit for part of its length, is narrow in places with two blind bends and terminates at a

busy crossroad in Burbage. It is used extensively by walkers, joggers, cyclists and a riding school with young riders in convoys of five or

so horses. The safety of all of these users will be seriously compromised by increased use by LGV's and white vans. Such a scenario

would not be untypical of many local lanes.

No alternative HGV routes have been declared in the event of any disruption to travel on the A5, M69, M1, or M6. I suspect this is because

these alternative routes will be on prohibited roads through Hinckley, Burbage and outlying villages such as Sapcote, Sharnford, Stoney

Stanton etc.No analysis is in the Tritax documentation.

The numerous and expensive mitigation proposals throughout the area suggest HNRFI site choice is flawed.

These mitigations are not solutions.

### **Pollution**

The increased volume of vehicles in the area, HGV's, LGV's, white vans and site workers cars will raise the levels of pollution to the detriment

of local people. There will not be a net reduction in pollution due to long distance travel being transferred to rail. It will just be transferred

to a local concentration. Electric vehicles might be suggested as a mitigation.Electric vehicles could also travel to and from ports to a variety

of inland destinations and would be equally viable, thus devaluing the HNRFI advantage.

### **Wildlife**

Wildlife in the UK is at serious risk due to human activity and increase in population. The flora and fauna in the proposed HNRFI area and

adjacent areas will be sacrificed by approving this development. The UK cannot afford to keep losing these pockets of natural habitat like

this one.

There is no mitigation that can solve this problem.

### **Jobs**

Tritax say 8000 jobs will be created. How so.No breakdown of job type or skill level has been given so cannot be challenged as a value

of benefit vs detriment of the proposed development.I understand modern warehousing is highly automated, so this figure of 8000 jobs

is suspect.

I hope the health and welfare of the people of Hinckley and the surrounding areas can be safeguarded against this monstrous development.

Best Regards,

BJY