

Dear Secretary of State for Transport,

Our group, which has been involved with this proposal from the start, would urge you to accept the Planning Inspectorate's recommendation and REFUSE the proposed Hinckley NRFI.

The scheme is overwhelmingly opposed by residents, councillors and our two local MPs and will have a <u>devastating impact on Hinckley and the surrounding villages.</u>

Our objections to the proposal are based on 3 major areas of concern:-

- 1 LACK OF JUSTIFICATION FOR A SRFI IN THIS AREA
- 2 HIGHWAYS IMPACT AND LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT SUCH A MASSIVE DEVELOPMENT
- 3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Lack of justification.

Tritax have failed to identify the businesses, manufacturers, supermarket chains or logistic companies that justifies this project.

When challenged at the public consultation, the representative admitted that they had no customers. This is a speculative project.

Many alternative Road Freight logistic parks and Rail Freight Intermodal options are available in the area, including Magna Park at Lutterworth, only 9 miles away, the largest logistics park in the country and the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT) - only 14 miles from Hinckley, amongst many others.

Tritax claim that the benefits of the development outweigh the impact on local residents.

The residents are 100% sure that the impact of this development on Hinckley and the surrounding villages will far outweigh any benefits.

The benefits claimed must be challenged since it appears Tritax are being disingenuous with the facts. Tritax PEIR Non Technical Summary states:-

"The assessment assumes that approximately 70% of the occupiers at the HRFI would be relocated from existing, lower quality storage and distribution premises in the LLEP area"

Not only does this indicate that there is NOT a requirement driven by local demand, but also that 70% of the employment gains at HRFI would be at the expense of job losses elsewhere in the Leicestershire area. At best, only 30% would be new jobs, drastically reducing the benefits claimed.

Although Tritax headline the 8,400 jobs, the new on site jobs available for residents of the study area would be around 2,500 at full occupancy, based purely on simply ratio numbers per square metre. The real numbers would depend on the occupiers and the ever increasing automation in warehousing and material handling. However, Hinckley is an area of low unemployment and it is likely that these vacancies would have to be filled from outside the area, with the additional worker movements further adding to the highways problem.

Highways Impact

This is an overwhelming concern to LRRG members and the community.

The developer's public consultation was considered by most attendees to be inadequate, with no information being available on the likely impact on the road network. This remains the case.

The traffic modelling that was carried out by Tritax is completely incomprehensible to most people.

It does not require modelling, however, for the residents of Hinckley and the surrounding areas to realise that 9,000 HGV and 8,400 worker movements per day, will have a catastrophic impact on traffic flow. Mitigations tabled by Tritax are unlikely to significantly affect this.

It is hard for Tritax to argue, since they have no customers, so they do not know where HGVs will be coming from or leaving to. Drivers are known to take the shortest/quickest routes and this is likely to have a major impact on Hinckley and the surrounding villages. At busy times, most of the major roads and some of the minor roads are heavily congested with stationary traffic. Adding massive additional HGV to this, will make the situation totally intolerable.

Environmental Impact

Although Tritax claim that all units will be zero carbon during construction, no assessment appears to be made of how many tons of carbon will be produced by the 4,500 HGVs , 8,400 worker movements and 16 diesel trains per day, seven days a week.

The level of pollution is likely to be significant and is adjacent to Hinckley's only and much loved country park - Burbage Common.

In addition to the emissions pollution, the group has major concerns regarding noise and light pollution, 24/7, 365 days per year, affecting the common, which will have an adverse impact on wildlife and visitors to the park.

Conclusions

- Tritax have not demonstrated the need for this SRFI.
- Both rail and road capacity exists at many major local hubs.
- This is primarily a road logistics site. It is not known how much of the rail capacity might be used, but there is no commitment to any level.
- The road network in Hinckley and the surrounding villages will not cope with the traffic forecast, even with mitigations, leading to severe congestion and round the clock noise and traffic pollution.
- The development will have a major environmental impact on both the neighbouring villages and Burbage Common
- The proposed HNRFI offers no significant benefits to the residents of Hinckley and the surrounding areas, which have very low levels of unemployment, but inflicts on it all the damaging consequences above.

In summary, we would ask you to support the findings of Planning Inspectorate, not overrule our community and turn down the proposed Hinckley NRFI.

Thank you for your time.