Planning Inspertorate

313 Cebruary 2025.

Door Madam/Sii.

Re: Hinckley SRF1 Interested Perty Reference Number 20038287

I attach my comments on the additional information provided by the explicate of the RF.

I have attempted to send there by email but I'm now at our sure that I have sen successful: as not registerne as sent in my email account. And now seem to have borded! He document / computor. Since I am infemdial wat, - 50 center (e) and.

I hope this reaches you in time Could you please send an acknowledgement to my email.

Your Since ely

## **Hinckley SRFI**

\_Dear Madam/Sir,

Please find below — Comments on the additional information provided by the applicant as per the Secretary of State request of 10<sup>th</sup> December 2024 regarding Hinckley SRFI

- --- from Christine Phillips, -Interested Party reference Number 20038287
  - Secretary of State was mindful to refuse the application in September 2024 .But gave the applicant an opportunity to supply additional information to address safety and traffic concerns in Sapcote.

In the applicants additional information they still deny the extent of the impact this development will have on Sapcote. Their calculations of the volume of future traffic travelling through Sapcote are flawed; and contradicted by other reputable bodie's figures, contininuing to greatly underestimate the increase by opening up J2-M69 upon which this development is reliant. M69 was built without full opening of J2 because of the same safety and traffic concerns about Sapcote.( vehicle size and weight has increased since ) The applicant continues to ignore developments in neighbouring areas; considerably underestimating future traffic flow through the village - preferring to concentrate attention on the site 'rules of forbidden routes' and the link road between M69 and A47. Likely sources of extra traffic affecting Sapcote - Warehousing at Enderby and Broughton Astley, Narborough, Quarry lorries from Croft, , Cobley Transport, etc. And cars from fast growing housing provision - meeting Government Policy.

Greater threat to the safety of cyclists and pedestrians- particularly children and the elderly and poorer air quality. These concerns will not be resolved by the new measures proposed by the applicant:-

- 2) Applicant additional information Enhanced plan for Sapcote
- (i) New "narrow road" signage -

\_The village center has a junction,a tight S bend and the road narrows and narrow roads. The applicant plans to install V.A.S. warning signs to the east and west approaches to the village centre. Warning Signs already exist on both approaches to the center of Sapcote on the B 4669. Warning of narrow road ahead, and of bends with' vehicles in the middle of the road'+ junction. Clearly the applicant failed to notice in any site visit. Any additional signs will "clutter" this area and cause driver distraction at a critical point. The fact that the signs would be Large Vehicle Activated is irrelevant, and have proved to be ineffective elsewhere -(see LCC response to applicant's audit).

Additional signs are unnecessary and do not add to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

(ii) <u>New Road Markings</u> -designed to encourage large vehicles to "wait" for oncoming lorries to pass.

The applicant plans to relocate the bus stop from outside the Co-op to a proposed layby further along the verge (iv) outside an elderly persons sheltered accommodation and also t widen the pavement from the layby- to the existing zebra crossing to the west. This bus stop is primarily for school buses , which are usually older double deckers. These plans ostensibly enable the widening of pavement at the Co-op , prevent illegal parking at the current bus stop there and allow more room for school students to wait.

This proposal will not solve the safety or parking issues at the Co-op. It <u>will</u> increase air pollution in a predominantly elderly residential area ,attract different illegal car/van parking and, when occupied, block visibility for safe crossing on the existing zebra crossing used by families on the school run and stude alighting from the buses.

All of the applicant's "Enhanced plans for Sapcote "suggest that their main interest lays in easing the passage of HGVs through this rural village rather than providing any real solutions to the safey concerns. The applicant, by the\_continuous disregard for the safety of residents, considers Sapcote as acceptable` collateral damage` it seems.

## 3)Conclusion

Nothing in the applicant's additional information resolves the safety and traffic concerns around Sapcote expressed by the Examiners and the Secretary of State.( also by the MPs, Distict and Parish Councils for the area and me a lowly villager)

The applicant has put a great deal of effort into "tinkering" around the edges of previous plans and providing new, but minor, ineffective solutions; some of which are hazardous. They have provided a plethora of statistics intending to show that the plans will fulfill the mitigation requirements. They minimalise the increase in traffic through Sapcote and understate risks to pedestrians and cyclists.

The only viable solution is a Sapcote bypass.- the applicant has never proposed this despite the fact they have`afforded`a bypass to Hinckley, Burbage and Sharnford by the link road from M69 to A47- but never considered the same for Sapcote – the village which will be the most affected by this project.

I urge the Secretary of State to refuse this application.

I invite the Secretary of State to visit Sapcote to see it for herself.

Christine Phillips Sapcote resident. 3/2/2025