

HSRFI Case team
Planning Inspectorate

3rd February 2025.

Dear Madam/Sir,

Re: Hinckley SRF1

Interested Party Reference Number 20038287

I attach my comments on the additional information provided by the applicant of HSRF1,

I have attempted to send these by email but I'm not at all sure that I have been successful: as not registering as 'sent' in my email account. And now seem to have 'locked' the document / computer, which I am unfamiliar with, so cannot resend.

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

Yours Sincerely,

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 10th December 2024 regarding Hinckley SRFI

--- from Christine Phillips, -Interested Party reference Number 20038287

- 1) 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, continuing 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) New Road Markings -designed to encourage large vehicles to"wait" for oncoming lorries to pass.

