

**From:** [REDACTED]  
[Hinckley SRFI](#)  
**Subject:** Comments re new submissions by applicant Dec 2024  
**Date:** 06 February 2025 21:23:46

---

Please find attached my comments :-

M B Lees UID 20039615

Thanks

The conclusion from the examination was “not to approve” after arguments about the calculated noise in the site operation on the surrounding rural area and leisure facilities. The design of this site puts all the noisy elements on the outside of the warehouses with their noise reflective metal walls. All this directly facing existing residential properties. Sitting at the height of the rail, embankment, level ( 2 to 3 metres above natural ground level) the detail arguments on noise calculations seem to miss the obvious point – it is noisier than it needs to be for the surrounding residential areas. On a different site the noise could be easily attenuated by the surrounding warehouses, but unfortunately this is the wrong site for such a layout.

A claim was made that “wind direction” effects were already included in the calculations presented. This area does have road noise, but the wind obviously has a direction, and here it is always a plus and minus effect arising from the different locations of the noise sources. The Proposed development is a new point on the compass of 24/7 noise, so the actual effect on each house and location is not a simple comparison of any original and calculated noise source simply “increased for wind” ?

Tritax have made no response to my detail submissions to the examination :-

1. ISO 9613-2 appears to be for “pure tone” noise calculation. I do not agree with the applicant's decision that loading/unloading containers be considered a “continuous noise”. Certainly not watching and listening to the Maritime operation at EM Gateway, with stop/start driving and stacker truck horn signals to the lorry drivers. No mention of this in the noise calculations for this proposal ?
2. This proposal requires 2,338,266 cu metres of ground movement to create a level site up to 9 metres below existing ground levels. The Project CO2 calculation is based on this “cut” being used as “fill” within the site. The area has a history of “bad ground”. I asked if there had been any confirmation of suitability of this material. Several ground investigation boreholes were made within the site shortly after the date of this question, but no reference to this in the applicants latest submission. Results ?

The examination did not include any of the commercially sensitive, or competition type details on the current operation levels of the three close by Railfreight Terminals and the effect of Northampton Gateway, which is still to begin rail operation. I can say that on my daily observation (webcam) of the existing container traffic, particularly in the usual peak November (Christmas stockup) period the trains were not fully loaded. You will presumably have your own figures (from Network Rail) on how many of the agreed rail paths are actually being used in any set period.

In the immediate future there is also the effect of :-

1. Croft Quarry new “inert waste fill” rail

operation

2. Croft Quarry future use after fill is completed

Surely a progression to a rail terminal in one form or another ?

The applicants most recent response accepts the document changes highlighted through the examination, but has not changed the major negative effects identified and considered through the examination process. Earlier planning approvals raised as justification.. Not sure why past history and decisions should ever apply here ?

I thought the purpose of the examination was to highlight the pros and cons of each individual proposal at that particular site and for that particular purpose. This is the wrong site, with unproven need for the immediate future. Development funds would be better spent within the more recent "golden triangle" of Sheffield, Doncaster and Leeds.