

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hinckley SRFI](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Response to Applicant's Submission of Further Information - IP Number 20040353  
**Date:** 06 February 2025 22:00:23

---

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Following the Applicant's submission in December 2024, we are writing to give our comments on the documents submitted.

We were pleased to read that the ExA and the Secretary of State were of the same view that the Hinckley NRFI application would have a Substantial adverse impact on the visual landscape of the area, the road safety of the surrounding villages (namely Sapcote), and would put the existing road network under significant pressure at the M1 J21/M69 J3 interchange. These were the 3 keys objections we made to the ExA over several deadlines, to Tritax in person at the public consultations, and were the foundations for our objection.

After careful reading of the documents submitted, I can see that the Applicant has put further significant work into trying to address what it sees at the main barriers to the scheme. However I think that on these 3 key areas, the Applicant has failed to address the concerns of the local people, and has again show an arrogance in it's response to the residents, and in several cases during it's written submissions, the ExA and other contributing organisations.

I will briefly cover how the latest submissions affect those 3 areas of objection below, but first I wanted to restate what we have said to the Applicant since the first Public Consultations several years ago:

The site chosen may be a neat parcel of land between the motorway and rail line, however they are trying to squeeze a nationally significant industrial development into the middle of several rural villages. The site is relatively small, and would be difficult to expand in the future if indeed there is the market demand for a RFI. If having a logistics park with a link to the rail network is of National importance, then it would be simpler and less disruptive to extend a rail link from Rugby to Magna Park (approx. 16km from the proposed site) where more units could benefit from the rail link. This is one of the largest logistics parks in Europe, with all the associated infrastructure already in place. Unfortunately for Tritax, this wouldn't allow them to profit off destroying rural communities with their logistics park development, under the guise of a rail freight interchange.

Visual Landscape

The Applicant still does not fully accept or acknowledge the visual impact this development will have to the North, across the Vale to Barwell, and I cannot see any noted changes

since December 2024.

In the 'Appendix 5 - Landscape and Visual Character Construction Effects' document, in the section looking at NCA94 Leicestershire Vales, it states "...limited by topography in other directions, such that the influence on the wider character area would be contained to around 1km. There would, however, be visual and perceptual effects within this area particularly throughout the enabling works before the structural planting is planted" The screening planting would not obscure the development even allowing for 20 years maturity after completion due to the height of the buildings, and would permanently change the character of the Leicestershire Vales NCA.

In the section "Properties on Shilton Road", they state "Boundary vegetation and fencing limits most ground floor views although some may be available and there would be open views from upper storeys. The majority of ground level construction activities would be screened by a combination existing mature vegetation in the middle to far distance, but high-level construction activities and cranes would be visible."

Again, this totally downplays the impact. Our Ground Floor view is directly across the valley towards the RFI Site, at a similar height. We would see all ground level activity due to the topography, despite being approximately 3km from the site. The whole of the view to the south from our property will be dominated by the development, with construction noise and lighting, and lighting once operational. This was raised with the Applicant at the public consultations, but was brushed off.

In the section looking at PVP26, they say "Main HNRFI Site would largely be screened by a combination of subtle variations in topography existing mature vegetation in the middle to far distance. Cranes and high-level construction activity would be visible across site, above the layers of intervening vegetation." Whilst there are some trees in the vicinity, to say the site would be largely screened is a huge exaggeration, assuming that the trees are all in leaf, and that they remain in situ. No tree condition survey has been carried out here to my knowledge. This viewpoint is the one protected in the Local Plan as being of significant importance, and as such has prevented other proposed local developments from taking place. If this viewpoint were to be diminished in such a way, then it will remove that barrier to development, having further detrimental effect on our local area.

### Road Safety at Sapcote

We were pleased to see the ExA and SOS note the dangerous number of HGVs that would use the village centre and its unsuitability for that number of vehicles. I note the Applicant's attempts to modify the bus-stop, but was pleased to see Leicestershire County Council's refusal to accept the proposal that allowing large vehicles to just drive in the middle of the road was a suitable and safe alternative. I have had to use Sapcote considerably more often over the last few months owing to the ongoing traffic works in

Stoney Stanton, and it is truly terrifying when an HGV comes round that blind bend, and around the blind bend in Stoney Stanton too for that matter. These village roads were not envisioned for the type and volume of traffic they now have to cope with. The roads have recently had to cope with extra traffic due to the closures in Stoney Stanton and several blockages on the A5 and M69, and whilst I acknowledge the changes the Applicant has made to the Triggers of its ANPR system, this is just going to push the traffic onto these unsuitable roads. This development, both in construction and operation, is simply going to make the likelihood of a serious traffic accident involving vehicles and pedestrians much more likely.

M1 J21 / M69 J3

This was our third objection to the scheme, on the grounds of the impact due to the increase in vehicles at an already over capacity junction. As a former daily user of this road junction, I can testify to the delays experienced just due to the volume of traffic, let alone any traffic incidents or roadworks on the network.

The response from the Applicant in their letter to the SOS (Sept 2024) was frankly staggering. The Applicant acknowledged a significant impact on the volume of traffic, but that because it was already over capacity, it wasn't their responsibility to mitigate for that impact. This was another subject I raised with Tritax at the public consultations, where they refused to accept there would even be any impact. If the development were to proceed, they have already agreed to make s106 contributions to other parts of the road network that will be put under pressure due to this development, this is no different. They would profit from it's construction, yet because this would involve a large amount of money and hit their profits, they are trying to pass the blame. This is the same approach they have taken to the recommendation to replace the pedestrian bridge at Narborough level crossing.

## Summary

As a passionate Labour member, I am fully in support of the new government and their aim to get on building nationally significant infrastructure projects; as long as they are planned and developed in the interests, and for the benefit of the country. This proposal is solely for the benefit of the Applicant. The site has never been suitable for a logistics park of any nature, let alone a relatively small one that cannot be easily extended in future. It has been chosen simply to use its proximity to the railway to justify a Rail Freight Interchange. Despite being aware of all the limitations and impacts to these rural communities, the Applicant has ploughed on regardless.

If allowed to proceed, the HRFI will increase the risk of injuries or deaths on the village roads, put further pressure on the over-subscribed road network, and destroy the rural landscape and it's communities for ever.

I was pleased to see the previous Secretary's decision back in September, and trust that

the Secretary of State will back her colleague's decision.

Many thanks

Kevin Bolton & Amy Smith

