

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hinckley SRFI](#)
Subject: Response to the further HNRFI submission from Tritax Symmetry
Date: 06 February 2025 22:49:46

[REDACTED]

Dear Heidi Alexander (Secretary of State for Transport)

As a registered Interested Party to the HNRFI Application please see my response as follows:

I am a resident of Burbage and have followed the Examination of the HNRFI application closely. I am opposed to this development and was dismayed to learn on September 10th 2024 that Tritax Symmetry had been given opportunity to submit further information for their HNRFI application.

At great expense the Government Planning Inspectorate appointed an Examination Authority team. They carried out a detailed and robust examination of the Tritax Application over several months in 2023-24. The Application submitted was found to be lacking on so many counts and rightly rejected by the Examination Authority. It beggars belief that Tritax have been given a second chance when they couldn't get it right first time round! Having had 10 years to put together a valid scheme, and yet fail on so many important points, it brings into question the competence and ability of Tritax Symmetry to be able to successfully implement such an important infrastructure. They may well have a long and strong track record of delivering logistics schemes but they do not have experience of developing a Rail Freight Interchange which is clearly far more complex. Tritax should not be trusted or granted permission. In one of the open floor meetings a Tritax representative openly admitted that the warehouses will need to be operational before the Rail Hub is built. I have not seen or heard of any guarantees that freight will go by rail to this development.

Eversheds Sutherland LLP (legal representatives for Tritax) state in their letter on 10 December 2024 (para. 1.5) "The Applicant has spent 10 years bringing this scheme forward at very considerable cost." I very much doubt they have also considered the huge financial drain and impact on cash-strapped county and borough councils, in processing the Applicants submissions and information, over the same 10 year period. As a tax-payer it is so disheartening to think about how much council funds, and time, have had to be redirected and wasted, in responding to or challenging the Applicants unwieldy and flawed submissions. These resources could have been used so much more wisely towards other urgent and local community projects in Leicestershire eg improving social care, hospital buildings, primary school buildings, medical facilities, flood mitigations, crime.....

I have read the further submissions from the Applicant regarding the M69 Junction 3/M1 Junction 21. The original traffic data presented was minimal and out of date. I drive through this Junction several times a week and it is already over-saturated up to and during peak times, often with long tail-backs on the M69 eastward and the M1 southbound. The situation is worsening. In their latest submission the Applicant seems to assume that because they have added a few Technical Notes to the Highways Authority they have done enough on this issue for it to be agreed by The Secretary of State. This is not acceptable. The problems created at this Junction make it such an important and

contentious issue that it demands proper scrutiny of data that is accurate and up to date, taking into account any increase in future traffic predictions. There will be Heavy Goods Vehicles using the local highway network to access the site as well as transport used by site workers. There are several housing developments planned in Burbage, Hinckley and Stoney Stanton, and these will inevitably add to the traffic in the area and add to the congestion at this junction, and with more development likely to come in future years. Without major Highways investment to greatly improve the flow of traffic through this junction the current issues will continue to get worse and bring more frustration and misery for commuters. I dispute that Tritax have given sufficient validation for this Junction 3/M69. In my view it is an essential requirement for there to be an up-to-date VISSIM model, as stated by the Examining Authority in their report.

Their latest suggestions to improve road safety in the village of Sapcote are totally inadequate. Currently motorists travelling through the village negotiate some very narrow and winding parts of the route, manoeuvring around resident's parked cars as well as driving through several priority signed traffic points; the route through the village is very much like an obstacle course. At peak times the route becomes busy. The proposed recommendations - to improve the pedestrian area outside the Co-op, install a zebra crossing, relocate a bus stop, will do little to improve road safety. One solution - to install signage of "incoming vehicles in the middle of the road" to warn drivers, and direct HGVs away from the footways on the narrowest parts of the road, presents further danger. If two vehicles, travelling in opposite directions, do not see the visual signs, then one or other may take evasive action by mounting the kerb as there isn't enough room to pass side by side. Visual signs are not always as effective as intended; a classic example are the two low bridges in Hinckley (on the A5 and the Hinckley Rugby Road) which are regularly hit by HGVs because the drivers have not seen the signs or have misunderstood them. Sapcote village is very near to the proposed site and a route that vehicles travelling to and from the site are likely to use, especially during times of traffic congestion in the wider area. Visual signs will not be adequate for the narrow routes so the Tritax recommendation is totally unacceptable and will further compromise road safety, the potential for collisions will be greater. As previously stated there will be many occasions when HGVs might re-route through the village due to taking a wrong turn or taking a short cut. I cannot trust nor do I feel comfortable with the recommendations Tritax have submitted on this issue.

The sound and visual mitigations for the residents of the Aston Firs Travellers site are also poor. The development of Junction 2 /M69 - going from the current 2 slip roads to 4, and the building of a new link road will greatly increase the amount of traffic in the immediate vicinity to Aston Firs. Erecting a 6 metre acoustic barrier would be intimidating and encroach on the open space of the site. With the tall trees of the woods on the other side of the site this would simulate a prison-like effect for the residents within. This solution has not been thought through adequately and may well amount to an infringement of Human Rights - we are all entitled to a peaceful enjoyment of our homes.

In September 2024 the Planning Inspectorate rejected the Tritax Application and the Transport Secretary wrote she was "minded to refuse". I trust the new Transport Secretary will see the many deficiencies and that many issues that still have not been adequately addressed by Tritax in their further submission.

I call on the Secretary of State for Transport to continue to reject the application.

Yours sincerely

Wendy A Ferriman (Ms)