

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hinckley SRFI](#)  
**Subject:** Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange response by IP 20040233  
**Date:** 07 February 2025 10:04:58

---

[REDACTED]  
RE: HNRFI - TR050007

Comments on the additional information supplied by the Applicant, Tritax Symmetry Hinckley, in response to the Secretary of State's "Minded to Refuse" letter of 10th September 2024 by Diana Harrold and David Harrold. IP number 20040233.

We are residents of Stoney Stanton and are registered as Interested Parties. We are directly affected by this proposed development. In the Secretary of State's letter, road traffic and safety issues are referred to in paragraphs 63 to 66 for Sapcote (unacceptable highway safety risk), and 67 to 68 for Stoney Stanton (limited weight against because of lack of reasonable steps to mitigate the impacts of the junction operating, in its view (the ExA), significantly over capacity).

**With respect to TSH's proposed resolution of the highway safety risk in Sapcote;** In their response letter section 2.13 the Applicant claims that the ExA did not understand the proposed kerb realignments. Our belief is that the ExA did understand what was being proposed.

With respect to TSH's additional information supplied in Appendices 2, 2(B) and 2(C). In Appendix 2, LCC have stated that that they do not agree that the problem of oncoming vehicles in the middle of the road can be solved by the installation of vehicle activated signage. We agree with them. This area is very busy for many reasons, often at times such as school start and stop times. These busy times do not appear to be fully taken into account. Travelling into Sapcote from the West (from M69 J2), approaching the area concerned a vehicle will encounter many cars parked on the left (next to a day nursery and a "Memory Hub" centre for people with mild dementia) which will force them over to the right - reducing visibility of oncoming traffic to quite an extent. Going around the corner to where the proposed zebra crossing will be (in front of the Co-op) there is a sharp corner with a road off to the left (Stanton Lane) and also a road to the right (Church Street). In both cases parked or stopped vehicles, be it shoppers, delivery vehicles or just visitors, force vehicles exiting those roads to be in unexpected positions. A driver approaching this junction needs to be very aware of all of the possible hazards and could easily be distracted from signage. Moving through that area, the driver then encounters a bend to the left also with poor visibility and enters an unavoidably narrow area. Any vehicles approaching in the opposite direction in the middle of the road would present a serious hazard as there would be little time to react.

With respect to visibility at the proposed zebra crossing. The applicant claims that the required visibility can be achieved with an 0.8m set back distance on one side, 1.2m on the other. It has to be mentioned that a) many parents with pushchairs would be using this crossing, therefore may require more than 0.8m, b) there is a care home only a little way down Church Street (first building past the co-op) which generates additional light traffic, c) There is a parcel pick up point outside the co-op in Church Street, d) There is a cash machine on the corner at the Co-op. All of these things can cause visual distractions including blockages to the line of sight. Therefore we do not believe this "just enough" approach is satisfactory, and that this is, in fact, a very unsafe place to allow more HGV traffic even with the proposed changes.

The enhanced scheme in Appendix 2 (C) introduces a section where HGVs are encouraged to take the centre of the road, with added signage to indicate that this is (or might be) happening. However light vehicles can pass in either direction. From normal driving experience, these schemes work in cases where visibility is quite good (e.g. an arched bridge on a straight road) but in this case, along with many distractions, distance of visibility will not be good. A light vehicle could quite easily encounter a vehicle coming the opposite direction in the centre of the road which would cause many problems. If not a collision, then vehicles needing to reverse into an already difficult junction could be envisaged. This idea of a central area for HGVs will also certainly cause more queues in both directions, of which queues back past the Co-op will make that junction particularly unsafe for pedestrians and motorists. This scheme is badly thought through and will lead to more safety problems.

**With respect to The Secretary of State's observation about Stoney Stanton:** The "eastern junction" is presumed to include both the junction of Hinckley Road and the B581, and also the cross roads / mini roundabout where the B581 crosses Long Street. A proposal introduced during the examination was to add traffic lights at the Hinckley Road / B581 junction, but also to do nothing at the B581 / Long Street roundabout.

Our contention is that it is likely that HGV traffic will travel from the West to the East along Hinckley Road, and then right into New Road (B581) and then continue along the B581 toward Broughton Astley. HGVs will also travel the reverse route. Driving along Hinckley Road, all vehicles encounter parked cars often on both sides, which already cause queues. Passing the doctors' surgery on the left and the school entrance, and the sometimes busy Living Rock Church car park, a driver would then arrive at the proposed traffic lights. If these are "red" (rather than the mini roundabout we already have) then this is likely to cause a log-jamb back along Hinckley Road with consequential safety problems for people crossing to go to the surgery and to the school. These lights are also likely to cause long traffic queues back toward Elmeathorpe on the B581 (past another school entrance and the church entrance) and in the other direction toward the Co-op. Therefore adding traffic lights at this point will make the junction worse than it already is.

Traffic turning right from Hinckley Road onto the B581 / New Road, HGVs (and other vehicles) are then likely to be in a queue back from the already over capacity junction next to the Stoney Stanton Co-op. Adding traffic to this section will undoubtedly lead to bigger queues and potential log-jams. This particular junction is already of concern because HGVs turning already cause problems for traffic in all directions. Vehicles travelling from Broughton Astley have poor visibility of vehicles travelling from the Huncote direction (where there is a Calor Gas site). Long Street toward Huncote usually has parked vehicles. Along Long Street in the opposite direction toward Sapcote, the road is very narrow, has parked vehicles and shops including a busy pharmacy. Both of these factors cause vehicles to queue back onto the B581. Having negotiated that mini-roundabout, carrying on along the B581 toward Broughton Astley there is immediately a thin section with poor visibility which is rather similar to the section in Sapcote. Often HGVs will straddle the centre of the road.

Note that previously a chicane had been introduced in Stoney Stanton on New Road between the Hinckley Road and Long Street junctions to slow traffic down, however it was subsequently removed and replaced by speed bumps because of the extremely long traffic queues it had caused.

Therefore additional HGV traffic (and light vehicles) caused by the HNRFI and M69 J2 proposals will make all of the traffic problems here worse. The ExA considered that the impacts should have limited weight against the proposal. The Applicant, in their Planning Balance table (their response letter section 5.44) have inexplicably declared that the Planning Balance here should be neutral without actually proposing to change anything. Those of us that live here know that our quality of life will be considerably worse if the proposed HNRFI development goes ahead. This is not "neutral" in the Planning Balance. In our opinion it should be more than Limited Weight against.

Kind regards,

Diana and David Harrold

---