

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hinckley SRFI](#)
Subject: Comments from Cllr Paul Williams - Interested Party Reference number: 20040120
Date: 07 February 2025 14:27:32

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited's submission of additional information as requested by the Secretary of State on the 10th of September 2025.

Having reviewed the Inspectors' Examination Report, the Secretary of State's 'Minded to' position outlined on the 10th of September 2025, and the additional information provided by Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited, I remain deeply concerned about two critical aspects regarding the decision on whether to grant the order for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Project:

M1 Junction 21 / M69 Junction 3

This junction is widely recognised to operate at or above capacity with current traffic volumes. The primary issue here is the complex nature of the junction and the adequacy of its modelling. It remains unclear from the additional information submitted whether an agreement has been reached between Tritax and the highways authorities to model the junction and the associated approach carriageways and slip roads adequately.

If this junction is not correctly modelled to ensure that the results can predict, with confidence, the queueing and resulting traffic capacities due to the proposed development, then the traffic predictions for the local road networks will also be questionable. Capacity, queueing, and driver behaviour at this junction, and elsewhere, have significant safety implications which need to be validated.

Therefore, if these matters have not been resolved and widely accepted as a true prediction of the development's impact, I strongly request that approval must be refused.

HGV Traffic through Sapcote Village

Even with the traffic volumes modelled in the application, safety concerns have been raised regarding the ability of HGVs to safely pass through the centre of the village. The revised road layout proposals do not materially address these concerns for local residents. It is crucial that the local highway authority is convinced beyond doubt that the proposed mitigation measures effectively minimise this safety risk.

If the traffic displacement effects are not accurately predicted, then traffic levels through Sapcote could be higher than currently assessed. The Applicant proposed and later rejected a Sapcote Bypass, deeming it 'not required'. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Applicant to provide compelling evidence that all safety concerns have been fully mitigated, which I believe has not been achieved.

Summary

This major development, if approved, will have a long-lasting devastating impact on the local area and its community. The examination process concluded that the harm would outweigh the wider national benefits. The Secretary of State provided the Applicant with an opportunity to make meaningful improvements to their proposals to address the identified harms, including those mentioned above. Much of the additional information was focused on explaining why the examination was wrong or misunderstood, rather than presenting meaningful improvements.

For these reasons, I request the new Secretary of State to confirm her predecessor's 'minded to' position and refuse to grant the development order.

Yours faithfully,
Cllr Paul Williams
Burbage