



2.09.2024

Dear Ms Haigh

Re: The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI)

I am writing to request that you reject the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange that has been proposed by Tritax Symmetry and examined by the Planning Inspectorate. I understand that a recommendation will come to yourself on 12th September 2024, and I sincerely hope that it will not be recommended.

I am a local resident and have followed the Examination Phase closely, attending the open floor meetings in person and online, raising my objections both in person and in the written representations. Should the proposal be recommended I am deeply concerned of the catastrophic consequences the project will have on our local area – the environment and for the people who live in the villages and town nearby. Although I am in favour of getting freight off the road and onto the railways, I do not agree that the area proposed in Hinckley is the right place to create a Rail Hub, simply because it is too close to residential buildings and villages, so will bring misery to thousands of local people. Most people believe that Tritax Symmetry have jumped on the bandwagon of the Government's strategy purely for their own means - to make huge warehouses and huge profits from renting their units. Personally, I question whether they would ever get round to building a Rail Hub once the warehouses are functioning; they have stated the warehouses need to be operational first, which somewhat makes a mockery of the government's strategy.

I remain deeply concerned about the traffic data/modelling, particularly at the M69 Junction 3 and the A5 stretch of road past Hinckley. I am confused by the Applicant's response to the points I raised in my submission 5 about traffic data/ modelling: the Applicant states "all strategic models were agreed by the Transport Working Group" yet according to National Highways the final review of modelling outputs reports could only be possible once traffic input flows (relating to the PRTM and furnishing matters) were resolved. I'm not certain they were resolved.

In response to Leicestershire County Council's submission 6 regarding the M69/ J21 data the Applicant states "the modelling demonstrates the magnitude is negligible in both scenarios and whilst the junction operation is worse without the committed LUE improvements, the impact on queues and delay remains marginal. Hence, the impact is not considered to be 'severe', and it is maintained that highway mitigation is not justified". I cannot accept this view. There has long been congestion at this junction during peak times, with frequent tailbacks on the M69. There will surely be an increase in traffic as a result of workers coming from and going to the HNRFI site through that junction, on top of the HGVs going in and out of the site. This is in addition to the increase in traffic numbers as a consequence of the many housing developments that are planned in Burbage and other local areas. I only see potential chaos!

From what I can see the planned A47 Link Road will have minimal effect on alleviating any traffic congestion on the A5 and M69 highways. In all the discussions regarding traffic volume I cannot see any other solution other than a massive investment by Tritax themselves, or the Government, to

improve the M69 Junction 3 and a massive injection of cash to improve the A5. **WITHOUT THESE BEING IN PLACE FIRST THIS DEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT PROCEED.**

Regarding the Construction Phase I was dismayed to read the Applicant changed the work times to Monday- Saturday 7 am- 7 pm (changed from 3 pm on a Saturday) with time beforehand and afterwards to prepare and review. Saturdays should not be included at all – surely local residents have a right to enjoy their gardens, a walk in Burbage Woods or the Common, without the incessant background noise of machinery? Our quality of life should not be reduced for the planned extended period of 8-10 years.

Regarding Noise and Vibration, I have read the British Standard BS5228 Part 1 and 2, the Control of Pollution Act (1974) and the Environment Protection Act (1990). I have also read much about the negative impact of Noise and Vibration on Health. In my observations of the open meetings in progress it became clear to me that Tritax have underestimated operational noise, and probably construction noise too. So, I ask: is there a procedure to halt all operations should the works exceed the agreed parameters and mitigations? (e.g. the daily readings for noise, vibration, dust, air quality being higher than they should be). I very much doubt it, not once the development has got that far! Or in other words what would happen if the data that Tritax previously presented, in order to get the proposal agreed, is found to be incorrect once the construction work has begun, and when the site is operational? I doubt anything would (not could) be done at this stage!

Finally, as a lay person to this kind of application process I have been astounded by the poor manner in which Tritax have represented themselves throughout the pre-application and the examination phases. The public consultations were appalling (I went to two): they were so poorly presented in small, cramped spaces with small displays, and with Tritax representatives who were so lacking in local knowledge giving vague, unclear answers to the anxious, searching questions from local people. Clearly these consultations were a tick box exercise and came across as very patronising to the very people who are at the heart of the effects of such a development. I have followed the Examination Process to the best of my ability and Tritax Symmetry have come across as arrogant and dismissive when various elements of their application have been rightfully challenged. At times their attitude has appeared disdainful towards Interested Parties. On several occasions Tritax Symmetry have submitted their written responses late. They have sometimes ignored repeated requests for more information from Interested Parties (IPs), or only given partial pieces of information. In some instances, the Applicant has given the IPs little or no time to review, respond, suggest amendments to the Applicant's lengthy written submissions, or they seem to be asking an IP to sign an agreement where there has been no agreement. Much of their information appeared lacking in detail or rushed through at the last minute in order to meet the deadline. In my opinion Tritax Symmetry failed to participate in the Examination Process in a fair and transparent way. Is this the kind of company the Government wants to work with in order to improve economic growth? I hope not!

I reiterate my view that this application should be whole-heartedly rejected.

Yours sincerely


Wendy Ferriman (Ms)