Rt Hon Eric Pickles MP
Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU

Our ref: SA7674/JC 25 September 2012

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing in response to the letter I received from your department on 19th September asking for interested parties’ views on considering the proposed Radlett and Colnbrook strategic rail freight interchange sites in conjunction. I still think that the appeal by Helioslough should have been refused outright, and the continued delay to this decision leaves the blight of this rail freight terminal hanging over the heads of my constituents. Having said this, as you feel that considering the two sites together would lead to a more coherent and consistent decision-making process I am broadly in favour of the sites being determined in this way.

There would be advantages to viewing these sites in conjunction. Helioslough’s first alternative site appraisal was considered by the inspector to be flawed and they were asked to do it again. Even this second alternative site appraisal I believe over exaggerated the benefits of having the SRFI in Radlett and played down the positives in alternative locations. Even the Inspector’s report of the 19th March 2010 you considered too favourable towards the Radlett site and in your final decision letter of the 7th July 2012 you disagree with sections of the Inspector’s report and make several references to the Colnbrook site being less harmful than the Radlett site (23).

There are many clear reasons why the Colnbrook site is more suitable than Radlett, and if you decide to conjoin Colnbrook and Radlett I will of course make representations to this effect, however I wanted to highlight why viewing these sites in conjunction would make for a more coherent policy. One of the major points of comparison is the availability of a local workforce. The Inspector at Radlett made it clear that this site does not have the available blue collar workforce locally and that people would have to commute into Radlett to work; in point 9.114 the Inspector
says, “The irony is almost painful. The Government is promoting SRFIs in order to advance the cause of sustainability; and the appellant promotes a proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange in a wholly unsustainable location”. This is in comparison with Colnbrook which has a large blue collar workforce on its doorstep.

I maintain that my constituents and I were hoping for a refusal and are disappointed that the shadow of this blight is still hanging over us. The proposed Radlett site should absolutely be refused for all the reasons I have listed in my many previous submissions; however if you wish to consider the proposals in conjunction I agree that broadly this will make for a coherent policy.

With best wishes,

Anne Main MP
www.annemain.com