

Your ref: TR050007  
My ref: DCO/TR050007/HinckleySRFI



**Communities**

Shire Hall  
Warwick  
CV34 4RL

**Tel: (01926) 412907**

[highwayconsultation@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:highwayconsultation@warwickshire.gov.uk)

[www.warwickshire.gov.uk](http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk)

Mr R Jackson  
Planning Inspector  
National Infrastructure Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

24<sup>th</sup> October 2023

Dear Sir

**TR050007 Hinckley SRFI – Warwickshire County Council (20040686 )  
Comments on Documents Requested to be Submitted by Deadline 1**

Further to the Rule 8 Letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September Warwickshire County Council would like to make comments on the following additional submissions issued by the Applicant for Deadline 1:

Doc Ref 18.1.3 Rev 01 Post hearing submission ISH1 and CAH1 [Appendix C Applicant's Updated Responses to the ExA's Initial Observations on Drafting of dDCO]

- Matter 5, Definitions, page 15 and Matter 36 Protective Provisions page 45 . The Applicants confirmation that it is committed to including protective provisions in the dDCO based on standard form s278 agreements is welcomed. Warwickshire County Council would also want the Applicant to consider Warwickshire County Council's standard s278 agreement in respect of the protective provisions
- Schedule 14 Miscellaneous Controls paragraphs 2 and 3:
  - Section 167 Highways Act 1980 – Powers relating to retaining walls near streets Section 167 allows the relevant local authority to approve a retaining wall to which section 167 applies and serve notice to require works to be carried out to obviate any danger. WCC have not seen sufficient detail in terms of the retaining walls that will form part of the development to conclude whether the disapplication of s167 is appropriate. Whilst it is acknowledged that approval via the DCO is likely to be appropriate, as highway authority WCC would want to ensure that protective provisions were sufficient to deal with a dangerous structure.
  - Section 56, Section 56A, Section 58, Section 61, Section 62, Section 63 Schedule 3A New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 . These provisions allow

*Working for  
Warwickshire*

relevant highway authorities to manage their network to ensure that it reduces delay and safeguards the travelling public. Warwickshire County Council's concern is that the timing of street works and the placing of apparatus cannot be adequately dealt with via the DCO. It is considered important that the relevant highway authority retains control over the management of its network.

Detailed comments in relation to the dDCO will be provided in accordance with the timetable.

#### Doc Ref 18.2 Rev 01 Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations (Part 4 of 7):

Trip Generation (iv) – reference made to 78% mode share for the upper employee forecast of 10,400. A 78% mode share would require an effective Travel Plan to ensure all modes are catered for, and that accessibility at both home and site ends of the journey is provided for, and the transport infrastructure is suitable and facilitates the active choice of sustainable modes of travel. Comments on the sustainable travel provision have been provided within Warwickshire County Council's Written Representations.

Modelling (iii) – reference made to Highways Position Statement. It is assumed this is at para 3.23, where it is stated that mitigation will be provided in the early construction phases. Given the scale and number of off-site mitigation works proposed, the timing for these works should be coordinated by the relevant Network Management Team, and should address the impacts of the development (traffic and network alterations).

Modelling (iv) Furnessing – some outstanding queries remain over the furnessing methodology and treatment of 'zero' or 'close to zero' cells; and at the Cross-in-Hands junction (junction 27 in Transport Assessment) there are differences between the modelled ARCADY capacity performance results and the Paramics results and this is potentially due to a difference in turning flow data (see below).

Modelling (v) A5/Gibbet Hill junction – note reference to Highways Position Statement at paras 3.70-3.73. In order to understand the impact of the development traffic on this junction it needs to be modelled within VISSIM. The capacity performance as shown in the 2036 scenarios for the existing roundabout as modelled in ARCADY do not reflect the current operation of the junction, hence the request for an unaccompanied site inspection by the ExA. Therefore the requirement for, and deliverability of, mitigation, has not been established and this is necessary in order should any planning obligations be required.

Modelling (vi) Padge Hall Farm – note the comment made, however the additional modelling requested as a result of the Padge Hall Farm planning consent was to assess as a sensitivity the impact of the consented alterations to the network (Padge Hall Farm A5/Site Access junction, A5/Dodwells alterations and lowering of the carriageway below Nutts Lane rail bridge) along with the Hinckley NRFI traffic – particularly that of HGVs and high-sided HGVs. The

potential impacts of high sided HGV traffic to travel between A5/A47 Dodwells and M69 junction 1 has not been assessed.

Modelling (vii) A5/Longshoot/Dodwells – no comment provided by Applicant

Modelling (viii) RRAM modelling outputs – no comment provided by Applicant. Outputs have been received, and where additional information/clarification required these are identified in Warwickshire County Council's Written Representations and in this document.

HGV Routing (i) – this is further dealt with in Warwickshire County Council's Written Representations and in this document. It is our understanding that HGV traffic from the development has been manually assigned to 'permitted' routes and not modelled with route choice as other background traffic has. This creates an artificial fixed route scenario for the development HGV traffic that will not occur in reality.

Community Liaison Group/Transport Review Group (ii) – noted, and should be included as a planning obligation if the ExA agree.

Sustainable Travel (i) – this matter is covered in Warwickshire County Council's Written Representations. Acknowledge the potential for employees living in close proximity to Coventry and Leicester city centres to access the X6 service, and have commented on the Demand Responsive Travel pilot scheme in WR. There needs to be more by way of direct connectivity for employees living close to the development site but who will require access to public transport to safely get to work – either because of the times of day travelling (shifts) or weather conditions when travelling. It is unlikely that employees will travel into Nuneaton (parking limited) travel 10mins by train to Hinckley and then wait for a bus to get to work – none of these alternative modes and their respective journey times and costs have been assessed.

Document reference: 6.2.8.1A Rev 08 Appendix 81. 1 Transport Assessment (Part 1 of 20)

Para 2.27 – This matter has been commented on in Warwickshire County Council's Written Representations (paras 3.52 and 5.7-5.11) submitted for Deadline 1. In brief, further clarification is required over:

- the modelling strategy for assigning HGVs forecast to use the network within Warwickshire covered by the RRAM area;
- Cross-in-Hands junction (junction number 27 in Transport Assessment) further information is required in regard to journey time results and the difference in capacity performance as modelled in the ARCADY assessment within the Transport Assessment and the Paramics assessment (including flow comparison data);
- M69 junction 1 – Paramics assessment shows the Hinckley Road approach to have increased journey times and queues in both morning and evening peaks, this is likely to be associated with impacts at M69 junction 1 therefore VISSIM modelling is required to demonstrate that the impacts on Hinckley Road (as opposed to the M69 junction 1 overall) will not be severe when the recalibrated MOVA is modelled. It is also noted in the Paramics modelling that Gypsy Lane

which feeds Hinckley Road shows a significant increase in northbound flow in the PM Period (1600-1900) – clarification as to why this occurs in the with Development including mitigation scenario is required.

- Binley Woods junction is shown in the Paramics modelling to experience queues in the peak periods, confidence interval analysis is required to demonstrate if this is attributable to the development traffic and the impact, if any, on Warwickshire's network.

Yours faithfully



Joanne Archer  
Delivery Lead Planning & Highways Development Management