

TRANSCRIPT_ISH2_SESSION1_31102023

Tue, Oct 31, 2023 12:44PM • 1:07:19

00:06

Good morning, everybody, and welcome to this hearing scientists here to begin. Welcome you all to the issue specific threat hearing on traffic and transport for the Hinkley national rail freight Interchange project. Can I just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly?

00:25

And can I also confer with the case team that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced, and we see a thumbs up from the back of the room. So thank you.

00:35

My name is Robert Jackson, I'd be appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm going to now ask my other fellow panel members to introduce themselves.

00:47

I'm gonna scream. So I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to examine this application.

00:55

Good morning. My name is Matthew Herrera, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel to examine the application. I'm also going to be keeping a list of action points and we can run through these at the end of the meeting. Thank you. I'm now going to together and we constitute the examining authority for this application. I'm now going to ask Mr. Saud to take us through the next part of the this agenda item.

01:22

And I'll deal with it a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person.

01:27

Everyone, please set all devices and phones including smartwatches silent please.

01:35

Toilets are out of this room on your left and along the corridor.

01:42

There are no planned fire drills today. So if the alarm goes off, please treat it as a real emergency and follow the green emergency exit signs to the muster point outside.

01:55

This building will follow the supplementary agenda published on the national infrastructure planning website on the 23rd of October 2023. Examine examination Library Reference, Evie, six double 01.

02:10

It would be helpful if you could have a copy of this in front of you.

02:15

His team will also display the agenda on screen.

02:24

The agenda agenda is for guidance only. And we may add other considerations or issues as we progress.

02:32

We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made, and all questions asked and responded to.

02:42

But if the discussions can't be concluded, may have been necessary for us to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or require time to get the information requested, and you can, can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing.

03:04

Today's hearing is being undertaken in a blended way, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing. And some of you are joining us virtually using Microsoft Teams. We will make sure that however you have decided to attend today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate.

03:25

A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the Higley national rate for it and attend section of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as practicable. After the hearing has finished.

03:38

A transcript will also be made available which will allow you to utilize AI technology.

03:44

With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone stating your name and who you're representing each time before you speak.

03:57

Microphone is activated by pressing the button at the base of the stand to the right.

04:04

Microphone head will light up when activated. If you're not at a table with a microphone, there's a roving microphone. So please wait for one of these to be brought to you before you speak.

04:18

A link to the planning Inspectorate privacy notice was provided in the notification for this hearing. We assume that everybody here today has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes five of the personal data of our customers assembled in accordance with the principles set out and data protection laws. Please speak to Emily Davis, case manager Steven Parker as officer if you have any questions about this.

04:47

Just make a couple of comments about the hearings been held this week. Firstly about their relationship to the examining authorities written questions which are to follow shortly after these hearings.

05:00

Just because something isn't on the agendas for the hearings this week doesn't mean to say that. We don't want to ask questions about it. It may be that we consider those questions to be better asked and answered in writing.

05:14

This week's hearings are where we consider that oral discussions would help us better understand and explore the issues and better answer our questions.

05:27

And I also make clear that this area is subject to controlled hearing with us as the examining authority leading what we want to talk about. This may mean that either from constraint of time or otherwise, we will not be talking about part of a topic that you think we should be talking about. In that respect. We have read all of the representations submitted to date, and we will take them into account.

05:54

It is just that we need to concentrate on those issues, which we think are most important and relevant at this time and making our recommendation to the Secretary of State.

06:05

Second point is to remind people that all hearings this week up to an including Thursday, as the three issues specific hearings tomorrow and Wednesday, the second open floor hearing on Thursday morning, and the compulsory acquisition here on Thursday afternoon will be held in this blended form, and thus you will be able to attend if you wish.

06:28

However, the issue specific hearing on Friday morning on the draft development consent order will be entirely online. There will be nowhere here to attend and watch if you were anticipating come to speak.

And please have a chat with either Mrs. Davies and Mr. Parker, so they can sort you out with that link to the hearing live on the internet.

06:54

As with all other hearings, the live stream can be linked to link to from the project national infrastructure webpage. Now go and ask Mr. Harun asked people to introduce themselves.

07:09

Thank you, Mr. Saad, I'm not going to ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to to introduce yourselves. When I say your organization's name. Could you introduce yourself stating your name and who you represent and which agenda item you wish to speak on? If you are not representing an organization, please confirm your name. Summarize your interest in the application and confirm the agenda item upon which you wish to speak. And please Could everybody also state the titles by which they wish to be addressed? But can we start with the applicant in any of their advisors please?

07:41

Yes, thanks. So good morning. My name is Paul male. I'm a solicitor and partner at shed Sutherland LLP and I'm instructed by the applicant to represent them. There are a number of people sat along the side meet at the table. So what I'll ask them to do is to introduce themselves starting at the starting at the top end and then moving down. Thank you.

08:08

So my name is Andy Passmore. I'm a director of b2b Consulting. I'll be dealing with the road highway network and sustainable transport issues.

08:20

Morning Sir, my name is Malcolm Asha. I work for BW be consulting as a transport planner. We're working on behalf of the applicant. I'll be addressing issues in agenda three and five.

08:34

Good morning Mrs. Laura Beth Annamma solicitor and partner at eversheds Sutherland LLP and I am instructed by the applicant on on

08:45

Good Morning. So my name is Peter James Frampton of Frampton town planning, I will be speaking to planning policy related matters under three, four and five. Thank you.

08:58

Good morning says. My name is David Baker, Baker rose consulting partner and I will be addressing item for today on rail connectivity.

09:09

Moni says Mr. Sam Carter, highway designer for BW be consulting and I'll be answering questions on the highway design.

09:23

Thank you.

09:26

We move on to organizations and individuals that have given their notice on their intention to speak. Could you introduce yourself and let us know on which agenda item you wish to speak? Maybe start with maybe Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.

09:40

Good morning, sir. My name is Mr. Mike Parker and the planning consultant representing Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council on may wish to contribute on any of the items under three four or five.

09:54

Going My name is Ethel noon. I'm a director of Mercury's associates transport planning consultants and

10:00

matching on behalf of thinking was was very counsel, probably mostly in relation to items three and five, but may have some comments on for as well.

10:10

Thank you.

10:12

Maybe District Council.

10:15

Morning sir. My name is Duncan O'Connor. I'm a solicitor and partner at BDB Pitmans are instructed by Blaby District Council.

10:24

Labor district Hamilton has an interest in in all of the items mentioned on the agenda.

10:31

Good morning says my name is Mr. Ed Stacy. I'm a major schemes Officer of labor District Council and will be on hand to sit and answer questions.

10:40

Thank you. Leicestershire county council

10:44

Good morning sir. My name is Mark Westmoreland Smith. I'm a barrister instructed by Leicestershire county council.

10:54

Good morning says Mrs. Rebecca Henderson I'm on behalf of Leicestershire county council as the local highway authority.

11:03

Thank you and which agenda items do you wish to speak to three four and five Thank you. Thank you

11:09

for actually county council

11:14

national highways power line my apologies

11:20

sorry worries county council please proceed. Thank you Good morning Sir Nicholas Dawn see Mr. Nicholas stone see worse county council Transport Planning available to answer questions on items three and five. Thank you.

11:34

Thank you.

11:37

National Highways.

11:39

Good morning, sir. Mr. Ben sim, spatial planning manager and national highways and I'm supported today by my colleague Russell gray who's spatial planning next to me I will be speaking on behalf national highways and we aim to cover agenda items three four and five.

11:57

Thank you.

11:58

Narborough parish council

12:08

you have a roving mic.

12:10

Thank you

12:20

Sorry, Richard Chapman, Chairman of Nara parish council and I will wish to speak on the items relating to the level crossing Gattinara

12:31

Thank you.

12:33

I'm thought parish council

12:49

Hello, Mrs. Becky Roper on behalf of council parish council have one item to raise on Item three J The a 47. Link road junctions also have three

13:01

short items to raise with regard to the effects on arms though I'm not sure what point you would find most appropriate to pop that in. We are it is it has plays on the agenda following the information received last week. It's one of those things in the

13:17

because the agenda is fluid obviously you appreciate until they have the deadline to it does appear in the agenda in the latest version of the agenda which obviously has been published. Okay. All right. If your queue then thank you.

13:29

Thank you

13:31

very much parish council

13:42

thank you, Councillor David Deville, Chair of verbage parish council and I would like to speak on items three, four and five.

13:52

Thank you.

13:54

parish council

14:06

sorry,

14:08

yes, Stuart bacon collector, hunker parish council potentially spoken on items three, four and five please.

14:15

Thank you.

14:17

Anybody from friends of Narborough station

14:31

the morning everyone. My name is John Harrison, chair of the Friends of Nagar station. Happy to see how the discussion goes as far as the effect on the local rail railways are concerned. So I'm happy to answer any questions and see how the discussion goes as far as the railway aspects are concerned. Thank you.

14:56

Thank you

15:01

CPRA Leicestershire

15:11

dari Thank you. My name is Gerald calth. I'm assisting CPRE Leicestershire in their response and they want to speak on items three, four and five. As you will be aware from last night I was also

15:30

worked with Satco parish council. This my colleague, John Merritt, I'll let him introduce. I'm Joe Mariette from CPRA, Leicestershire.

15:40

I want to speak on well maybe speak on three, four and five.

15:44

Thank you

15:47

are there any other organizations or individuals sorry that are registered to speak

15:54

over the

16:01

hands of the genitori not representative as OpenNebula parish council, and I wish to speak on on regarding Section four. Thank you.

16:12

Thank you.

16:15

Good morning. My name is Tim Burgess. I'm a resident of the village of Barwell. I had wanted to sorry, I'm representing myself, I had wanted to speak to items three and four but in the light of the introductory comments from the panel, I'll restrict myself to three. I wish to address the issue of power specifically. So wherever wherever you feel that fits within that item, I'd be happy with. Thank you.

16:38

Thank you

16:45

Thank you. My name is counselor Mike Shirley from Blaby District Council on representing the ward of FOSS high cross and specifically Sean flood parish council.

17:03

Sharon Scott residents of SAP coat

17:07

rack representing myself I would like to speak under Section Three on I m one junction 21 And also on K effect on the village of sabko. Thank you

17:28

Catherine bass I'm a resident of arms thought but I represent gamstop sounds together and I may wish to talk on items three four and five Thank you

17:45

Hi, I'm Anthony randerson representing necessary to counsel with drugs but strategy may wish to contribute to items three, four and five.

18:02

Morning certainly my name is Brian plum. I'm a senior director at RPA cyber I represent a consortium of land promoters including Barwood and Parker strategic land. I may wish to speak under item three. Thank you.

18:23

Good morning, Tim Rose director of MEC highway consultants, representing Stoney Stanton parish council. I'd like to wait to speak on behalf of them on agenda item three. Thank you.

18:40

Good morning. I'm David Herold, Chairman of Stoney Stanton Action Group. And I'd like to speak on Item three, I the effect on Stoney Stanton.

18:54

Thank you.

18:57

Okay, is there anybody else in the room that wishes to speak today?

19:06

Thank you, if I could now move to virtual attendees. If you're with us on teams, please could you raise a virtual hand if you wish to speak today and again, introduce yourselves and let us know which agenda item you wish to speak on.

19:27

Though Is there anybody else who wishes to speak?

19:30

Thank you. So that concludes the first item on the agenda. I'm going to pass it back to Mr. Jackson to deal with the next items.

19:38

All right, which is entitled to and I've just lost my screen which is kind of done without

19:46

but he's just dropped have to come back.

19:54

Let me briefly explain the purpose of this issue specific hearing. This is to allow us to consider the traffic

20:00

To transport elements the proposed development is related to three main areas road traffic and infrastructure, rail traffic and infrastructure and the public rights of way network. We have fully appreciate that in relating to road traffic that there are implications for other areas, particularly in alphabetical order, air quality and emissions, biodiversity, noise and vibration, and cross cutting areas such as tranquility, and enjoyment of the countryside. However, we won't want to discuss those today. These will discuss tomorrow in lshs. Three, therefore, please don't don't be offended if we stopped discussions today, should they stray towards these environmental issues?

20:39

While we have an overall agenda, as I indicated earlier, I suspect it would fairly fluid in that I have put it on traffic model as the first item of the agenda item three, in one sense that will only conclude when we have been through all some of the other points. So please bear with me as we go through those points. And we will I will give the opportunity for further discussion at the end towards the end of item three on that point.

21:04

Can I ask everybody understands that if agreement is not found partake between parties, either in our discussions today or hereafter, but our final report secular state, we have to make a conclusion on your

disputes. Therefore, if we asked you for a view without prejudice to your overall position, please bear with us and help us trying to defend a position which comes untenable will be likely to harm your case in the wider arena. So I will now move on to Item three which is the highway road highway network.

21:37

If you just bear with me a second my screens decided to go down

21:52

comes back

22:06

it's back now I just don't want to if you don't mind me, I need to rearrange things onto the second screen.

22:42

First is traffic modeling. First, I'd like to discuss the traffic model and stand it. The main parts is that the applicant and the highway authorities have agreed to the use of the P r t m 2.2 model. But there's some seems to be some differences as to how you apply the outputs. Since the final final output the result of various matters, where there is dispute between the parties, in my intention to go through the each of them and then come back to later on to ask your concluding remarks. However, I would like to ask one question for the applicant racing to the future date future your date, which has been given us 2036. The reason for this question is that the start of construction is said to be 2026 with a 10 year build program. Assuming that is the case, then the last warehouses will only just be being occupied in 2036. Unlike most operations, I have expected to take a number of years to become fully operational. And this therefore asking whether 2036 is in fact should be the correct year audit should be say 15 years after commencement, ie 2041. Can I help the applicants comments please?

23:57

Thank you. So just to explain how the applicants going to reply to these questions. What I would largely expect is certainly around these modeling and technical issues that that response will be led by Mr. Pasmore or Mr. Ashe so I'll just pass them please do demonstrate to them please.

24:13

Thank you, sir. Malcolm Ash on behalf of the applicant. The 2036 horizon was was agreed through agreements with Leicestershire county council. It was projected forward to that year on the basis that we had loaded the network with the full development horizon traffic. We did the same for 2026 as well to test it in the worst case scenario 2036 came out of the prgm modeling and that is where it was seen to be a reasonable approach to take for for that 10 year horizon four for the full build out. It is tested with with the full capacity of the of the development itself onto the network. But obviously it wouldn't include the additional background traffic that would have occurred but

25:00

Like 20 2014? Well, the additional traffic that we've accounted for is indeed up to 2036. But this was, this was agreed with the local authority at the time, we felt that that was appropriate in terms of modeling.

25:15

uptime. Okay. Can I ask the county council why they took that view?

25:22

back ends in this chair county council, and we took the view. So on the basis that we didn't have any further information at that time about the phasing of the development over a longer period of time. Okay. Yeah. But even so it was due to finish by 20 construction by 2036. You do, as I say, You expected not to take a bit of time to become operational. And that's why not that 2041 Say, absolutely. And better my frayed at the time of agreeing the future. Yeah, assessment, that information wasn't available to us. Okay. We're actually county council since you're online. Do you have any comments on this?

26:03

Nicholas, Dawn, see, Boris, kind of counsel. I think in terms of the strategic modeling, we were largely defer to our colleagues that had less to show in terms of model availability and forecasts your availability.

26:15

So I think that was probably the driving factor when the process started back in 2017. So it's had quite a long sort of gestation in terms of the project to development.

26:27

Okay, and does national highways have any comments on that? Thank you. So Mr. Benson, from national hires perspective, we're happy with the prgm. The year the 10 year approach was taken was because at the time, the existing circular 220 13 stated 10 years from first opening, and as my colleague from what you just said, we started these discussions in 2017. So that was the relevant policy at the time. Okay, fine. I get the boy, thank thank you for that.

26:57

Again, on a more general level, in our rule 17 letter response, the applicant has submitted response to the recently published DFT and I EMA, ie M A guidance, that sort of is circular, and additional updated guidance from the Institute of Environmental Management and

27:17

what the acronym stands for sorry, my question relates the DFT guidance, which is tag unit for forecasting an uncertainty

27:26

in its response to the applicant indicates that due to the timescales of the examination of the three options set out like set out, it is only like to be able to apply adjustments globally, to model results in a post a model adjustment.

27:41

That kind of just couldn't get that as good as the situation, isn't it? Correct? Yes, that's correct. You don't have any of the highway authorities have considered that is you being limited to that one approach to be reasonable to start with the county, national highways?

27:56

We're happy with that approach. So let's do county council.

27:59

Happy with the approach set and worship county council.

28:04

Agreed. I think we're happy with that approach. So thank you. Okay.

28:09

The next in response to that guidance, the applicant has asked this was a County Council's NDI modeling team to look at the data, but their responses were only received back last week on the 24th of October. And that wasn't a time to analyze it and put it into the deadline to submission. That being the case, do you know when you're going to be able to undertake that analysis and submitted into the application? applicant, please? We will. We'll review the initial guidance from NDI, which we have we have some feedback from and then we'll we will meet with the highway authorities to really approach in terms of modeling the next phase

28:48

and the submission date.

28:51

And we I mean, we I would like it to the deadline of three, which is the 14th of November. Okay, we will we will endeavor to get it for deadline three. Thank you. There's the County Council and the height national highways think that's going to be possible.

29:12

Pick anything that share county council clearly it's under the gift of the applicant to obtain that information and present that to us in a timely manner. But we will be to our best to facilitate that. Thank you. Thank you national highways. Mr. Benson national highways, we will do the same search to try and facilitate that I will speak to our supply chain to understand their timescales as well. Thank you.

29:33

I appreciate it. It's a tight timetable for fortnight. But we if we get to get this through the whole six months with appropriate we need to make sure that it expedites the system clearly in a fairly fundamental point.

29:47

All right.

29:52

When

29:55

I also want you to have to have a look at some of the other traffic data now I've ever seen.

30:00

The plan is showing where the various links are.

30:04

Before I go through them, can I ask the applicant to review those plans which should have been submitted?

30:10

In the near future? I've already done it relatively quickly. So I might have made mistakes. But I don't think all the links on table 8.3 are shown. For example, I couldn't find links 76 and on sheet 21, there has indicated that link 41 B for support 669 Hinkley road is on that plan, but it isn't.

30:32

I have found that sheet on on one on sheet 25 but it runs off the page. So I'm not clear what the western end is. Could you please therefore asked you to go and have a look through them all and if necessary, submit. And as well as revised plans, can I have a shedule setting out where all the changes have been made? And again, can I have that the deadline for you please? Yes, sir. Thank you.

30:54

Okay, I'll now want to move on to LORRY PARKING, if that's possible. So we're going to come back to washing up traffic modeling OBM when we've been through everything else.

31:05

As you're aware, there's a lorry Park proposed on the southern side of the link road. And I'm wondering what the proposals are for its operation, could the illustrative master plan a PP 043 has been put up on the screen.

31:40

The lorry park, but first looking is in the air to the southwest of the overall development in

31:50

this sort of the area

31:53

and to the southwest of the

31:59

site, the link roads probably the easiest way to place it right if anybody wasn't quite orientated as to where it is.

32:08

The applicant's indicates this be a private lorry Park. But would this be limited to those accessing the rail port or those using the rail port and the warehousing or just the way housing units only that be advised please?

32:24

Thank you. So for my oath of the applicant, I think to

32:27

clarify, it stated in the project description chapter of the paragraph three point 47 that the access to the lorry park will be controlled so that it's available for

32:41

Pinkley national railfreight interchange related traffic which is traffic using the warehousing and traffic using the rail port Fine. How would that be secured and enforced?

32:55

Again, this is a work in progress in the highways position statement that you will have seen that was submitted at deadline one set out the applicants intention to include requirements related to the governing of access to the lorry Park to ensure that it remained for development related traffic only that requirements will be proposed in the next iteration of the DCO. And we envisage that that will entail adherence to a scheme which will control that access. And again, that scheme will also be prepared and submitted alongside the next draft of the DCA which I think is a deadline three

33:39

biggest deadline for but I might be wrong about that. Does the county council and national highways have any comments about that mechanism for enforcement

33:51

Mark Richmond Smith for the county council not at present present observation is we haven't got a requirement we need to see it and then comment on it like

34:05

Steve and Sam national highways

34:08

for for your benefit. So we're supportive of the LOI parking because it provides a facility that means does not belong to on our network facilities. However, we do want to see the scheme and the plans for the enforcement of how it is going to operate to ensure that it doesn't then have an effect on the local road network in the strategic road network. I'm sure the applicant is fully aware of that particular point. And clearly, depending on precisely how it is proposed to be enforced

34:37

will obviously be critical to its whether it does what it does or whether it acts as acts as an additional factor for traffic.

34:49

Next question I've got is

34:52

I don't know how he's gonna get good work. Well, we can have all the series of documents a PP 52 a PP. 55

35:00

either up, these are the facings drawings for the area and you'll see the area in question. I don't know whether it's possible to get all six plans up at one on different tabs. If it's possible, it will be better, it would be easier. So that happened and then do some talking well, that goes on in the background, I hope. What I'd like the applicant to go through is the phase and the delivery of the rail port returns area and the lorry Park as shown in relation to the other development proposed.

35:27

I'm interested not only in the timeline, but the why the timeline was chosen.

35:34

The series of documents which I've said my understanding is the rail port returns area would be delivered in Phase four, which is on a PPO 4053 And I'm wondering whether it should be delivered as soon as the rail port becomes operational, which is in phase two or what other mechanism would be in place to ensure that lorries are weighed HGVs are waiting to go to the rail port area would be able to park up without causing a difficulty.

36:14

Berry Baker Baker rose on behalf of the applicant as far as the airport phasing is concerned the master plan and concept is to bring it forward as soon as we can. And therefore if there is a demand to bring forward that for need for the rail port servicing and and lorry access and everything then it would be brought forward first, it wouldn't wait until the relevant phase of buildings. But that's not what's shown on the plans. It's indicative as a master plan. It's indicative this phasing because the bid the phasing it's led to the problems which the county was the County Council's have identified. If it's needed at phase two then surely it should be shown on the drawings for phase two.

37:01

This is really a highway question not a trance, a traffic a trains question railway twist

37:11

think we'll we'll have to review that one.

37:15

I want to thank you

37:21

do and cannot do that. Do any of the authorities have any comments on that? They'll start with Leicester county council. Leicestershire county council have any comment? If you haven't got any comments? That's fine. There's national highway so any comments? Blaby District Council any comments?

37:40

At Stacy flavor District Council no thank you and pinky boss was history Council.

37:45

That's fine if this tricky show.

37:50

While we're talking parking since volume, traffic volumes are likely to be influenced by the amount of parking that might be available on site. In I was interested to note in the deadline to submission last week on the device design code, section 9.2 sites, primarily the parking will provide that surface level with quotes multi level multi storey car parks only being provided to address occupy specific needs. And unquote. Can the applicant explain how this relates to traffic modeling? And how robust the modeling is if the development is subject to further traffic general remain generation facilitated or promoted by the occupiers seeking additional parking?

38:32

Yeah, so the traffic generation was based on floor space. As we've we've explained within our deadline, one submission. And the requirement for parking is in line with with leicestershire's Maximum parking standards. I think there needs to be in terms of the trip generation, we're confident that that's a very robust approach we've taken in terms of the trips that are generated from that site. There's been no discounting involved with the

39:03

the mezzanine floors that are included. So we've been we've we've basically included for the maximum amount of floor space and then added the rail port trips on top of that. I think so we from from a from a modeling point of view, we're confident that though those trips are very robust in terms of parking, we are slightly below the maximum standard. So therefore it would be

39:28

it would be dependent on those occupiers as to as to what what that would be, what those requirements would be at the time and the facilities that they would need within those maxima that are set by Leicestershire. Could you sign post me to where the calculation of the car parking numbers has been made? Is showing that it is below the County Council's maximum standard? Yes, it's in the center transport assessment.

39:57

If you just bear with me a second

40:11

And the past more b2b in terms of the reference to multi storey, car parking, that's more of a master planning, issue them and then

40:21

I appreciate I just it was the first time it just appeared. And we were thinking if people are wanting multi storey car parks that's going to increase likely to increase the amount of traffic running to and from the site, which means that traffic modeling hasn't been question mark about it. If they weren't there it What if multistorey car parking? Wasn't there had been done? Because it's new to the Zanko? Then our issue disappears. I spent the County Council's bus you probably would disappear for having noticed that but themselves? I'm sure they did.

40:51

Yeah, so it's table 5.53 and five for within the transport assessment.

41:01

But can I ask the applicant to go and have coordinate a bit more in the past the

41:07

in the design code over this question over multi story car parking? Because there is a question mark as to how that contributes rate on to the flows of traffic there are from

41:19

I think to reiterate, I think the the the my appreciate it's more than that, but I'm sorry carpark spaces are included within the total number of spaces assumed for the development. Could that be explained to me? Yeah, in the in the submission that how

41:36

that surface level quantum of car parking and the multi storey amount that may be anticipated?

41:44

Yes, because it wasn't clear to us before that last week that that multi storey car parking was proposed in any way, shape or form, sir, thank you.

41:57

Next, I'd like to move on to phasing, which is the phase of the delivery of the associated infrastructure because it doesn't appear clear to me as to what that is. I'd like the applicant to explain the extent of the with infrastructure, but without development models is the that infrastructure the M 69 junction to southern link southern slip roads, the and the link road between the M 69. Junction two and before 668 I was able to send link road only, or does it include additional all the additional infrastructure work up to an including work 22

42:37

of our capacity the applicant, sir, to confirm that the model approach without development with infrastructure includes for the south facing slip roads on the conjunction to the 69. The a 47 link road to the B 4668. It doesn't include for other works, mitigation works within that package.

43:03

parity

43:05

does the link road and include the its western roundabout and the works to the A 47 roundabout and short Westerns to Northwest it includes the works to the before 6x Eight. So the roundabout there but not to the the the works to be a 47 Thank you.

43:26

So what I would like to now to know is the phasing of the other works as to when what are the triggers, etc for those and at what point they would come in? Yeah. And to the reasons behind us doing the scenario without development with infrastructure was to understand that background redistribution of traffic, it was something that we discussed with with the local authorities at the time, it seemed like a reasonable approach to take to understand what what the infrastructure brings to the to the locality where that that redistribution happens. So

44:09

that's sort of a bit of a bit of a background in terms of how that's done. On the back of that. It was it was quickly realized that a lot of the mitigation that we are proposing onto the network would be required at that very early stage once the delivery of the access infrastructure is in place. And the the first occupation that happens on site, so the phasing was very much the reason behind that scenario was because we needed to understand what that what that background traffic movement was. And then that reveals was that it triggered the need for these permits, mitigation works that we've put into the package. But when are they going to be delivered at what point did the day become the the the upper works as it were the additional mitigation works and what's the trigger for them? The trigger trigger is first occupied

45:00

Should right

45:03

could you just I would like the applicant to confirm that is all secured in the draft DCO

45:08

yes sir pull mail for the applicant I mean, I refer to requirement five. In the draft DCA, what requirement five deals with is the phasing of of those highway works and works number eight and nine, those being the, the two slips are required to be completed prior to the occupation of any warehouse floor space. And then in relation to the other numbered works forming part of the highway works, those are all to be completed prior to the opening, or actually the first opening of either slip. So that package of measures is all in place prior to first occupation. And

45:52

to cover what Mr. Ashe said about the rerouting of background traffic, all of those off site works as it were all in place for when the slips open. Okay. So

46:07

the electoral authorities have a view on that trigger being appropriate.

46:12

There's Telnet, as you can take out Council

46:16

recommends to initiate county council Yes, we consider the trigger to be appropriate. And the requirements themselves to us are not clear. That's the That's just like if necessary. It's the trigger. What I'm trying to sort out is clarified the points for the for the modeling point is that

46:32

all these mitigation works will be in place by that point a national highway, you can content with that as the answer. And that's to be able to move or not move on from that point. We are in terms of the modeling assessments, however, the phasing for the development going forward, we recommend actually the slips are needed for to build construction for construction tracking purposes, but we'll cover that later. Okay. Does we're actually count accounts have any comments on that?

47:03

The nonspecifically. So Nicolas, don't see where it's going to cancel. We defer to the the other authorities on that.

47:19

Which does actually made us move on to that whether on to whether on night, Nate neatly on to those points for the to slip whether the two ends six nonslip raise the point whether they were at what point they should be in place. Could Do you wish to take that further please? Thank you. So Mr. Benson national highways, national highways view is that really the northbound oscillate and southbound on slip should be provided prior to built construction and that's to ease the construction access arrangements for the site.

47:51

And that is the basis that the then the traffic construction traffic can utilize the strategic road network rather than trying to use a local road network which may be to the detriment of local residents and an immunity in the area. It also means that the junction is fully operational as well to those phases of the development as is built and as it's occupied. Moving forward.

48:17

There is one additional comment sir which we'd like to make under phasing, which is as well is that we feel as national highways that the railhead should be provided from the day of opening of the scheme to promote sustainable movement of freight we'll come back to that later. Does the applicant not not the rail right we'll come back to that later is the provision of the slip roads

48:42

per mile for the applicant. I'll let Mr. Ashe deal with some of the modeling points related to that. But as there is a point that principle goes to the minute the slips are open, then all of the other highway works needs to be in place effectively to provide for the Mets to provide mitigation for traffic rerouting to use those slips. So it isn't simply a case of building the slips to enable construction traffic then to access the main site because the minute the slips are open, the a 47 link road needs to be in place that includes the knee bridge across the fairway and all of the and all of the other work so it's it's it's not simply for the slips into enable the construction traffic to access. I'll let Mr. Ashe talk about the modeling.

49:28

Thank you sir.

49:30

In terms of in terms of the delivery of the slips, I think that they are proposed in the first year of the construction phase

49:39

with the AK 47 Link being built around the same time. And therefore the majority of the site when it for the construction of the of the buildings would be would have the slip roads in place.

49:57

Phases further down further along

50:00

The construction program

50:08

and I asked national highways, if we came to the conclusion that

50:15

it could be constructed, we agreed with the applicant and it could be constructed prior to first occupation. What is your view that the 3d modeling needs to be rerun of that and that alone?

50:28

Yes, sir, would need to be. And that's because actually the 847 link vote and the slips are one package in themselves, the development needs them itself, not just the rerouting of background traffic. Now, I appreciate that. It's more to do with

50:43

the point of the trigger.

50:45

Additional modeling would be need to be done. So yes, to understand the suitable trigger of when any piece of infrastructure is needed across our network.

50:58

Do you think it would be possible if I could ask the applicant if they could produce produce eggs again to a similar chart, setting out the construction program for the proposed development, showing how the phasing of those minimal I work is secure and how the M 69. Junction works are?

51:16

As as you've said, there'll be an early operation? And how the time shaped frame set within the requirements certain elements are going to be possible.

51:26

Yes, sir.

51:27

When do you think you might be able to deliver that D three or day four? I think that will might have to be a default. Would it be nice if we dumped on d3? I would hope it exists all? Yes, it could be done.

51:38

I will check with the team. But if we can get into d3, then we will thank you.

51:48

Now Now I'd like to ask the applicant if the cumulative assessment of construction traffic modeling counts for the effects of potential closures due to work on the M 69. junction to sorry, apology. So if I could just make one more point on the on the last agenda item which we were taught we're focusing very much on the construction of the roads and the infrastructure. Of course, in order to enable the a 47 link road to be constructed in itself. There are some fairly substantial earthworks which needs to take place on on the site. So I don't I think we need to bear in mind that we're not just simply talking about the construction of the road in isolation. We'll certainly put that in to the development Gantt chart that you've asked for. Thank you. The normal response from applicants at that point is that essentially earthmoving equipment goes in once and stays there until the end. So the actual traffic so bear associated with normally fairly minor

52:40

highway authorities have any comments on that?

52:46

We haven't seen any modeling of the construction traffic impacts Okay.

52:59

Okay.

53:03

I'd now like to move on to the timing of the rail connection. representations, as we've heard been received national highways and others as the others, they affect light see the rail connection operational prior to the occupation of any warehousing. I appreciate the depressant that isn't appropriate proposal with the applicant using a trigger of 105,000 square meters of warehousing space. I just do have a question about that figure. Can I just be specific, be specific, and I asked their applicant? Why it shows that figure? And and the question about any associated office space, and whether that should or should not be how that deals within the 105,000 square meters figure and how it how that should be sorted out and secured.

53:48

I appreciate it as 105,000 square meters of warehousing. But there will be inevitably because that's taken off the sanitary the Phase One an element of associated office floor space, it isn't clear what the quantum of that would be and what the effect of traffic modeling of that would be visa vie the

54:09

these would be the rail port

54:19

Thank you. So Paul, my hope for the for the applicant.

54:25

Clearly is you've identified requirement 10 is based on amount of warehouse floor space, that warehouse floor space correlates with the extent of warehouse for floor space on the parameters plan set out for zone A, which is the clarification point. We'd expect that I think on the figures aren't being shown here. But we'll clarify in due course to include about five to 10% of his space

54:55

so you're looking at

54:58

it worst case another 10,000

55:00

Another 10,000 square meters of office floor space.

55:05

I think from from the truck trip generation point of view is that five to 10% for B eight type developments is is around the right level for these sorts of

55:16

developments. So it would be ancillary to the DEA numbers that we've dealt with. And I appreciate the idea, but it says it's not clear whether the 105,000 is warehousing including ancillary offices, or whether it is 105,000 of warehousing plus five to 10%. Of associated office.

55:39

I think we can certainly look at the way the requirements worded to make that clear, so if that's the way in which is it

55:46

it's inclusive, so it's always inclusive, it's handwritten for a total of 105 square meters, whether that be trade warehouse or ancillary office by Thank you

56:01

do any of the particularly the highway authorities or any other body have any comment about that 105,000 square meter based out we've got that bit of clarification on it

56:15

now we'll just move on to the justification for there being a figure at all.

56:21

The NPS and and then that national policy statement for national networks or if I use that acronym, in paragraph 4.83 states from the outset a rail freight interchange RFI should be developed on a form that can accommodate accommodate both rail and non rail activities, ie from the outset, and paragraph 4.88 goes on applications for a proposed split rail freight interchange should provide a number of rail connected or rail accessible buildings, or initial takeup plus rail infrastructure allow more extensive rail connections within longer term. initial stages of development must provide an operational rail network connection and there is inter modal handling and contain the storage. It's not essential for all buildings on the site to be rail connected from the outset. outset, but significant elements would be Can I have the applicants thoughts on how a proposal complies with this, so the initial so its initial stages provide an operational rail network connection and areas of intermodal handling and container storage. I appreciate the applicants reasoning in the planning statement. But please remember that we are needing to consider this application in its own terms. And since we also have the draft national policy statement for national networks, which dates in paragraph 4.84. Applicants should develop rail infrastructure and buildings capable of road connection from the outset and consideration of further rail infrastructure to allow more extensive rail connection within the site in the longer term is strongly encouraged. So it's whether the draft NPS nn makes any difference and your thoughts generally please for the applicant.

58:05

ramps and ramps and Town Planning representing the applicant.

58:09

The applicant has explained its position on the proposed timing for the provision of the rail terminal respect to requirement 10 When the clarification in the highways position statement, which was submitted deadline one

58:25

and the statement says the applicant considers that it is reasonable for construction and occupation to take place within construction phase A as identified on the illustrative works and phasing plan, then that would amount to 12% of the proposed total floor space.

58:46

And these early occupiers would be able to use the rail port once it becomes operational. And you'll see in the appendix to the market needs assessment documents 16.1 correspondence from maritime who are the preferred operator for the rail port at Hinkley. That and their quote from that letter from our experience with other s RFIs. Startups we believe that the opportunity to allow warehouse occupation and operations to take place ahead of rail terminal operations is instrumental in allowing organic growth and encouragement of occupiers to use the SR f5 to its full capacity. So it's to good news to have those early occupations.

59:39

The position is like all major construction developments is a vast investment up front. You've got fast investment in the slip roads if you've just heard and the AK 47 link the bridge over the railway

59:58

and the other way

1:00:00

arcs. And as the MPs says, These SRF i's are to come forward in a commercial framework. And particularly here at Hinkley national we have the rail connection on the west side of the site and the SRN connection on the east side of the site. So you've got works to connect as well in terms of the development. And so we say in terms of the flexibility that's referenced into the MPs and the realities of major developments coming forward, that it is appropriate, or this developer to enable some advanced occupations, and then the requirements stops it until the rail port has been completed. But we think it's an entirely reasonable approach. And we consider the approach chimes with the the emerging MPs and this recognition of the need for flexibility and commercial reality, like you.

1:01:08

Do I have responded to any comments that the national highways wants to make a move on the other floor to register me? Thank you, sir. Mr. Benson, we have been through the highways position statement provided and document reference 18 point 2.1. And we note the comments regarding the West Midlands rail freight interchange and Northampton del Valle great interchange, and the

amendment audit that was made on that. However, national highways perspective is that we should be trying to deliver sustainable developments with all movements by all modes as soon as possible in line with the new circular as well. So

1:01:44

what I would suggest is perhaps we need to have a modeling exercise undertaken with the phasing of the 500,000 elements to understand what highway mitigation would be needed on our network, the SRN, I won't speak for my colleagues and local highway authorities. And that's because obviously that will have a more road based element and have a greater impact on the network then perhaps has been considered the moment which has just failed a complete rail and road split site.

1:02:15

And I have the applicants response to that, please.

1:02:18

Yeah, Malcolm ash are the applicant. And I think that to remodel on the basis of 500,000 square square meters is you know, we've we've already modeled with the 850,000. We've suggested that most of the all of the

1:02:36

highway infrastructures is delivered within that early phase because of the the background traffic. We just feel feel that that additional 500,000

1:02:47

into remodeling is not needed.

1:02:52

Just just to confirm the debt was based on the hunt isn't done. 105 It hasn't been done on 500,000 That's correct. Yep, fine. That's fine. I've got I've got I've just got to check make it clear in my mind as to the way we are just the county council have to make Leicestershire county council have to come to work here in a minute.

1:03:10

Mark Wessman Smith because council so we don't need to add to what national highways said that reflects our position. Thank you.

1:03:19

And we're actually county council.

1:03:24

Member I think we are in agreement Nicholas dancy Orange County Council. So I think we're in agreement with the height the other highway authorities. Thank you very much.

1:03:32

Does anybody else wants to make any comments on this? The point about the timing of the

1:03:39

rail port being delivered an operation thank you. Duncan O'Connor for Blaby District Council. The council's position is set out in its written representation.

1:03:52

The NPS is clear that a significant element of buildings should be well connected from the outset. were acknowledged there are precedents for some floor space being allowed before our connection is established and the applicants highway position statement identifies those and the council's position is that the onus is on the applicant to justify why that is appropriate in the circumstances.

1:04:18

The council acknowledges

1:04:22

the revised draft NPS and paragraph 8.4 Sorry 4.86 of the revised draft NPS.

1:04:30

But the revised draft also says that applicants should develop rail infrastructure and buildings capable of rail connection from the outset.

1:04:41

And the applicants phasing plan in particular shows that units one and two, which are the first units to be developed are not capable of being rail connected from the outset. So it'd be a question for you certainly a decision maker to decide whether that is compliant with the NPS.

1:05:06

Get over where there's a gentleman at the back.

1:05:12

Thank you very much timber also resident of Barwell, I'd have I can refer to the document a gentleman has already referred to, which is the letter from the proposed operator of the site, which I think is I won't try to remember the name. I'm not questioning the actual quote from that letter. And I haven't got it with me. My interpretation of that letter was not, clearly if you build it, they will come. But rather their experience was that if you build it, some people might be tempted to look at coming. It did not and nowhere is addressed the issue that if you fill a site full of operators who are road dependent, you are highly unlikely to attract anyone who wants to use the rail facility. Thank you very much. Thank you.

1:06:00

The applicant? Yes. Thank you. So Paul, male for the applicant. First off, if I might ask

1:06:06

for some clarification from national highways on the 500,000 figure. That wasn't a figure that I immediately recognized and wondered what that was a reference to.

1:06:18

These

1:06:21

I may have got the figure mistaken in my head. Apologies.

1:06:27

And now I can't remember. Let me just double check and I'll come back. Yes, certainly. We were having we'll be having a break fairly shortly. Particularly, there will be people who have been online for some time before we started so well. It's probably actually it makes it quite a good place to sort of have a 10 minute break at this point anyway. So if we have an adjournment now for 10 minutes, you think got wet unless you think where you got got the 500,000 Figure Figure from there. We can go from there. which case we'll get It's now three. It's like lots wrong. It's now seven minutes past. If we come back at a quarter past is that all right? So just just under 10 minutes, so if we could return at quarter past We're adjourned until quarter past