

TRANSCRIPT_ISH2_SESSION3_31102023

Tue, Oct 31, 2023 4:44PM • 1:39:16

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

road, applicant, junction, traffic, highway, development, stanton, route, link, village, impact, crossing, stoney, mitigation, proposed, terms, point, number, deadline, issue

00:06

Good afternoon. Good afternoon all the hearing is resumed. Can I just confirm with the case team that the livestream recording is working? I'm getting an appropriate note from the backseat. Thank you very much for that.

00:20

Right.

00:22

Returning to where we were just before the lunch break on the A 46, seven length road junctions? Yeah, I've been like you, I've been looking at the thing and I can see the background figures, the background traffic is there. But however that does that does lead to the question of whether paragraph 3.2, which is the wild which essentially says the distribution of the traffic, everything coming in from the northwest would could turn off and go in from the first jump, first junction and everything coming in from the M 69. would go off with the first SEC at the first roundabout is accurate with the crossing between the two of them and obviously going to the lorry Park. And well, that part what that paragraph is accurate, if that makes sense.

01:07

Yeah, okay. Mark of ash for the applicant. And the the report itself was based on testing those, those roundabouts to

01:19

what we think will be the impacts on on them.

01:24

The links between the two roundabouts to account for the PRT and flows through their capacity was tested with a 50% and a 65% sensitivity to understand whether that would be tested to disruption or not. Both worked well. And those were tested against the crossings as well through on the A 40 suddenlink road itself. Thank you. Does any of the highway authorities make any comment on any of that?

01:50

List account listed again? This is recommend for this check and counsel. Just to confirm that on the basis that information was only submitted last week, had an opportunity to review it in detail. Yes, no. Absolutely. Absolutely. Detail submission. You're very much entitled to make representations. The next d3, which is a couple of weeks time 14 to November.

02:12

So could I sorry. So could I just make a couple of points of things that rose this morning it might be helpful to clarify before we move on in the agenda and I'll pass to Mr. Atia Mr. Pasmore to do this. Firstly, is the question about the capacity shown in the TA for the the T link road, roundabouts where they exit the site and what that actually shows. And then secondly, it was the relationship between the predicted numbers of junction 21 and the sustainable transport measures that would come on to but I think in the light what Mr. Simms said this morning, I think it's worth Mr. PASMO. Just making a comment on that, before we move on to that section of the agenda. Thank you,

02:52

Andy Passman for the applicant. The modeling was based on the trip generation assuming that the travel plan wasn't implemented and none of the sustainable transport measures were implemented. Given the population of Leicester its proximity to development and the fact that regardless of the delays at junction 21, it's gonna be the most direct route for car shares and public transport users to the site

03:16

where the opinion that the measures would make a higher contribution to the travel plan target reductions and more remote junctions where highway improvements have been proposed.

03:33

Anything more wrong, Let us burn ministration before we move on to as it were the next item which is on K which is set sorry. So just just in terms of the the access roundabout Sunday, the question earlier on about before 6x Eight just to clarify that that is table 8.5 With

03:53

within the transport assessment itself that demonstrates that the the proposed roundabout junction does function well within the capacity of of the

04:04

the

04:06

job later when they've got the opportunity. Thank you.

04:10

Okay, all right.

04:12

So move on to k which is the effect on

04:15

Sakura village.

04:18

effect. Can we look at the proposed traffic figures? Can we have off the sheet 25 of the link lands during the links please

04:31

get right.

04:35

It's the top of the hour because of being sat because the top of the top of the hill Thank you.

04:41

The links 41 and 43. Identify there's a small blue section at the end. I'm assuming that is link 92 Because it wasn't at the offices hasn't been there's a link number on it but not

04:59

and so

05:00

There's a color on it. But I'm assuming from what I've noticed, is one of the problems identified with the plans, like I said earlier. Sorry, yes, that's covered in 1992. Right, assumed it was. So the data from these shows that we have increases of in all traffic movements for nine for 3000 802,209. Eat moving east, west to east along those three.

05:26

And in HGVs 275-262-1228,

05:32

which are all over well over 100% increases in that on those links.

05:37

As we saw earlier, they're all on undesirable routes. If you go back on the HGV management and road routing strategy. Do you have any comments on on that which clearly is showing that ATVs are made finding a way to go through this?

05:53

Yes, the southern slip roads through the PRT draw

06:00

HGVs through Sapkota, resulting in predicted doubling of HGV movements,

06:06

which would be around 13 to 25 per hour over 16 hour period. Development trips will be managed by an HGV routing strategy and also later, so Sony diverted background traffic which would be impacting their traffic calming signalization of Stanford Lane had been proposed to make the loop route less attractive to HGVs in order to reduce this reassignment and mitigate the environmental impact of the residual vehicles. And the resulting scheme we think is reasonable and proportionate. But these figures are the mitigated answer numbers aren't

06:41

that they've been mitigated numbers and mitigated.

06:46

underpass more for the applicant. I'd also like to point out that the

06:53

the increase in HGVs is primarily to do with reassigned background traffic, which in the opening year 2026 is 50 HGVs, which is 27%. So it's traffic growth that is that is predicted in the model to result in additional HGVs. And obviously the traffic calming the signalization of the junctions either end of Stanton lane, our aim to try and reduce that minimize it as far as possible, and ensure that the environmental effects of those additional issues are are mitigated.

07:34

Does Leicestershire County Council's make any of these figures notwithstanding you only got got them at the end of last week.

07:47

backends in Austria contests

07:50

were not clear how the proposed mitigation for SAP cope village will in effect address those additional HGP flows. It's not clear how a gateway feature a zebra crossing. Some planters and some seating will address the impact of doubling of HGV traffic

08:12

and device more for the applicant. It's not just the traffic calming, it's the signalization on Stanton lane, which will obviously on both sides of standard like which will allow us to to make those movements less attractive to HGVs. It is reassigned background traffic so it is coming from somewhere else because of that route being more attractive in the base situation. And therefore we've we've identified that those measures to try and mitigate that as much as we can.

08:48

And the backends to the ship and counsel on the basis. We haven't seen any strategic modeling of the mitigation. We can't draw those conclusions.

09:01

I think in terms of anti past,

09:03

I think in terms of strategic modeling, that's obviously peak hour flows. The HGV routing strategy identifies that only 25 HGVs will be rerouted as a consequence in the peak hours as a consequence of the the undesirable routes, and therefore we don't believe that will have any bearing on the on the peak hour transport assessments.

09:32

I'm going to continue to look at this. This drawing I've been looking at the traffic flows between links 43 and 46, which you can see at that point on there.

09:44

In Table eight at the old traffic blink between both afforded link 43 and linked 46 drops by just under 29% or approximately 3700 movements a day. So effectively Are you saying that the

10:00

If that is the amount of trend of traffic generated by the eastern end of SAP cut,

10:05

do you know approximately how many dwellings are in that area?

10:10

It was something that we've visited while we were looking at the prgm with a what's called a select link analysis that looked at the trips passing specific points within the village to understand the distribution of where those those trips were coming from.

10:26

We that is included in the forecast model reports

10:31

at Figure three point 12. And it demonstrates that a lot of that traffic is generated from the local area in terms of in terms of dwellings and on at least population within Stanton, Stoney, Stanton and Satco. We were looking at about six and a half 1000 people. I'm the reason I was doing the number crunching was a sort of, I was doing a

10:57

if there are X number of dwellings, and on average dwelling has y number of movements as a day. What were the I think, sort of mental? All these figures reasonable? Check. That's the reason why I was interested in how many dwellings there were in that end of saccade. Alright, sorry. Alright.

11:20

That's some background noise. And

11:23

then there was I was wondering if

11:26

Blaby was able to provide a rough idea as to how many dwellings they're meant to be sort of to put in

11:35

to the west, sort of to the east of length 43. On that plan. It might be interesting, interested, that sort of center center check of the data, given normal tricks, data on how many? What how many dwellings? How many movements are associated with the dwelling? Just a sense check that the marble

11:56

could in a crib lady be able to find that information for us. Yeah. Yeah. So I think that's something baby can provide. Thank you very much. That'd be great essentially, is to the end of junction 43. Just about approximately how many dwellings would serve into that node into that node?

12:20

The applicant and others will see in the critiques about the width of the beef four, double six, nine in SAP cut, and Does he wish to make any comments about that?

12:35

I think the roadworks in Sydney Stanton for that matter. It should be mentioned that the before 669 is an existing link to a strategic road network. It is fully adopted with no rate restrictions through it.

12:54

There are constraints around the center of the town. We've acknowledged in our our reporting. And those are

13:03

generally around the presence of buildings to the back of footway. And the inability to widen any further in terms of the very center of Saqqara itself. And elsewhere the road is

13:20

that the roadworks are are adequate for the purpose of the the road of this nature. So what was your response be to be that the proposition to HGV traffic should not be using this route, except providing deliveries?

13:36

I think it would be a very difficult measure to enforce. I think it is. As I say it's an adopted highway with access to the strategic road network. There are existing businesses within subcut and Stoney Stanton and brought nastily which use the route exists at the moment and to enforce further restrictions on that will be will be difficult very tricky to enforce. But not impossible.

14:07

It is I don't I don't think it really would be appropriate for restrictions will be enforced through the through the village. Oh, I've never had an perhaps more discussion about that in a minute.

14:19

Does anybody else want to make have any comment about the effect on SAP but we'll come to the other we're going to other villages. Later. We're just doing one one at a time. So gently run the back was first

14:33

ever Morgan chair circuit parish council. I just wanted to go back to the mitigation proposed mitigation with the separate crossing point one zebra crossings they have to have to be lit with certain lighting, I believe. Now for any HGVs to pass the area in which you're proposing the zebra crossing, then must mount the pavement. The pavements in that area either with or around 600 mil. So I just want to know what to do.

15:00

Your proposal would be for the lighting of the zebra crossing.

15:08

In addition to that, you've done the proposal you're relocating the bus stop. So we're taking a bus stop from outside the village shop, which is off the highway. And looking at placing it further right outside the entrance or entrance and exit of a residential road

15:28

right along where eventually there could be up to 400 additional HGVs traveling through the village things in a day.

15:36

As soon as the bus stops at the bus stop, and a lorry approaches where the buses start, you don't have a single lane carriageway with a road with that may or may not be in that particular location.

15:49

Less than six meters wide.

15:54

Thank you, thank you.

15:57

And then the lady at

15:59

the front was

16:03

Sharon Scott resident of Saqqara and I've lived there all my life I would say and I referred earlier to an accident in the 60s. And the road layout hasn't changed since then. So I just would like to say you're, if this is allowed, we're opening it up to profitable child fatalities.

16:21

I attended the tri tax consultation in sabko in January of 2022. And I raised the point about the narrow footpaths and the house is backing right up to the footpath and the how they were going to

16:36

widen it. I also said to the ITA at the highways consultant that I was aware that some residents in the village had received letters from Tara request on behalf of tri tax requesting details of the title to their properties and outstanding mortgage borrowings. But I was told that was just red tape. And I said to the highway expert, well Please can you indicate to me on a map, how you're actually going to achieve widening of the of the footpaths and the roadways? And he refused to answer my question of walked off.

17:08

The latest consultation. traffic calming scheme is different in that it's got on street parking bays, and Gateway features and additional gateways.

17:22

But I would say that none of this has really been consulted on I mean, in particular parking bays, there will no details of those were given at the consultation. And they may affect village businesses, particularly the nursery, and also the center of the village, which is the bit where the I don't I'm sure you've looked at it. But the bit where the the very narrow pavements are. I mean, that's the central hub for people. There's the coop, and there's the post office.

17:51

And I don't know whether you're aware, but because it's not cook grew up in the 1960s, we do have quite an elderly population. So you know, you've got quite a number of elderly people visiting Co Op post office.

18:05

And you've also got the children walk into school. So I do think this will be horrendous. I mean, try tax did also carry out consultations on a bypass in August 2019. But the only thing they offered up was just the lines on maps the route for option A a completely failed to take account. And Scott, that isn't info on the table in front of us. So that is not relevant to our discussions today. No, that's fine.

18:32

Because it's part of the consultation. There's a terms if the application in front of us that's what we're right. That's fine, then that's all I want to say on that. I mean, I do hope that things will take into account the rendus effect on Snapcode. Thank you

18:48

haven't done yet CPR at the frontier.

18:52

Thank you for

18:54

I want to make two key points. The first one is I do want to come back to what the applicant said about the national planning policy framework in regards to

19:07

HTV going through a village such as this, the assertion seems to be that because this

19:15

have existing HGVs that adding additional HGVs and it has permission for ATVs will be safe and suitable.

19:26

We would like to assert very clearly that that's not how we interpret the NPPF and I have been it inquiries into sites in rural areas where specifically the issue of whether HGVs can go through a road because of the width of the road has been a determining factor. So I think that the idea that because there is an existing problem, it is acceptable to put that problem in

20:00

and it comes back to the additional the issue that originally came up on the motorway junction, which it was specifically to avoid traffic using these roads, that those slip roads weren't there. So if you encourage an increased traffic through an area which already have the problem, you still have to answer the question relevant to this in NPPF. Is it safe and suitable. And when we come to the width of the road,

20:33

we don't know because we don't have it before us. The pedestrians that are using that section, we don't have any evidence with regard to that. We not we have a list of crossings or whether the rhythm a piece of, of infrastructure, but we don't have any examination of that we don't have any examination, we may come back to this in detail. If when you address cycling, but it's very relevant to this point. We don't have any information or any traffic assessment of cycling, even though we know from the Strava data that this is the route that's used. So we have none of the basic information to answer the question, which is relevant to the NPPF, which is relevant to the width of those rows as to whether it is safe and suitable for vehicles to use it. That clearly, we can't restrict people who already have use and it is a road that is already used. But that does not mean that we should suddenly add to it, I want to just add one particular technical thing, and I thought you would have stolen my thunder when you produce that document. But if I could just

21:44

take you to 819 the length again, you refer to the overall length, I just wanted to refer to the link the traffic which is using it, which is HGVs. And if one looks at

22:01

41, I couldn't do this before, because we've only just got the now appreciate this, that's where the links are. And I've searched for them.

22:11

And if you look at the difference between the without development, and with development, you'll see on 41 of the 197, HGVs.

22:24

And 472 was the development in place. You'll see on 43, that 142 and 404 HGVs.

22:35

When we go down to a very odd thing happens or seems odd to me, when we go down to the link 46, which you mentioned, there are 52 HD TVs, the number of eight qubits has gone down that you that link. And there are 349 HEV is going down the link to link 46. And it comes in a way a bit like the problem that you introduced before or or it seems to me that it is because

23:08

the issue there is that roughly about 275 290

23:15

Are the difference in each case. So all the development

23:22

traffic or all the reassigned traffic, some of it will be reassigned. Some of it will be people who are going to the site who want the motor anyway. But all that traffic is going down the B 4669 To link 46. Less traffic is actually in the development. So using the shot, you're going down anywhere else. Now the only other route

23:47

that will be likely to be used by an HDTV that was coming through there unless they were going to fat code presumably to the Co Op, which is about the only thing there is in SAP code.

23:58

Any HTV would have to be good. We'll be going down there or Shawn for I think it's charm for road. Yeah. So my question is what's happening on chamfered road? Why if the traffic is increasing down to link 46 isn't the same proportion going down chamfered road what what's stopping it do that?

24:22

And a result of that and of course chamfered road is not not

24:28

identified. It's not modeled if we went to table 820 We would see a moderate impact of 7000 link 43 and 41 and a minor impact on link 46. But we wouldn't know what the impact was on Sanford road because it's simply not modelled or it's not it doesn't it doesn't come into it. And traffic must be going down it but very little so basically all the all the traffic's being shoved down this

25:00

Right. So, and obviously given HDb, that's such an important element of risk and danger. We're in a village, which is of, you know, where we've got very sensitive locations. That seems to be quite an important issue. And I suppose it comes back, if I can just finish the point that I'm making.

25:22

To the concern that I raised when I was here, we were raising in written representations from Sac code, but CPRE also support and may well apply to other villages, which I haven't personally looked at in detail. Why given the sensitivity of this village, why given the amount of additional traffic going through it? And if the additional traffic going through it may be reassigned traffic, it's still a result of this development. It's not being reassigned because of somebody else doing anything, it's being reassigned precisely because those linked roads are being opened for this development. Why do we not have although we understand from Leicestershire thing they may have than? Why do we not have a detailed link assessment of the impact on this very affected village? And can permission be given until that is available and the people who

26:26

rightly are affected by it? People like us who protect the countryside have the ability to look at it, though the my point?

26:36

Thank you, I hope I very, very fact quite a longer intervention, does the applicant wish to respond to that in any way shape anyway,

26:45

Sam Carter representing the applicant, just coming back on a couple of those points with respect to the design and the traffic calming.

26:55

It's a B 4669 is a B road. And it's therefore not possible to implement a weight limit through there. So what we've done is designed a traffic calming scheme to dissuade HGVs from using that route HGVs, which are reassigned as a result of the

27:13

south facing slips as existing background traffic.

27:18

With respect to the points about made at the back with respect to two separate crossings and bus stops, and what have you, I don't recognize the reference to on the street arcing. And that's not something that we've shown on our highway plans on a PP zero to eight

27:37

with respect to the location of the other features. And there's a there's an agenda point on road safety audits later. But I will say we have submitted these plans recently to an interim stage one road safety audit, which will, we will obviously take account of with respect to positioning of various features. But I'll come back to the point that these are traffic calming features that are supposed to make this route less attractive to HGVs. Whilst not while it's not possible to outright ban them because of the classification of the route. And then I'll pass to my colleagues to pick up some of the traffic modeling points. And the past more for the the applicant. It's there was a question about the diversion of HGVs. From chamfered. That basically is the the M 69 junction to attracting those who instead of going directly across the a five as they currently do, they turn and go through sub cut and and, and route on to the M 69. So this is

28:45

background traffic. And I know that it is related to the development. And what we're trying to do with the traffic calming is at the moment, it's modeled with a really big change from the existing routes to the proposed route. And we're trying to soften that with the traffic calming to make that less significant and obviously moderated down. The situation is that in the opening year, those increases are a fairly modest two HGVs an hour, it's when you get the traffic growth up to 2036. That the the impacts could be could be greater. However, we feel that the measures will be put in to try and dissuade HGVs from reaching through there. And obviously improve the environmental impact of those HGVs is proportionate to the impact that that's shown. Can I query sure if it is background reassigned traffic then why is it and it's low numbers immediately. As soon as the trap the slip roads have gone in? She'll surely people would quickly find the way through and the numbers would increase? Well,

29:53

quickly from from either a reassignment Yes and it's that's not what you just said. No, no

30:00

Now, in terms of peak hour flows, ah, so the peak outflows are low, right 5050 movements throughout the day, around two hours or two per or per hour. So that's the clarification.

30:14

Okay, quickly because we know we've got quite a lot still on the agenda. Okay, John Marriott, CPRE Leicestershire. I know the county council years ago revised their C Class roads, lower class roads and got rid of ambi roads. And they got rid of a lot of B roads, which they considered to be unsuitable for HGVs. So the count has got comparatively few B roads. And I have no doubt whatsoever that the 4669 was kept as a B road because it didn't have a link with the M 60 died

30:48

and said to the one to the north, we haven't discussion about that further later on. Can I move on to Stoney Stanton, please?

30:55

And that the tape transport assessment as 016 on page 160 indicates the new road long road Broughton road junction stent, same standard in 2036 operates over capacity in the without development based scenario, decision will be made worse, particularly on the long street arm by the proposed development.

31:19

Can we ask what the proportion do we know what proportion of HGVs against non HGVs there would be in Stoney Stanton? Because I haven't been able to pick that up through the linkage data.

31:32

portion of a street is in Stony stance and actually reduces in those future years and that that's a function of of the rerouting that we've we've talked about Satco

31:43

the reason for that is that the b 581, which connects through across 69 into Alma stop is is moving on to the before 669 and therefore the HGV movements are our lesson

31:59

okay.

32:09

But let's just county council give us its view on both the highway safety implications of the proposal and both in standard candidates and saccade and whether it will result in severe residual cumulative impacts.

32:27

Beck Hansen Leicestershire county council Cytotec, could you repeat the first question whether in both the Stoney Stanton and or SAP cut areas, the proposed development will result in severe residual cumulative impacts? of view is the answer is yes. And we

32:48

are yet to see mitigation that safe and deliverable to address those impacts.

33:00

Do you believe that it would be possible to do it given them with the physical restrictions that there are in that area?

33:07

And by that I mean, only using land that is in the public zone in public ownership such as highway or similar in sac code, I don't believe the mitigation strategy that's proposed is the right strategy to address the impact of the HGV traffic. Ordinarily you introduce gateway and traffic calming features where there is an identified speeding issue, not a traffic flow issue.

33:36

That speeding issue hasn't been identified in deeds, that coat village benefits from a traffic calming scheme. Now.

33:45

In terms of Stoney Stanton,

33:49

there is only one scheme of mitigation that's proposed, which is the signalization of one of the many rounds back junctions the other one has been ruled out on deliverability grounds by the applicant. On the basis we haven't seen any detailed drawings or detailed assessment or road safety audit of that junction, we are not yet certain that it is deliverable within the constraints of the public highway.

34:18

That's based on the associated equipment that comes with a signalized junction ie the poles are controlled over the signing etc

34:31

and the past more fully apprehend just just to clarify in terms of the gateway feature, it is a one way shuttle operation. And the aim is to create delay

34:43

to make that route less attractive. So it's not just for speed reduction. The aim is to is to is to reduce the length they increased and so

34:58

yes, Jen

35:00

Come over here.

35:01

Do you bring the mic up sorry?

35:17

Yes, Tim Rose and NEC on behalf of say Santen parish council, just in relation to junction 38, which is the Eastern mini roundabout within Stanton village. The with development scenario takes the queue length on the long street northern arm to 75 vehicles, which is around 500 meters in terms of a

35:37

vehicle cue in the a&p. So just wanted to reiterate the, the impact on those two junctions. And as Miss sensing from Lesha county councillors said, there's no mitigation in providers junction 38.

35:51

We don't believe there's any meaningful mitigation that can be provided. However, we would say that the the impact is therefore severe and cannot be mitigated and in that location.

36:14

just emailed commercial on behalf of the applicant, I think in terms of juncture 38. There are there are restrictions on that, however, they mitigation is achievable through other measures that we are proposing in terms of travel planning, terms of HGV routing and, and public transport improvement. So

36:36

it is not completely

36:38

a situation where we can't mitigate the impacts here.

36:44

Sorry, Sam Carter for the applicant, just on Mrs. Henson's point with respect to the safety and deliverability of the mitigation schemes.

36:55

My understanding that the mitigation within Stoney Stanton and saqa is shown on the highway plans and within the transport assessments.

37:04

And as I mentioned earlier, is in the process of being discussed with respect to stage one road safety audit.

37:12

Throughout the process, there are a number of meetings with the Leicestershire county council and requests to review the detail of these mitigation schemes which is not at this stage happened due to an acceptance of the trance traffic modeling.

37:32

But recently,

37:35

Leicestershire have stated that they are willing to have a discussion about the preliminary design similar, similar sort of scenario as we are with national highways of presence. So hopefully we will we will get some movement on that and be able to demonstrate the deliverability of our mitigation schemes to their satisfaction.

37:55

Thank you, sir. Just to confirm the

37:58

proposals we were asked to review in detail with the link road proposals, not the off site mitigation, or resistance on reviewing the link road proposals was on the basis, we didn't have the complete modeling to understand what the traffic impacts were.

38:14

Would you be able to look at them to see whether

38:20

whilst you may or may not consider that they were sufficient, because you have a look at the decision in geometry terms whether they will be safe in that sort of sense. We absolutely will review them once we get the one to 500 drawings that we've asked or at the scale that of the drawings that have been provided. We're unable to review those against design standards. They're just impossible to design check. Exactly the provided living provided a deadline three with national highways. We're doing that in a workshop setting, which we think is more productive because it doesn't revolve around deadlines and so on. And we can be a bit more collaborative. I'd much rather do that. But I'm happy to provide a deadline three,

39:01

an update test and deadline three would be very useful. Gentleman over here.

39:15

Dave Howard Stoney Stanton Action Group, just a general comment it feels to me as a resident of Stoney Stanton that this is very much a sticking plaster approach because during the consultation, hardly any of the sensitivity receptors were and I never even knew what the sensitivity receptor was before I looked at it. were taken into account so we identified a lot and now in the ES it's almost impossible to check whether they have been properly taken into account because some of the checking methodology which which was in the consultation material p e ir, has been removed from the ies so we can't properly check it. And we can see that the mitigation which is

40:01

These proposed traffic lights don't seem to have been consulted on at all. And not only that, but even if you just stand there and look at it, you can see that queues will go past the school pastor surgery. It just doesn't make sense at all. And as for the idea was mentioned earlier of having a calming effect of stopping trafficking one way not the other.

40:26

There was a calming

40:29

method put in many years ago, which was then taken out because of this long queues back towards built in as the end towards amscope. So it was taken out and speed bumps were put in instead.

40:44

Thank you, thank you.

40:46

Alright, this is what I was going to move on to Alsop is Garcia and obviously we've had concerns about local revenue from local residents about any traffic on the proposed development. No links in that area in that area have been tested.

41:04

And

41:06

could it could the applicant in particular and possibly Leicestershire county council explain why they haven't gotten the analysis of the implications of proposed development in detail in this area. They have been tested, they have gone through the PRT and they have been reviewed through our analysis. And I think the important thing to note with specifically to Alpha ELLs law, as we were discussing earlier on is that the B 581.

41:32

With the introduction of the a 47 link road

41:36

has a reduction in traffic across it as traffic diverts to the 47 link which provides a clearer and higher capacity link to the before so certainly a 47

41:53

I'm looking at the rest behind you from I'm stoked I'm thirsty about you. Do you want to bike got working come into any of that.

42:02

But yet grab the bike up again. So sorry, misses the whole running.

42:14

Hi, it's Becky vapor from salt parish council. Got a few comments here. Let me stress them all or just specifically this. I would like to do with Elm swamp as a whole. So probably easy, as long as short and sweet because otherwise, yeah, this is probably better.

42:30

Just to directly respond to the

42:34

analysis that the a 47 link mode would be a wonderful improvement from so

42:40

there was no answer to my earlier question that should be a four to seven link road fail or not be able to take a flow of traffic for any traffic related incidents. There is that has the potential to drown. Both Councilman Stoney Stanton with traffic moving away from that into the most logical V route and that's what would happen.

43:02

Be 581, also known as station roads through amps, or is the villages access to services and amenities and as Burbidge common road would be removed, it will become the only route to services and amenities. It is our connection to our children's schools. It's our connections to the post offices. And it's our connection to our doctor's surgery.

43:24

Over the span of the construction phase, which is estimated to take around 10 to 12 years.

43:31

The associated works as the roundabouts and also on Hinkley roads, Stanton lane will prevent access to the services. The alternative route is just over seven miles long and will take us all the way through Hinkley which already experiences heavy traffic delays, we will also encounter all of the associated works on the A 47 And where the eighth or seventh length road joins before 668. And of course everything over the 69 junction to roundabout so the detour currently is about 20 to 25 minutes and that would be significant during all the highway works and we do still need to take our children to school and go to work ourselves.

44:10

As I said village babies common road disabilities only alternative routes which stands to be permanently removed, excuse me.

44:26

We do also have some serious concerns a parking in the village during construction phase and operational phase. And this is to do more with commuter traffic as opposed to no parking which will be visited later. We have raised these in our relevant representations and also our written representations and response feels dismissive and parking is available on site. The responses we've received and any transgressions should be reported to site management's.

44:55

We believe more robust methods are required from the applicants to ensure this

45:00

doesn't happen in first place to protect the communities that you're affecting most.

45:05

There is also just one very quick point.

45:08

We've also queried in our relevant representations and written representations and I believe other parish councils as well. Looking at the deadline to respond to the parish groups from the applicants, our query about the inconsistency and over estimation of the number of HGV miles been removed from the public highway during your community, newsletters, your community explanation document and also your current projects. website, which explains the benefits it's built at 1.6 billion HGV kilometers are removed from the roads per annum, the average person would look at that and think, Wow, you really can't argue with those green credentials. But that isn't consistent with the 83 million miles. But you're actually building the HLR. Five to remove from the roads. So perhaps some clarification on that. If there's any confusion on our behalf would be helpful. Thank you.

45:59

Does the applicant wish to respond to that?

46:06

Yes, I think so address the last point, the AC 3 million is quoted within the climate change charter as being headlined figure, I believe that the the 1.6 billion was reported on our website.

46:22

So in terms of the submission, the 83 million is the figure that we have. We're, we're recorded.

46:32

In terms of the the

46:35

first point on emergency access on the the A 47 an EB 581. This, the the link road itself provides an emergency access point between the Ames 69 and the a 47 link roads without the reliance on

46:56

local roads.

46:59

It's to some extent dependent on the situation and the emergency responses that are required at the time, which we cannot model for we cannot we cannot account for but we believe that with the presence of the additional roads and slip roads that they do provide alternative access to higher capacity roads, and which which we think is appropriate.

47:22

In terms of the permeability of a site, there have been so that we'll come on to this in public rights of way but there are diversions there are routes that still are able to be accessed by the public through the site that do connect through to the south and to to facilities in Hinkley itself.

47:44

Okay, thank you,

47:46

gentlemen.

47:56

Hello, I'm Steve Cooper, Stoney Stanton resident, I just like to pick up on the HGV movements a little bit more, because I don't think we've had a proper answer to that 1.6 billion HGV kilometers were quoted, you're now having that. But that still is probably four and a half times more than is actually capable. So I'd like to know how that's been calculated. And also what criteria the examining authority used to make it to say that's a significant reduction.

48:28

And when we come back and answer the second half of the question, hopefully the applicant can find some information on the first the 1.6 billion when I noted it from the representations were made, I investigated and found that it was an error on the website that's been taken down. Could you could you could you

48:46

what

48:49

was removed?

48:51

If you haven't changed your cache, then it'll keep populating with the whole picture. It has been removed, it's an error.

49:00

What's the correct v 83? Is?

49:05

Yes. And the that is related to the movements of vehicles that we've estimated from the number of trainees that were coming onto the site. Could could could you possibly provide us a written note setting out how it has been done by the sheduled? Thank you.

49:21

Okay. Right. I now want to move on to number a level crossing.

49:28

I'm afraid we've got to move on. We've still got a lot more on the agenda to do.

49:33

Can you put it in writing?

49:38

Please.

49:39

Thank you. I'm sorry, but we've still got a lot of things to do. And we're going to have to have to cut out a few things that I wanted to speak to

49:48

apologize for those who've been waiting a long time.

49:52

It is possible that we they make up points you're making may come up sort of incidentally on the things we're still going to do as we go down the agenda.

50:11

Number level crossing, as you're aware, generally we were back in September, we asked that can provide some information later the use of the Narborough level crossing by non rail users. In other words, those who were crossing the railway to get between Uber and Lyft, thought, difficult. We've had some information to date, this probably is why I asked the applicant to explain what's been submitted to date and what is still to come and when that will be submitted to the applicant, please.

50:38

Thank you, sir. David Baker, Becker is the applicant. The because you've asked the question, understandably, of what the current position is, the data that we were using before was historic data based on network sales information and never really had done the review. So we instigated a survey video survey, which would actually track both questions that you asked about transport movement, and whether cars could create a level crossing, which isn't available data that were relevant have. And then we've assembled that that information is being assembled from the video direction, I believe, but happy web have that now. And at the same time, they took down notes of when the red lights came on, and when the level crossing went up, because that is effectively when the highway is closed. And I've then map that against the truck, the actual train movements through on that day. And we go, we've now got the data for all the train movements for a week, and from the 11th of October. And we've got all of the left crossings, ups and downs from the level from that. And I'm going to complete that schedule I've given you Wednesday, which gives you a snapshot. And it it does effectively correlate. One of the things I would just point out that in that schedule, the definition of an hour changes. Because trains don't necessarily pass exactly on the hour. So

51:58

I'm gonna want to come this in the rail. What I'm interested in is when when we're going to get the traffic the road information.

52:08

So as Mr. Baker was alluding to, so Malcolm ash from the applicant, as Mr. Baker was alluding to the survey data is now being received. So we aim to get that in for deadline three. Thank you. Okay.

52:19

And that will also include the data on the traffic use. So

52:24

the equivalent of the DOL DLs model, there'll be no be clear and things like that.

52:29

We'll do an assessment based on the traffic that's going through it. Okay. Right. So we now move. Sorry, Rebecca, and yes, sorry, county council, slightly to concern to read the applicants note on norbar Level Crossing table that's been submitted to on the basis that the video surveys have been undertaken over a seven day period from Wednesday, the 11th of October.

52:55

On Friday, the 13th of October Leicestershire schools closed or their half term, and therefore the survey flows of the impact on the local highway network will not be representative of normal traffic conditions.

53:11

We'll have three days that are and two days that aren't in reality.

53:19

unless everybody was out on inset day on the Friday,

53:22

exactly, there's a very limited window. So you probably have potentially two days of representative traffic if there were no other incidents or events on the highway network on those dates. So it's very limited analysis. Okay, we've got the absence of that criticism. Yeah, Mark of actually applicant, I think

53:43

we wanted to get the data in as quickly as we can to to be enable us to assess it ahead of the deadlines. What it does, though, is provide us with a comparison between the term time and non term time traffic flows, which will be useful in terms of the analysis itself. Okay, thank you.

54:02

I now want to move on to the a five, a 426 qubit Hill junction, which is

54:11

further south in and more extra county council Sorry to keep you on the line so long, as indicated it would like visiting multiple to be run on the basis of the effects of the proposed amendment. On the basis there is currently isn't a committee scheme for the signalization or other improvement of that junction. Can I just confirm with warrants to county council? That is correct.

54:31

Yes, that's right, sir. Thank you, Nicholas. Dawn to Orange County Council.

54:35

Sorry, could you just hang on a second, please? Yeah, go to we go back to normal level cross.

54:41

Can I still with I'll deal with more extra county council and committee back to you certainly. Yes.

54:47

Yes. Thank you. So yes, the formally proposed highway Mitigation Scheme to signalize the junction is no longer being pursued. And highways England are doing a

55:00

AP zero b study, I think it is the moment to look at a potential Mitigation Scheme for cumulative impacts at the junction. So there's a lot of developers that are making contributions towards

55:12

an ultimate scheme, which will mitigate their own specific impacts. And I think we'd like to see the same approach followed here. And the same assessment methodology as well through the vizeum. Which gives an advantage in that it can explicitly model junction interaction, and platooning effects between six junction one and giblet Hill. So that's particularly important in the PMP, when you might be interested in taking a site visit, where that particular arm the the a 46, South arm is heavily congested. And that starts before the actual traditional peak area, it begins that sort of 1630 and continues throughout the pm peak.

55:53

African next refer to national highways because Bob was the first part of your network.

55:59

Thank you, sir. Benson for national highways. We concur with our colleagues from Orange County Council that further detailed modeling needs to be done utilizing the visit model at gibi. Hill. We don't have a scheme that is committed at the moment. But we do we are working on a new series of options in partnership with watershed and Leicestershire to look at how we solve that so that that assessment needs to be done

56:19

to the applicants response on that. Yeah, just in turn. So welcome, Ashley, the applicant just in terms of the the traffic increases at CIBC Hill, we're we're looking at the proportion of 1.7% 1.9% impact from eh and RFI.

56:35

We originally modeled the outputs on the basis that there was a signalized scheme that was being brought forward as part of another development. We've

56:46

and we based our review on that on that.

56:50

I think in terms of the the contribution that was mentioned by by Warwick sure that's something that we can work with them in terms of how we do them. Thank you. Okay, now inverse back to not Nobre level crossings. Sorry, sir.

57:08

Thank you, Richard Chapman, Narborough parish council,

57:14

I look forward to seeing the data which the applicants have said that they will produce.

57:21

We have seen some partial data on the level crossing downtime. And to save time, perhaps I could pick up both the rail and the road issues in one go as they are interlinked. And also, I won't repeat what we've already said in our written representations, because I'm sure that you have read those and considered those very carefully.

57:45

The data which we have seen,

57:49

we don't query it.

57:52

I think the difference between ourselves and the applicants is the significance which you attach to it. So I'm sure the applicant oops, suggests that a few minutes here and there have in the odd hour is insignificant. But if you extrapolate the data, which we've already seen, then in an average day, we're talking about a 15% marginal increase in downtime. And it's not the downtime itself. That is the issue. It's the it's the impact of that downtime. So if we we've got to in doing that, we've got to look forward to 2036. When this facility might be operational on when it is operational, the likely impact will inevitably be greater because of other developments, which

58:44

not trying to make a pun or coming down the track.

58:48

Increased housing, increase rail services, the things which we've set out in our written representations. So even at current levels, congestion in Nobre caused by the downtime of the level crossing is severe. It is the main route which connects the villages of Narborough and little Thorpe, a busy road linking to interdependent communities with large commuter populations.

59:18

So

59:22

we don't accept that the impact is insignificant. Neither are the impacts we rejected the modelling data for air quality

59:34

is okay, there's a localized and intermittent issue. The congestion, which you will have seen from our submission on occasions, stretches back through the village of Nobre almost to the roundabout and onto the before double one four, which at some point it will do and that will cause additional traffic issues.

59:59

Looking at the

1:00:00

Damn time at the level crossing the applicants quote the National Rail policy that up to 14 minutes in an hour that we're going to talk about later.

1:00:12

Okay, I'll come back to that.

1:00:17

The final point that I would wish to make is that

1:00:21

my counsel appreciates that situation at Naropa is already far from perfect. But that in itself is the reason why any additional downtime, however seemingly insignificant will have a disproportionate impact. And it is the impact from this proposal and the other proposals which are likely to come forward between now and the time that that, that that development is operational, that need to be addressed, not just what the current downtime is at the level of crossing and the impacts of that. Thank you. Thank you.

1:01:02

tential, Jen, Jen, Mrs. Davis, the gentleman in the front.

1:01:08

coming the other side.

1:01:15

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm John Harrison, chair of the Friends of NAR prestation. I was just a little concerned a few minutes ago, when it was looking as though you was going to skirt over the quite serious problems that we have a knob or station and Norbert level crossing now. It is potentially a dangerous place, not just the crossing itself. But the actual approach, particularly from the Narborough side is a very narrow pavement. And it's used quite a lot in the morning and in the afternoon. For

parents taking their children to school in the morning and then bringing them home. There's quite often they leave one of their children at home and they're pushing him buggies and pushchairs. And they now have to go on to the road when the barriers are down, which potentially if anyone from try tax wants to come and observe the situation, particularly at peak times, at Nobre, they'd be very welcome to do so. We managed the Friends of an arbor station, we've managed to get some money reasonably from East Midlands railways access for all. And we've made the short stay car park more disabled friendly, but we've not been able to do anything on the road. And I think as far as this applications concerned, we're going to have slow freight trains lumbering through Nobre, they're never going to get up to 75 miles an hour, when they're taking off on a gradient away from the end entrance and exit to the actual site of the Birmingham to Leicester line. I hope perhaps later on when we get on to the item on the agenda when we consider the rail aspect and

1:03:14

but I'll I don't want us to skirt over the implications that this project is going to have on Arbor itself and the crossing, thank you, thank you.

1:03:29

The customer for the applicant. In terms of the modeling that's been undertaken, highway modeling traffic modeling has been undertaken to date, it does demonstrate that the development traffic itself is very, very low that it wishes to to revive another crossing. And what it does show is that there is a slight increase in background traffic that's reassigned in the morning peaker. But when we did the evening peak hour assessment, we actually put in extra downtime to cater for another freight train coming through. And that resulted in the redistribution of background traffic to avoid that additional delay. Our viewpoint is that this isn't a case of longer queues, it's additional frequency of queues. And therefore, it's something that we will obviously be responding on within deadline three where you get the data Thank you.

1:04:24

Can I then go back sorry, to highways again, and point o crossing hands roundabout, which is the one near

1:04:34

Magna Park. Again, you've asked information from work that we're actually count against has asked for information from the applicant in the form of spreadsheet including comparison with the RRM model and demand turning flows is a

1:04:49

is the applicant able to go it's going to be able to confirm that they're happy to provide that information.

1:04:57

Yeah, so I think in terms of the the trafficking

1:05:00

Increase. We're again, we're on quite low levels here. But we have

1:05:04

we've taken on board the comments from, from Gazeley that came in through the written representations in terms of their Mitigation Scheme no longer being on the table. What we do accept is that our scheme along with us what needs to be delivered up first occupation, as we discussed earlier this morning, thank you.

1:05:26

And some national highways if possible, so if I just pick up something about Jupiter Hill, yes, well, yeah, gibbet Hill as well. This the scheme that was identified for magnet Park has been withdrawn as it can't be delivered. So but there's a cumulative impact at that location regarding a number of developments. And whilst Mr. Ashe said that their impact is very lower over just around 1%. The way the junction is operating at any impact location is having a severe impact on the operation of the junction. And that's similar with the cross in hand junction as well, in terms of the cross in hand junction, and we're also asking for provision of that information and that was just requested. So I'm quite pleased to hear that that can be provided good.

1:06:10

I think Malcolm actually, the applicant, I think it's our intention to work with the authorities to get that undermine policing.

1:06:21

There were three other junctions which Leicester county Leicestershire county council indicated

1:06:27

they said that three missing analysis from the transport system I think I got it that they had been in the latest version I may be wrong.

1:06:36

There junctions five which rugby Hill Brookside on the B 419. Close to Hinkley railway station, junction nine a 47 Beef 582 Desperate roads these are desford west of Leicester and junction 30 A five Hi, I'm Elaine Nan Eden next roundabout out on the a 5g on the two practical junctions and what a better way to describe to get

1:07:02

Could you confirm whether or not you the lace first of these addresses those the latest version of the TA does having junction 30 high end Lane in the neater lane. We have got models for rugby road and Brookside road on Desperate road as well which we can share with the the the highway officers.

1:07:20

The backend some flesh shake and castle. And we can't actually find the information in version eight of the transport assessment. The junctions junction 30 is included. It's five and nine that we will survive in nine will come in a future revision of the transport assessment we can update. Yeah, good. It would be useful if you were able to if they already exists, you could forward it to the county council expeditiously.

I hadn't the deadline because it would allow them to look at it and move the process on quicker than if it doesn't exist already. Yeah. So I think it's worth noting that both those junctions have a reduction in traffic through them. So we have modelled them, but we will share those. Thank you. Okay.

1:08:06

Now, can we we now want to move on to Q which is the HGV routing and enforcement

1:08:14

we have to look at this draw drawing earlier. Could we get up

1:08:18

figure four of the HTV route management plan and strategy A pp 362.

1:08:44

Right which in some ways is a very simple drawing.

1:08:51

Now, not my working assumption, and somebody may now surprise me is that in general terms, the use of the a five and the eight, the M 69 as the primary and suitable routes does seem to meet the sensible ones, which I would be surprised if everybody says no, we've actually go down one of the backroads but I am here to be surprised.

1:09:13

Does anybody have any problems with that being the quote unquote desirable and quote unquote, undesirable roots.

1:09:22

Silence is beautifully deafening. Thank you. Right. So we want to Hatton's discuss a few other things about that. So the HGV route management planning strategy goes on to make comments about what happens should the M 69 be closed and effectively leaves that for later consideration? Can I have the applicants response to the proposition needs to be sorted out before development were to be consented? Because if the only placements were unacceptable, I the alternative routes were unacceptable. That would have the effect of negating the permission. Which national guidance does indicate means permission to be withheld in the first place.

1:10:00

Oh

1:10:08

my gosh, applicant?

1:10:11

Sorry, could you repeat the question? Essentially? Yeah, I'm making the point, you need to sort this out first, because if the alternative if the solution, your alternative solution in the case of the M 69 being taken out was to have unacceptable effects, then

1:10:31

then that will guidance in the planning practice guidance in re indicates that permission should be withheld for the first principle development.

1:10:42

I think in terms of the routing strategy, the intention is for this to be deployed

1:10:48

on occupation and that these routes are defined within the report itself got that, but what goes happens with it goes wrong. And in other words, the N 69 becomes unavailable.

1:11:01

Yeah. So, what the a 47 link row provides is an alternative, but that is you've just we've agreed, and

1:11:09

unanimous around the table isn't undesigned and undesirable, but it's not it's not prohibited.

1:11:15

Okay, but that what have you modeled all the traffic going out that way? How, on the prgm. Now, on the piano RTN will be going out on the link road, so it all would go in and out to the West?

1:11:30

It's given that we have to remember that the be 468 junctions are already at capacity, or thereabouts.

1:11:38

The this is Minister's emergency scenario, which is money aside the emergency services. And I'm saying we need to sort that out at this point. If I said to the proposition that that needs to be sorted out before permission were granted to ensure that those solutions were acceptable

1:11:55

and impossible for the applicant? Are you talking HGVs? Are you talking the whole development? We're talking age, principally HGVs. But it could also apply? So I'm gonna come to you later

1:12:09

on, if not anon available to the for use in both temporary purposes in both directions in both directions.

1:12:17

Okay, we haven't looked at that. But we can look at that. Thank you. There needs to be a subtle, a, essentially, the emergency plan, which is essentially so I was taught that after the event would be to use the AK 47 and the oh five, but we should do that, then we need to know what that what the effects

of that would be. And whether those are acceptable, because if they are not acceptable, then there has to be a question as to whether the whole development is acceptable in terms of the assessment that we undertake. Are we assuming that there's no traffic on the M 69? Correct.

1:12:50

It is shut to all traffic, all traffic

1:12:55

to injunctions three into was respected. Do you feel that is a reasonable assessment for us to take

1:13:03

is not for me to give evidence. But I had a happy hour and a half to get sitting on the closed mode way last week.

1:13:09

Okay.

1:13:11

If I Benson financial house, if I can help just in terms of scenario, it is very rare, yes, that the SRM closes his entirety. But say for example, he had lost control and crossed over central reservation. That would be an instance where we'd have to do a full closure of the carriageway, to obviously do that. We manage it as quickly as we can and take it off. But that's just to try and to help the applicant to understand what that scenario could look like.

1:13:38

Anti basketball for the for the applicant. So in terms of the the local network, where we will be assuming that it would be overcapacity because there's traffic routing, that wouldn't be on the M 69.

1:13:51

It's going through a 47 and various other routes, and then we're going to be loading our issues on top of that, is that what we're saying? I think in this example, it is the case that because of the HTV routing strategy, and so correct me if I'm going wrong, but because you're saying that everything has to go on the SRM if the SRM isn't available, you've got to utilize the AK 47, as that's the next specs best option, but what is the impact upon the local road network if the SRN is unavailable? Yeah, understand that for for our HGVs. But the if the mode FTA and 69 was shut? It would take it would mean that PC use would it be out as well?

1:14:33

You can't. So is it is it? Is it worthwhile that perhaps we work with the applicants offline regarding this scenario, because we'll have strategic diversions as well. And I think it might be worth wildly talking to colleagues back at national highways and pops to counties as well to understand what happens in that instance and where traffic is diverted to because that has to be considered as well because otherwise it won't be a representative assessment anyway. Actually, it's advantageous because there are there

1:15:00

are a whole bunch of draft examining authority questions relating to alternative diversion routes. And the events have actually been short circuiting that that would be really useful. Yes, please, as you can imagine, we're welcome. Thank you.

1:15:15

Right.

1:15:18

Next, I'd like to talk about enforcement mechanisms to ensure that HGV routing is appropriate. The proposal as it stands is for automatic number plate recognition technology and a series of civil penalties want a better term miscreants.

1:15:33

I'm interested in why the applicant chose this approach rather than for example, the extension of weight limits on the roads where vehicles over seven and a half tonnes gross laden weight were permitted. articles were not permitted apart of course, from access.

1:15:49

And personal for the applicant, I think as earlier was was mentioned, bureaus are not subjected to weight limits. And therefore, in order to prevent

1:15:59

HGVs from the development routing along routes that we find undesirable, there needed to be a different way of doing it. We have experience of operating such a system in Warwick shirt with the wrench gateway. And that's been operating for two years, and it's working well, and therefore we chose to adopt it here.

1:16:19

Why can I just given that you are the parent draft DCO involves roads being designated to certain categories? Why wasn't the consideration of greed registering for what a better way describing roads as B roads down to zeros, which would then have allowed seven points a ton race weight restriction being allowed as part of this proposal?

1:16:46

Well, we looked at a solution that worked elsewhere for us and and proposed it.

1:16:55

I'm just thinking there might be

1:16:57

less county council

1:17:00

misses recommends Kenosha County Council just to say the applicant hasn't approached us in respect of reclassification of any of the routes or indeed changes to any rate restrictions, which indeed, if they did, we would discuss in line with Leicestershire police as the enforcing authority that those proposals hadn't been proxy on.

1:17:25

On the past month, yeah. In terms of that, it's not necessarily a power that our client has

1:17:35

a lot of them to declassify or reduce the past vacation. We've had little or no engagement on the mitigation to date. And there was no reason to suggest that suggesting reducing classification from a b2c road, would we would have got any solution to so we were putting forward a solution that was in the control of the the applicant and could be delivered by the applicant.

1:18:06

Okay, going back to the proposal, it sounds involve financial penalties, considered to be incurred for those considered to be persistently breaching the strategy with funds collected to offset state management charges for those occupied complying with a strategy. Could you confirm what you is? Do you consider a persistent breach to be one of the trigger breaches set out in table two, the HG V routing document on page 28?

1:18:34

A persistent breach would be one that the working group, the HTV strategy working group would define. And that will be based on the views of not only the developer, the site management company, but also the local authorities. To date, we've been successful with the ACV routing strategy that we've operated and the breaches have been very modest.

1:19:00

What would you what would the applicant's response be to a proposition that given the effects of MIS routing will be on those living and working in the facility? Should not the funds be more appropriately utilized in a community fund to offset those harms, rather than being for essentially a, a benefit for those who operate the site? I think the the reason that the funds are collected in the way they are is to is to benefit those that are operating and adhering to them and penalizing those that aren't. So the operation of the system. If if companies are adhering to it, they don't pay for it. The people who the companies that don't adhere to it, pay for it but the people but the people who are being harmed by it are not those who are benefiting from the from the fines.

1:19:54

Oh,

1:19:57

the applicant is willing to consider that

1:20:02

Thank you. I'll put that on the agenda for Friday morning

1:20:13

can I go? It was something I want

1:20:21

Can I Can I just get a socket? I'll come to you in a second. Just want to ask, let's let's count together if and work together in a minute. So I'll come to you in a second. How what consultation Do you normally do in respect of an introduction to environmental weight limits, given the comments about B roads, but Notwithstanding that,

1:20:40

how long would it take?

1:20:42

How long would it take? Yeah, ifs from when promotion to taking effect, an order from promotion to taking effect can take anywhere between six to 18 months dependent upon any objections received in consideration of them. Obviously, there are legal timeframes that have to be adhered to within that in respect of advertising, etc. So generally, it's more toward the 18 month end of the spectrum than the six month end.

1:21:16

Do you have the same experience?

1:21:18

Like I certainly was drawn to Orange County Council, my colleagues just advised me that it's between 12 to 18 months, so it's similar to Leicestershire, definitely. Okay.

1:21:29

I've been wondering, you know, obviously, we've got what we have. We've just a bit of information, which we're fine with us. Thank you. Okay.

1:21:38

All right.

1:21:40

Yes, the lady who indicated earlier.

1:21:48

Hi, it's Deborah Cooper from a residential Stoney Stanton.

1:21:53

Just trying to understand if there is enforcement and it's successful. Why do we need to put traffic signals in Stanley Stanton to put them off

1:22:06

antiparticle for the applicant, there's two components to the HCV impact there is the background HGVs and then there are the development ATVs. So what we're trying to do with the HTV routing strategy is to take those development HGVs off the routes through management and enforcement by the development itself, and then looking to to discourage existing or read or diverted ATVs. That would be there as a consequence of potentially the slips rather than the development itself, trying to discourage those with traffic, calming and other environmental measures.

1:22:44

Just going back on stone and Stanton, if you're causing the delays, they'll just be for the residents and any incidental journeys into the village then the delays will be impacted those people

1:22:59

Yeah.

1:23:03

Right.

1:23:05

Trying to keep going through similar fair amount to do road safety audits understand that things have moved on in recent times.

1:23:14

Can you can you applicant explain where you where you've got to on the road safety audits and when you anticipate the first results to be back with you as it were Sam Carter representing the applicant.

1:23:29

We've staged one road safety audits. The briefs for Leicestershire are currently being updated as there was some collision data which was out of date, which I believe has been resubmitted as part of a deadline to package

1:23:47

and with respect to national highways, GG 119 states that the Road Safety Audit takes place at the conclusion of the preliminary design, which I think given the discussions we're having with Mr. Sim and his colleagues, they are not yet at the position to sign those briefs off. We have however, progressed interim stage one road safety audits so that we've got the inputs and the the findings of those that we can take into account whilst progressing our design where our preliminary design work, and then once the briefs are agreed we'll revisit those to the satisfaction of the highway authorities and publish our responses in due course. Thank you. Yeah, there's this just regarding GG 119 and vote safety audits. I'm just noting in terms of the timescales. I can't give a certainty of when national highways would authorize the road safety audits to be done, because we haven't we haven't got to a position where we concluded with the detailed designs from the preliminary and I think that just should be noted as a bit of a risk for the examination.

1:25:00

I'm aware of that, and obviously will hopefully, hopefully, as a result of today's discussion, we move explore

1:25:07

the Chicago Council. Thank you, sir. Just to confirm, we have also waiting for the vehicle tracking to support those briefs. I'd be grateful if we could confirm a deadline for that submission as the applicant. Yeah, the vehicle tracking is within the brief so that when they're revised and sent to you, that'll be included. Thank you.

1:25:27

Could I ask about the base data for the Road Safety Audit, whether that's been updated? The I'll be particularly concerned, you're aware of the two cycling accidents that were immediately at the be 414 on four junction, which weren't in the

1:25:48

assessment because of the crash map they used was older. So I'm wondering if the road safety audit will be up to date. In regard to

1:25:58

incident. There was my there was a submission that deadline to which he showed road collision accident. So up to the P IC data anyway, up to I think it was it was our this one was September on one was June, and I'm doing that from memory. yet. I'm being told that the junction in question isn't part of the works that we're proposing. But we are aware of those and the pic data has been updated as you say yes. So yes, that the data is is pretty easy in

1:26:29

today's data, but it's one case it's fairly recent. We will look at it when we get when we got Yep. Sir Benson for national highways. My colleague has just pointed out to me that the new circular clearly sets out the role of de veau social it says intern development priorities should prepare for Millennium redesign. At Stage One vote safety audit, before planning commission is applied for to demonstrate that road safety issues have been considered. So the circular is quite clear that we can't really progress we shouldn't till we've got the

1:27:01

right to nearly nearly Nick. So

1:27:06

please wait. Please wait for the microphone.

1:27:13

Sorry to come back again. Before we leave room, and we have your name please. David bill. So you can as county councillor for the western side of Hinkley, can I just please ask Can anybody here?

Please tell me the justification that all the estate roads, all the state roads on the western side of Hinkley will be expected to take more traffic? I can't understand the logic of it. Good. Good. What Could someone please explain that to me then because that is the that is the thrust of the written submission I put in and I would very much like to know if anybody can explain it. I don't think that's really something for here for for the examination Today. Today. Clearly we have your written representation. And we referred the matter for us, as the examining authorities report upon in due course, clearly if the applicant wishes to respond to something that at any submit point in time that is up to them.

1:28:10

So just Just on that point,

1:28:13

there are figures within the transport assessment that demonstrate that the overall impact on income is actually reduced rather than increased.

1:28:21

What can I suggest that you have a meeting discussion this outside the examination? Because they may be able to point point you it was to build in precisely where the figures that they believe show that rather than you trying to try to search for its essence about it's probably it may be a directional thing rather than anything else. I'd like to try to finish the roads stuff before we move have a break. So

1:28:45

a couple of things road parking in the vicinity.

1:28:49

Maybe this is for the two district councils. Are you aware of any lorry parks, other than

1:28:57

or places where a series of parked up overnight one of our expression fly parking in your areas other than motorway service areas? I'm just wondering, what I'm trying to anticipate trying to understand is whether or not there is a problem with fly park in the area. We've heard a bit about this morning. But if you do have some information that will be really useful. At Stacey for Blaby District Council. I am aware that there is an issue in our district with that, but I'm not personally close enough to the details to be able to answer that today. So I'll take that away and have a look. I know there are some of the hotspots around the district. Thank you.

1:29:34

My Parker thinking was with Borough Council. I heard mentioned this morning that I think it is an issue in Hinkley but I don't know the detail. And like Mr. Stacy, I will look into it and get back to you on that. Thank you very much.

1:29:47

Mr. Benson for national highways. I it'll be helpful so we could put a statement in regards national highways position of HTV parking for deadlines three. The reason I say that is we're at 98% occupancy for HTV parking provision across

1:30:00

Is the East Midlands 97%. For West Midlands, I believe we are heavily reliant on this area of layby parking as well. But as national highways and within our circular sets, how we're moving towards required services, to have clear services and facilities provided, thank you.

1:30:17

Which moves on to the conclusion sometimes the last item, I'd like the highway authorities to sit out there where we where they think after today's discussions where you think you've got to, and then I'll come and particularly water anything still needs to be sorted out from your points of view.

1:30:35

And then the applicant sort of know where they are going forward. And when they will be able to listen, this is have that information, probably best as we start with Niflheim. That's simply Thank you, sir. Mr. Benson for national highways. I think from our perspective, we just want more clarification and information and want to work with the applicants and our transport consultants to understand the impacts and how they're going to be mitigated across our network. We've got a lot of information it's been very helpful, but we still feel we've got a bit of a way to go. And we'll also be looking at that in partnership with both Warwickshire and Leicestershire as development local highway authorities.

1:31:14

We have got the workshops operating we have em 69 Junction two so I am comfortable in that respect is progressing. But I would like to be able to formalize a national highways position hopefully by the next round of examination hearings if we get to that point. Okay, thank you. And this is just again, the council message recommends Leicestershire County Council.

1:31:35

We will continue to work alongside colleagues and indeed the applicant where we concern on all concerns remain there still appears to be a fundamental disagreement on the interpretation of the model outputs.

1:31:49

We with no commitment in respect of assessment of n one, junction 21 and any mitigation strategy.

1:31:59

We will review the additional information that has been provided. But again in respect of the model outputs.

1:32:09

We will main concern there is no commitment to the updating of those traffic surveys that underpin all those local junction assessments and indeed the furnishing approach. We would welcome the

assessment of the a four to seven doglegs around about and the impact of patch Hall form and hopefully, the applicant will commit to that assessment through further meetings.

1:32:35

In respect of the link road junctions will review the application submission that was made at deadline to provide comment on that

1:32:47

we still have the outstanding matters of the effects on Sapkota and Stoney Stanton. And we look forward to receiving those drawings of a scale that we can design check and the supporting road safety audits to ensure what is proposed to be delivered will generally be safe for all users.

1:33:09

Thank you very much. And we're actually counting outside. Thank you, Sir Nicholas Tonsley, Borussia county council, I think we'd like to see more evidence regarding the the enforcement regime for the HTV routing management in Warwick. Sure. Well, we have specified some some of our preferred prohibited routes.

1:33:31

If it can be demonstrated that it's going to be similar to Redditch eastern gateway in terms of the enforcement regime that would be very useful to have that information. But what is critical is the location of the the ANPR monitoring cameras, which will sort of inform the

1:33:49

any sort of breaches that arise within our rural villages. That's probably our key issue. There's the issue of to address with Gibert hell and crossing hands udgivet. Hell, we'd like to see the vizeum model used because it has the ability to effectively model junction interaction into six junction one and on to the a four to six coming out of rugby. That's a very sensitive corridor on the major road networks and we need to be sure that the development impact is is mitigated.

1:34:24

In terms of the strategic modeling, I think we'd like to reach agreement with the other authorities on the applicant on the furnace in methodology. And the issue about the petrels farm sensitivity test is very important. And we don't think it should be overlooked. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. And is the applicant. Is there anything you wish to sort of say in final response on this point?

1:34:50

I think in terms of the assessments that have been undertaken, we think they're representative and we think they're reasonable. We are content to have a look

1:35:00

At some of the issues that have been been raised,

1:35:03

providing it doesn't require rerunning of the PR TM model. And we can do sensitivity testing based on on that, in terms of junction 21. We, we have put forward our sustainability proposal proposals for mitigating our impact at that junction, we are willing to look at a situation where we're loading development traffic on top of

1:35:32

the Do Nothing scenario. So effectively avoiding the the rerouting of traffic, however, we maintain that we believe the outcome of that will be that there won't be highway mitigation possible at that junction.

1:35:49

Okay, yes, thank you. So I was hoping to get a couple of minutes. So Athol noon from Haiti and boy was at Castle was only a couple of minutes to wrap up a few things. We'll do some in writing. But Just two very quick points, if I could.

1:36:03

One relates to the strategic modeling, we identified during the early discussions a possible issue with distribution, particularly of HGVs. And I'll put it in writing, but basically, obviously, the decision of HGVs has a lot of effects in the area. And and we think that the distribution as shown, doesn't quite match up the needs case has been given for the development. And I'll give you some more detail on that. And the second thing is the a 47, as a route for particularly HGVs to and from the development as shown on the diagram that you have up at the moment. I think that as consulted on that shows that the the the link road to the A 47 is an undesirable route. And we assumed that was the case. But as you pointed out, earlier on, there's a lot of HGVs. Using the A 47 is worth just noting that in the forecasting report, the model forecasting report, it's quite clear that the AK 47 is seen as the quickest and easiest route from the west to the development as is the use of the Ashby road north towards escuela Zeus and in Darby. So I think that there's a bit of clarification and thinking about the effect of the a 47 as a as a route to and from the development particularly for HGVs. And it's worth noting that the A 47 is a road but it's 30 miles an hour and has a lot of development other side a lot of use of walking and cycling. And there's a whole lot of new development planned in the vicinity of Bhawan. It'll shorten which will be the other side of the a 47. So it's particular concerns from the Hinckley and Bosworth. Thank you very much. Thank you. Andy Basma for the applicant in terms of the HGV distribution within the PRT M model that was produced by AECOM based on a quite a rigorous assessment of the various attractors and producers of HCV trips in the vicinity and was agreed with with all the highway authorities in terms of the

1:38:08

link road the a 47 link.

1:38:12

That section that's from effectively the northern section of what is Lester road that the the arrow on the hair is intended to show that the route down into

1:38:27

into Hinckley and up into into Barwell is the restricted route, we do recognize that they should actually be two separate arrows. And obviously, the section from the the a 47 link to the A 47 is expected to

take HGVs and that's how it's been modeled. And that's how it's been assessed in the environmental statement. Okay, thank you. Thank you, right. I think he's done. We had time we had a break.

1:38:56

It's, it's now

1:38:58

officially I think we'll go to 22 or so it's now just gone pretty far. So we're 14 minutes. We'll adjourn now until 1540