

# TRANSCRIPT\_ISH2\_SESSION2\_31102023

Tue, Oct 31, 2023 2:29PM • 1:31:50

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

junction, traffic, model, applicant, highways, modeling, prt, leicestershire, county council, link, road, national, flows, impact, include, outputs, assessment, roundabout, network, comment

00:06

Would you please sit down?

00:09

If you need to finish a conversation, please you could you do it outside the room?

00:15

National High, the hearing is in CONUS confirmed that the live stream is is back back running again please.

00:36

That's it. Thank you. Sorry. It's made to make sure that the delay on that national highways, could you just confirm or whatever related to that? 500,000 square meter bigger, please. Yes, thanks. So Mr. Benson national house, so I got the figures rather muddled in my head, and I meant 105,000. But just to clarify, regional, we'd like to face assessment. Yeah, we're fine. Okay. Thank you. We understand that somebody else who wants to speak on that last item as well. So

01:06

did they entertain the mic can be brought to them. Thank you. Just mics coming to you.

01:12

Sorry, sorry. So those of us who have indicated we'd like to speak will be allowed to scream started with a little a traffic modeling.

01:20

The traffic modeling has come is sort of going to be overarching for for more or less the whole of the item three. But if you've got significant comments, as we go through the agenda for the individual items, I'm expect to get more to get out of the large scale into the mind into the more detailed areas. Can we come back then on traffic modeling? No. Yes. If you wish to Well, I'm very happy to hear what you have to say. Right. Well, sorry, David and Bill Burbidge, parish council on traffic modeling. We we studied we studied the report very very carefully. And I've submitted some thoughts on this but were found the information supplied totally incomprehensible Lane there's there's references for example to station road. Well, it could be station rock nastily station Road, oh, short and straight. And this and this problem

arises throughout the report. There is it's incomprehensible to anybody trying to make sense of it. Looking at Burbage itself, there's a reference there to pull for a long lane. Wolfer Lane lane is a quarter of a mile cul de sac. But according to the figures supplied by try to act on the mass supplied by try tax, it will have an increase of traffic. How can a cul de sac in the middle of a village have an increase of traffic? It doesn't make sense. Looking at the

02:49

looking at the western side of the

02:52

thing click because I'm also a county Councillor responsible for the western side of him claim the the green it shows green light on the A five leading to the west and a green line on northern perimeter road day. 47. Also going to the west

03:14

with the reading of that is that as a result of this, we're coming to that we will be coming sorry to interrupt you now we are going to come to that bit later.

03:24

I'm what I'm hearing is about strategic issues relating to traffic modeling rather than details. So what happened?

03:34

What sorry, onto LORRY PARKING? Yes, that's fine. Laurier parking.

03:39

It's quite clear. Well, the question is, is it going to be is there going to be adequate LORRY PARKING at the moment, Hinkley suffers residential areas suffers from the overnight path and of HGVs all over the place.

03:57

Because we've had we have existing industrial estates and we have inadequate parking within those estates. And the England Bosworth Borough Council has to spend each time cleaning up human excrement from these places. It is a read for sight first thing in the morning for prestigious

04:18

positions, uses of it of existing industrial sites to find such a horrible mess on their doorstep, literally every day. So is there going to be adequate parking for the overnight, overnight travelers HGVs. Often who have come in from Eastern Europe and

04:42

have totally no,

04:46

no facilities to use. Are we just going to have a complete an additional mess? All over verbiage. We have to ask that question because it's not clear.

04:57

And lastly, if I may

05:00

Just say facing it's absolutely essential that the rail sides are putting before anything else happens. Anything else will be a total betrayal. Because we've always said and this goes back five years that what we're looking at is just a

05:18

sea of warehouses that size of Burbage, you look at the center of Burbidge and you look at the size of this thing they are of Harrison size. And what we have feared we feared all along is that what we will see is a sea of warehouses and no rail connection with hNf meaning Hinkley no rail freight connection, I'm sorry to be blunt about it. But unless the rail freight, the rail connections are going from day one, then this will be a betrayal. Thank you. Okay. Does the applicant wish to respond to any of that?

05:54

Thank you. So pool mail for the applicant? Yes, on a few points, if I may. Firstly on Mr. Sims phasing modeling point, the applicants position is I don't see why that's necessary, of course, because before any floors base can be occupied, all of the mitigation that it's suggesting, will be provided will be in. So you can't put it in any earlier than that as far as occupations are concerned. So that phasing model is not going to give you any any additional information.

06:27

Secondly, in relation to the timing of delivery of, of the rail port,

06:34

one thing that I would highlight is that all of the made DC o's and that includes now the following the recent amendments to the Northampton gateway DCO. All of those dc O's allow for occupation of floor space prior to operation of the terminal. So that includes the three East Midlands gateway, Northampton gateway and West Midlands interchange. And in terms of the percentage of floor space, that the applicant is setting it trigger at in requirement 10. That is the lowest of all of those made DCO. So you've got a commitment from the applicant to deliver its terminal, effectively in an earlier stage of occupations than all of the other made DCS today.

07:26

Thank you.

07:28

Right

07:31

above it move on to D which is the use of the rugby rural area model ri M.

07:39

And it's written representations and national highways I've set out seven critiques of the era and modeling outputs on page 51. Or it's rep one 182. I don't tend to go through them here. But I would welcome both national highways more extra County Council's view as to what the overall effects of these critiques have on the overall effectiveness of the model.

08:07

Thank you, sir. Mr. Benson national highways, at the moment national highways is unable to support or come to a conclusion based on the outputs of the people area model.

08:18

It is a number of matters that need further clarification or the modeling needs to be working as well. To do that,

08:27

I don't presume to go through all the critiques at the moment we supplied them in our reference and and no doubt the applicants team have them. We are looking to have an active meeting. I think we've all highway authorities to discuss these matters. But the moment national highways can't come to a conclusion about the acceptability of the Lobi rural area model. And we do still remain very concerned about impacts on the A five notably the a fi a 46 giblet Hill junction and also the six junction to

08:57

junction as well which is great separated. Yeah.

09:01

What I'm interested in is what difference it will make.

09:11

If it's an academic exercise, then you need to know what what the implications are of it not being satisfied satisfied. At the moment, national highways cannot be satisfied. We've got a robust evidence base on which we can inform you on the suitability of the development and whether it's mitigated on the strategic road network. But if it wasn't, if it wasn't, if it is robust, if you if we handled trees and it was a robust, what are the implications? The implications are we'll be looking at mitigation at a number of locations Ay, ay ay five, a four to six up hill and also M six junction two which is the M 69 interchange looking for the developers to work with that. We'd also based upon the PRT M modeling also need the a five ml IDs are on the list as well so we will cover them up to

10:00

But what you're essentially saying is is like in your view, it is likely it would need additional mitigation.

10:05

Yes, sir. Thank you. Can I have more extra County Council's comments on this, please? Thank you, sir. Nicholas dancy works for county council. I'm conscious that national highways consultant as well as raises a number of technical issues with the RAM. I think some of those relate to journey time validation on the on the strategic road network. That's my that's my understanding. Yes.

10:31

I would like the opportunity to discuss this in more detail with national highways and our model custodians who are vectors micro sim. So they they develop the RAM they develop the base model and forecast models for for the assessment.

10:48

I think there are quite a number of technical points we just need to run through with our with our colleagues before commenting further. So

10:55

I do you know, when you're likely to have had those discussions?

10:59

Not at the moment. So we haven't gotten a meeting actually programmed with with the national highways or the applicant, but I believe one is has been offered. This does sound like it's more of a matter between the county council and national highways than the applicant at this point. So you have come to at least in agreed position before walking to the app. Yes, I agree. So sorry. Yes. Benson for national highways. We can have that conversation with WorldShare at the earliest opportunity work proactively with them. There has also been a Doodle poll from the applicants transport consultants to want to work at a time where all three of our authorities and themselves can come together

11:35

as the applicant wish to respond on this point. Yes, bargain Ashford the applicant think in terms of the real rugby rural area model. It was a subject of agreement of scoping with WCC and NH two VCCS consulted back toss the the custodians as Mr. Dorsey alluded to have the RAM model provided the outputs to us they have run the model themselves in in discussions with WCC.

12:02

The outputs were shared by the Back toss team. And the highlights of impacts were provided across the rugby rural area network. This follows a review of the outputs and flows by BBB which we submitted as as oh two for

12:16

the summary now noted the main impacts from from the rugby world weary model,

12:21

key ones being the approach arms, the 69 junction one.

12:26

And this concluded from the vector of outputs.

12:30

In terms of the modeling, we have taken junction two, junction one and modeled that through a visit model which is a micro simulation model

12:41

which provides which has a facility to include a mover which is an optimization system which operates at the roundabout to give a better more realistic picture of how the the junction operates in that in that scenario. So we feel that we've

12:59

we've we've taken the outputs from that model. And we've taken it a step further with the visit to to understand the impacts that we have. And that was the primary output from the run, but that it was it was that junction that was affecting the lives. Although you have heard from national highways, there are another other a few other junctions that they wish to consider as well.

13:19

Yes, and we can we can discuss that in our meetings. But in terms of outputs that we've seen that that was that was our conclusion.

13:28

does work out county council wish to make any comment on that?

13:32

Thank you, Sir Nicholas, don't see Orange County Council. Yes, we'd like to have the opportunity to review the the outputs from the vizeum modeling. With specific respect to the Hinkley road approach, where there was an impact flagged in the in the run modeling. We'd like to see how that has been mitigated in the in the BISM.

13:53

The National Highway System, if any comment on where we're at the same point as our colleagues from watch county council, we'd like to see the proposed mitigation premises guarantee which one based on the visit modeling, okay. can have a discussion about the busy monitoring shortly.

14:09

I think that's everything on the on that particular use of that particular model. I'd now like to move on to furnishing for members of the public bonusing is a method of estimating turning movements at a junction without actually doing a survey of all the arms and movements through them in simple terms, as I understand is industry standard method of establishing traffic movements.

14:34

The outstanding issue as I understand it relates to the use of furnishing as a concept when observed movements were at zero or close to zero and are likely to be significantly changed as a result of the

development. Have I got that right essentially they have taken that from national highways representation. So I think they would like just to confirm that they have got that right. Is that correct? You are correct, sir.

15:00

and do Lester and Warwick agree with accuracy looks up this county council?

15:06

Yes, so just to clarify that the furnace thing methodology is based on observed data. So it is based on observed surveys. It's based on the survey data, but it then is arithmetically CAG.

15:20

To get catchword get to 22. The solution based on fly flows. Yes, I appreciate it.

15:27

But the ratio relates to obviously, significantly changed.

15:32

directions from point journey journey this endpoints

15:37

work workshift county council wish to make any comment on this. Thank you, sir. Nicholas dancy Orange County Council. I just like to pick up a point that we've we've read in less dishes, written representations, if I may, concerning the age of the traffic data use to inform the furnishing process. I think some of that data was primarily pre pandemic data. And I think the question has been raised that that there has been an opportunity post pandemic, certainly post 2021, possibly to review some of those turning movements with updated survey data. So I think that's probably where the some of the questioning relates to regarding to the furnishing methodology at the moment.

16:19

Thank you.

16:21

Thank you, does the applicant wish to respond to these comments at this point?

16:27

Yes, in terms of furnishing methodology, we've gone through quite an iterative approach our predecessors on the on the project had a signed off version of the bonusing methodology,

16:39

which looked at

16:42

the difference between PRT M scenario and

16:46

adding the difference onto survey link flows.

16:50

The b2b produced the revised furnaces now that outlined outlining that the agreed furnishing methodology will be taken forward with a different approach proposed for the site junctions which are which are a completely new.

17:02

However, LCC commented on that, providing following extensive review and refinement and development, including input from various project stakeholders, and it was signed off a PRI previously, the lhhs position remains that the Hydrox previous version, so our predecessors version of the furnaces methodology provided an exemplar approach.

17:26

So we revisited that and produced

17:31

an approach on that basis.

17:34

In July 22, LCC requested some clarifications on the convergence criteria for the site access junctions, we'd agree that the approach proposed approach whilst acceptable should be sensitivity tested, it was the feedback that we had to ensure robustness.

17:53

And it was the general comment was a valid general comment after review has identified commitment to additive approach producing targets. And this is often preferable

18:05

until the scenario where where we have new junctions on that network.

18:12

In terms of the think in terms of the flows themselves, the flow that's the first methodology is to understand the turning flows in the future year. So we're looking at 2036 outputs from the PRT a model, the turning counts that we used were from pre pandemic

18:31

and this aligns with the assessment that was done recently patchwall farm

18:37

and in terms of in terms of the flows that we use there, the counts predated the COVID pandemic, and therefore don't require post COVID factors.



18:50

It was also noted time that LCC has requirements for any new traffic counts, we factor to pre pandemic levels using COVID factors supplied by NDI.

19:00

Therefore, LCC and accepting on adjusted post pandemic traffic counts, any new traffic counts will be bait rebased 2019, early 2020 levels, and therefore we we saw no merit in terms of re reassessing those, those those numbers. And the feedback we've had from NDI in terms of overall, the global picture in terms of post punch movement is that there's still traffic movements within the PRC ma area is still below in below the values in terms of between five and 8% across the prgm area at the moment.

19:43

So we maintain that the pre pandemic turning current movements are appropriate for all that for the purposes of the of the assessment

19:58

it needs to handicap

20:00

bekende is the Leicestershire county council just confirmed that this chick and council are not disputing the furnishing methodology. What we are disputing is the age and the appropriateness of the survey data that underpins it. I think the point, sir, is not just the impact of the pandemic, it's the impact that changes since a committed development changes to the local highway network would have on the relevance of that survey data today. And what the furnace in methodology does on those turning movement is exacerbate that so if you get that that turning movement incorrect, the furnishing methodology will exacerbate that, that everyone needs in the survey data

20:48

was trash.

20:50

I think in terms of the flow is I mean, this as I say, this was accepted recently at the petrol farm development, which is further down on the agenda item so we maintain it that they're appropriate to for the purposes of furnishing in the future. Okay. But if you're not going to agree or not agree, I'm not there for their for theirs. I've got your positions, which is the important thing thinking.

21:15

Right now moving on to punch Hill Farm and the two. So I'm sorry. Thank you.

21:23

Before we get into that thinking, thank you, sir Benson national highways just regarding the finessing from national highways point of view, national highways had agreed the finessing methodology, however, based on the review of the latest version provided in September in September 2023. We've

now revised back that we're not in agreement on the finessing mod methodology, it is set out in our representations.

21:47

In paragraph 6.1, to six point 12 point survey that there are two areas of concern for us, when observed 2018 19 turning movement is zero or close to zero, the finesse process will not reflect reassignment to the traffic into the corridor, where this is indicated as an effect of the scheme by forecasting scenario outputs from the PRT M version 2.2 to our to traffic forecast model. There is a risk then, sir, that this will underestimate the demand for the turning movement at an assessed junction. The other concern focuses on that were a large observed 2018 2019 turning movement has had a negative growth applied due to reassignment effects of in the PRT M version 2.2 forecast outputs, this could then result in a suppression of flow demand. And this is important to the injunctions operational assessment if for example, to suppress flow demand was to say a right to so therefore potentially demonstrating that the junction is operating better than it, then it better than it would in reality.

22:53

We have, we will take up those matters with a point of discussion with the applicants to the lhasa discussions that we are looking to set up.

23:03

Now, Mr. Make response, are you happy to deal with it through through this separate discussions? Yeah, we're happy to take them in discussions. I think it is worth highlighting that

23:14

the approach we've taken on the junctions which are new to the network had a slightly different approach due to those zero values. We will we'll take that forward. Thank you.

23:27

Richard, we can now turn on to patch your farm and the to a five A 47 junctions.

23:37

Mindsight proposal involves lowering the carriageway height on the a five and thus increase the crease the effective height of the railroad bridge for traffic at the moments got a four by eight meter high height restriction.

23:52

And obviously, I'd like to skirt established a few facts. I suspect that these are going to be best answered by Hinckley and Bosworth Boris Council, although one of the questions is for Network Rail if they are here. First situation as report is there is a resolution to grant planning permission from the two local authorities because obviously it's also partially in Warwick share.

24:13

can do are you aware where the Planning Commission has actually been granted as yet?

24:19

In kibblesworth, please,

24:22

sorry, my political office

24:25

my pocket include impossible. I don't I would have to find that out come from a series of questions. If you could take note of them and we could have a have a written response of this. And equally well if during the life during the examination things was changed. For example, planning commission will be granted. Could you please just let us know where we are. So we have the latest information.

24:49

So there's that so if it hasn't, has permission being granted, and if not, is there an anticipated timetable for tape sorry,

25:00

Time that timetable for that to be granted.

25:06

I could precisely know like to know what hap is assuming it gets granted, what is to be granted,

25:15

both in terms of built around that on site, but also committed off site works. Yeah, mystics think they can probably help. But there are I mean, obviously, I need to know what the build development is, which is more computer second. And then again, listed probably help triggers for the highway works. And for the developers, if less to think that Leicestershire county council, I think they can help but I'll go for those if we can go from there. But yeah, thank you. Thank you. So Rebecca, and Alicia county council. In respect of the current status of the planning application, the application has been resolved to permit by three planning authorities it seemed impossible with burner needs an impossible bed with Burr and rugby Borough Council, subject to the signing of section 106 agreement, that section 106 agreement is currently in circulation with the relevant parties for agreement in signing. You haven't the idea when the timetable for it is ISIS suspect it would be imminently it won't, it won't be mantling. Well, as I say it as a though it does come through during the examination it'd be really useful to know

26:25

the permitted off smiteworks Do you have to know what they are?

26:28

If you don't, then there's not a problem. But just

26:34

as I said Benson national highways the off site highway works focus on the lowering of the carriageway under the nuts lane where we bridge as you mentioned, sir, also capacity enhancements to the AK 47

dot wells roundabout, which is to the south of the roundabout, we can provide you two drawings, if you would like Sir, will be useful and a new signalized access on to the a five to the east of a 47 dwells junction.

27:05

Those appreciate the difficulties of Winchester junction is which on this particular scenario.

27:12

Again, it would be useful to know what the triggers for the highway works are

27:18

if the if the and

27:21

so that we know when there is and isn't it? Isn't that Network Rail on the call? I'm not quite sure. I think Mr. Robinson is because one obviously one of those will involve works to that bridge. Are there any

27:37

restrictions on when those works could take place? So as far as you're concerned? Or could you find out whether there are any? I will be able to find that out? Yeah, not as far as I'm concerned at the moment. Yes, I think I can take that away. It would be useful to know whether there are any restrictions on plus yet again, natural national highways may well No thanks, sir Benson national highways formed internal discussions that we're having with the applicants, they are looking to try and get on site in spring 2024. But that is subject to them getting their technical approvals through section 278 agreements with ourselves. And obviously, agreement from Network Rail. Yes, no, I appreciate that.

28:17

But again, I want to know when that

28:20

if they were if Network Rail was going to have any constraints on timing, because they might say, Fine, but you can't actually get we can't give you the ability to do the works until a particular date at random. Spring 25 for example.

28:38

Does anybody have any questions? Any points on the factual nature of that information?

28:44

Yeah.

28:46

Yes, yes, don't go Marriott, CPRA, Leicestershire. My understanding is that most of the patchwall farm size is actually rugby. That obviously the axis comes off the 85 which is in Leicestershire. But it was mentioned that includes the Dodwell around about what was not said was whether it includes anything

further to the west, which is the junction coming out of an elite and or anything to the east, which all the way back to the 69 when the whole lot gets pretty chalked up quite often, quite frequently.

29:24

Thank you, sir Benson for national highways. There's no further mitigation to either the West have long, I've got a 47 a five Gregory's and Douglas junction or to the east from what I've already set out on the strategic road network in terms of the a fault. Thank you. Yeah.

29:40

Right. My understanding is that the punch hole farm felon was not logged in the current card and transport assessment. Although from what I've read, I think you consider it as being covered in the uncertainty log.

29:55

Could you guess up the planning date planning date receptions and

30:00

Network assumptions to understand the uncertainty log events, there's a and b of a p p 148.

30:08

I'm trying to identify we'd like to greatly if you could identify what's which site that is done on that in those seven, I've got the model, I've got the right document, they're going to wait literally come up to come up, please.

30:31

Think it's on page 48 of the PDF when we get there.

30:45

Reason being it didn't want rent under the name patch or farm.

30:49

Or not that I could say anyway,

30:52

some drastic, physically serious ways.

30:59

Which, which, which one of those? Which which one? Is it? Could it be maintained?

31:08

Maybe the table does run to the next page. So it's quite possible.

31:14

So the inclusion of perpetual farm isn't within the

31:20

the uncertainty log version eight, right? However, it is factored in within the background growth, the temporary growth that is within the prgm itself.

31:33

Less scattered obec, hence in less shutdown to care. So just to confirm a known you're correct protocol isn't in the uncertainty line, not clear, it's covered in background growth, because it isn't it wasn't an allocated local plan site, right. National Highways

31:51

agree it isn't in the log, but we can't gather how it's in terms of the background growth. However, there is a further modeling tool that can be used to understand the impact and development with petrol farm, which is the a five long shoot to DOD Wells vizeum model, and you may have seen in our submission, so we provide the modeling protocol regarding that. And that's how we assess how we're currently assessing the impact with pageable farm mitigation and development on our network at that location in agreement with less sugar molecule. So it's not in the uncertainty log.

32:28

So what I'm interesting is, obviously, if it hasn't been doing that, and because it's because it was essentially a windfall site, it won't have been included in the background of the PTM or pr t m model. So therefore, things have changed materially, I would assume to you as the applicant would make a response.

32:47

I think we can, we will look at the the background growth in terms of what what has been allowed for within that. It's important to note that the partial farm, the RTM run did not include the Hinkley site either. So, you know, I appreciate it's gotta go work with liked about both ways. Yeah. But that's the classic. When if you don't get the two sorted out between the two, and you end up with a problem, because there isn't ordination.

33:13

Somebody has to be first and somebody has to be second, just just chronologically and then this context, your second, I think this is the nature of modeling, you know, this is where, where, where we need to address this. So where where the buck stops, really in terms of how we would we go about doing that? Think in terms of our assessment. There are our PR TM outputs, we can review against what the PRT announcements from the petrol farm site and how that impacts but I think fundamentally that that the impacts we have on the A five are, are low.

33:47

In terms of the bridge itself, we were discussing earlier on, there is an assumption within a petrol farm ta about additional traffic being pushed through

33:57

because of the lowering of the bridge. We're gonna come to that in a minute. Okay.

34:01

Did Mr. Norris Miss Johnson? I say. So I think we're just about to come to the point yes, we can we appreciate that. Because with the information we have got, we have got we can work out how much traffic is going to come down that side. What was modeled into come down to the west side of Pinkley

34:18

national highways. I just like to provide some clarity and Mr. Ashe just mentioned that the impact on the A five is low, but with the operation of long shoot Dodwell says one junction at the moment they are under critical pressure so even as small or low impact can have huge ramifications for that junction. Okay, so let me give an equally well there would be under this under if traffic

34:41

came down to junction one and then along the a five route around the west side of Hinkley. It would be coming into that junction but it was just on a different arm

34:50

yes so there's that route but also down through the A 47 through includes so yeah, I appreciate will have effects it's just than how they have it sort of half model but but

35:00

Part not? Yes. Just for clarity. It's it is two junctions. They operate as one together. Yeah, yeah. Okay. So just just in terms of the the PRT, I mean, the long sheepdogs. Well, I had a scheme on that through the IRS to process with national highways, it was something that we were requested to remove

35:20

in the August September of 2021, which triggered the remodeling for 2.2.

35:29

So

35:31

the reasons why that was removed was because national highways were looking at a whole route scheme for the risk three strategy.

35:42

I feel like we're getting into ping pong, but I'll just try to explain. So national highways did have a scheme set out in response to that was highlighted, however, it didn't present the best value for money and effort was agreed with the Department for Transport to remove it from the base. And that was formally done. As part of the V's pipeline schemes. The junction is part of a corridor called include to Tamworth

36:05

where our colleagues are currently looking at what options are available, we do not have at the moment though, says a set scheme at that location. We don't have national highways does not have a mitigation scheme that it will be delivering at location. Therefore, at the moment, each development has to go through the modeling protocol, just understand its impact on the network, and whether it can be accommodated, and it can mitigate its impact at that location. And

36:33

mentor the public who aren't quite aware what risk stands for its road investment strategy. And it's the pub, it's department of transports

36:42

ski national list of schemes for bringing forward as to as over the net over a five year period.

36:52

I'd now like to have a look at some of the flows out and the link maps provided last week with the data of Chapter Eight of the ES which is in in operational traffic and the relationship with the HGV management plan and routing strategy.

37:08

Could we have the Ordnance Survey base link map? 20 up please?

37:24

Yeah, it is top left hand corner.

37:27

Yeah, there we go. It's length 50 feet of length. 54 which essentially is the link between the B and the B or 6x Eight letter road between the new link road and the A 47

37:41

If you go to table 8.17 in Chapter Eight of the ES which is a pp 171 117.

37:56

Sir, please, could you repeat that reference? Certainly it's a PP 117 And it's table 8.19

38:05

Chapter is chapter eight, which is of the yes which is the traffic and transport chapter.

38:11

And if you go down to link 54, because the gist of what we were looking at

38:19

we will see that for HGVs in the without developments, but fortunately, for the last line on the page, which makes it a little bit easier to pick it up



38:28

from a distance

38:30

you will note that without demand there so some six HGV movements, but there are the different web development shows 1079

38:38

movements

38:41

then if you then go to

38:44

the link,

38:46

the link wrote the ATP management plan and linking strategy and which is a PP 362 and figure four

39:06

and as you see on here we have the

39:12

the jet shows the link road as being one of the quote unquote undesirable routes for HGV traffic

39:22

the appreciate the modeling was undertaken without the benefit of the increased height on the A five railway bridge and as the implication is that the A 47 reviews the Western bypass typically the links from that point are up from the top end of link 54 If you go to onto sheet 20 Back to sheet 20 Which is when we were looking at this earlier, Link 55 which you go up which is the next one up and then if you look go then go to the table back to the table in the environmental statement on 117 and for Link 55.

39:58

You will note that there is no

40:00

Change in HGV movements

40:04

and thus, now need link sharing sheet

40:09

19.

40:16

That's 2020 Street 19.

40:19

Wait, which if you look at sheet on link 53 Two is further up.

40:28

Yeah. Which, which if you then go back shows an increase of 796 HGV movements that would meet, which means Mara, theoretically, Psalm 283 HGV movements would utilize the A 47 Northwest bound, because that's the road running at the eighth link road is running back down towards the a five

40:52

nonproduction or any of the links that being assessed going back to the link 53, which we have in front of us, we don't have any information in table 8.3 or eight point 19 on the end of the proposed traffic or HGV flows on the a five and therefore we can't work out what the assessment of the traffic from this is only a five A 47 Junction. Can you help me?

41:23

I think so this is one we can take away and review.

41:27

I think that's quite a weak answer. I've got to make that point it's quite clear that you were going to have an impact on the a 40 on the A 548 47 junctions onto the under the previous modeling using a flat. I appreciate why he was going round that way because the minimum height but anyway, it needs to be noted within the prgm there's no restriction on the height and the ability for HGVs to go through the bridge.

41:57

So there isn't a restriction on high sided vehicles going through there. It's not something that can be programmed in so PRT.

42:10

Does Leicestershire county council make any comments on on that particular bit I've just been through so it's a bit of a bit chaotic, I'm sure as chair county council just to confirm prgm is built on observed data so of course it wouldn't take account of high sided vehicles using that stretch of the a five because they couldn't really be restricted due to the height of the railway bridge. Okay.

42:37

I'd like the just just to confirm, I think sort of sort of answered earlier by national highways. The proposed works on the south easterly of the two roundabouts are not the northerly of the to the junction of a 47 a five junction so that correct.

42:54

So the actual farm works on a 47 a five Dodwell is junction which is the roundabout not the signals, which is the a five the long shoot the four northwesterly Yeah, I'm sorry, I do I do being not being a local and as you will appreciate, I tend to do these by geographical relationship. Please pick me up. So when I referenced them by their names as well. Okay, thank you. Okay, so having done that,

43:22

we now move on to m 69. Junction one. Those are sent to me, I'm going to come bit circle circulars to getting the traffic through the on the bridge. But what I've been trying to work out is whether the model does show traffic coming around the west side of Hinkley. So I think it's important to note that the PRT M outputs are a ADTs. And the the impacts that we've reviewed are the peak hours within the transport system itself. So therefore, there is a different series ADT flows within es which are daily. And then the PRT app, the the transport system looks at peak outflows. But then

44:04

Michael, we brought to you hang on a second.

44:13

Thank you, sir. Looking at the map on the on the screen, you say the red line, which shows an increase of traffic coming up to that 8447847 Junction. And then extraordinarily the plans issued by try tax show Green from there on which means less traffic? No, it doesn't mean it hasn't been assessed on the links. Are you seeing the same thing applies to the a five up to the up to Dodwell junction showing so in this extraordinary how this traffic can disappear.

44:48

It doesn't make sense to those of us who are trying to understand what pairing the information Yeah, these what the the plans which we got last week, the dead deadline to submission that show us the

45:00

geographically the links, they, they were in there, they just weren't clear that, for example, when we come to when we come to talking that to the villages in the minute we have three, three roads and hinky road on the before for eight and it was impossible to say which one was which hence to the to the maps?

45:18

Yeah, I think it's important to note that that the the assessments that have been done here were are based on es guidance and change in flows through the network. The PRT M, outputs demonstrate the change in flow between the without development and the with development with the infrastructure case. And that's how the the chapter has been set out and those changes between the scenarios.

45:45

That differs to the approach within the transport assessment which looks at peak hour specifically. And those impacts on the peak hour as in the worst case, part of the network with a trip trip generation within that. Thank you. Okay.

46:01

Moving on to junction M six nine junction one.

46:05

And it's D one submission. Leicestershire County Council of Orange County Council indicate the lone wood bridge would increase the amount of HGV traffic on the stretch of the a five that's their view. And this would also have the effect of allowing higher HGVs on the section which has not been included in this current model because physically they couldn't get there because they've gone around the outside. Is that That's correct. Is it not? Sorry, can you repeat the question? Essentially, the model should not have shown any traffic going from junction one in the North End and North westerly direction

46:44

within the PLC model within your within the modeling that you have done, because any overhype because of the overhype problem, and therefore that's the reason the over the over height vehicles went around the outside.

46:57

That was the recommended route from the site. But the PRT model can't distinguish between high and high sided vehicles and low sided right. Okay. But despite that was pushing notwithstanding that it was seen as an undesirable route. Correct? Yeah, yeah, fine.

47:23

So you've said you're the main point is your take this away and look into doing it given we now have further

47:30

clarity that this is more than more than it's a reasonable assumption that it's a deliverable site, given? It's got a resolution to grant permission?

47:38

That yeah, I think in terms of discussions with the highway authorities that the AFI was one of the priority things to discuss, okay.

47:48

Coming back to the M 69. Net genuine overage, we're actually county council has also made the comment in relation to the B 4109. Which within the county boundaries, as I'm assuming is the B 4109. To the sale for the M 69 Junction rather than one to the north. Could that work? Please confirm that.

48:06

Thank you. So Nicholas, don't see Orange County Council. Yes, it's the the southern arm at that roundabout, the Hinkley road before 109. Could you just explain to me the particular issues in that at that at that at?

48:21

Thank you. Yes, sir. Of course. The

48:26

the RAM modeling notes a cue increase from 12 vehicles on that northbound approach in the 2031 reference case 255 In the 2031 with development with routing restrictions with mitigation scenario for in the run modeling. So that's that's a notable increase in in queues during the peak hours during the am peak.

48:55

And we'd like to better understand the how that is dealt with in the optimized resume model

49:03

with discussions with national highways and the applicant.

49:09

Does the national House have any comments at this point for yourselves the applicant? Yes sir. Thank you we got concerns around the operation of M 69. Junction one because of congestion and peak periods notably are concerned during the peak period where queuing is observed on the ACE a five eastbound approach and the M 69. Northbound offset which at time extends on tm 69 Main Line, which is significant safety concern for national highways. We haven't been able to fully consider the modeling that's been provided by the applicant as we have. Sorry, I'm just trying to find my notes. The additional information is required

49:44

regarding that, but

49:48

we will work with the applicants and Orange County Council to resolve those elements if we can.

49:55

Does the applicant really comment? Yes in terms of the ram

50:00

modeling that has fixed timing signals within it within the parameters model,

50:06

we are re optimizing the unsexy nine function one,

50:11

the vision document that was submitted with the application has a summary of that.

50:18

It demonstrates that that with real optimization that there are improvements to journey time and delay throughout that

50:28

junction overall. And so therefore, we conclude that those, those measures are appropriate. And with the vizeum, we have more detail to understand that with the mover optimization system added into the vism model. So you'll be taking that away with the two with auric share and national highways to take that further and less less. I'm not sure how much what you're involved with with that particular junction is position.

50:59

And much lesser involvement.

51:02

And just to note, a comment was made about mover, not optimization, we'll need to get away. But mover is an optimizing tool already that's in operation at that junction, therefore making tweaks to singing changes, we've moved it, it doesn't provide that greater benefit, but we'll work with applicants and both highway authorities to try and find a solution if we can add that location. Thank you. Yeah, we did consult with the mover engineer on that.

51:28

The signal optimization at the moment is currently outdated, as he indicated, and therefore we're proposing change to those those signals, the mover configuration,

51:40

just as a wash up doesn't work. Should county council have any final comments they wish to make on this?

51:47

Nothing further to answer we just like a little bit more detail on the specifics of how that's been achieved in terms of the optimization.

51:56

Thank you. Okay.

51:59

Now moving on to ethics. And objection to before we have a discussion about the proposals, I'm interested in the history as to why it was only designed with two north facing slip roads.

52:13

We've had read relevant rep from Christine Phillips indicates that such sounds would turn down previously due to the impact they had on local villages. Now, with the greatest respect to Mrs. Phillips.

52:24

That has to be I can only be assertion without evidence behind it. And I wondering, has anybody got a document leftover from the 1970s? I assume, which actually provides the information which can justify

that comment? I've got I'm gonna start with national highway because it's their road after after all, but we'll then go, we'll go as others to see what really does have that information. Thank you. So, Ben, Mr. Benson national highways. I'm not aware of any documentation. However, if you would permit me I can have I can ask colleagues internally, and if we do have anything submitted for deadline three, that would be wonderful. Thank you. Yes. Gentleman from CPRA.

53:03

Yes, John, Marriott, Leicestershire, C CPRA, Leicestershire.

53:08

I'm aware of the background of the M 69. And I my old boss, you designed it.

53:15

But I do know that at the time Leicestershire county council had a lot of concerned when the M 69 was being designed about traffic coming off at that junction and going into basically South southern less Leicester. And that's why the two slip roads weren't put there. But you haven't got any physical ARB? I haven't one must exist somewhere. It was it was early 70s. Probably. Yeah. No, I appreciate I appreciate it to get known for 50 years ago, probably even more, but there's a lady at the front front here. If you just wait for a microphone to come to you.

53:55

I've lived there all my life. And I've got personal experience of what happened at that time, because I was badly injured. Namely, sorry, yes, sorry, Sharon Scott. I was going to bring this up in effect and socket anyway. But as a child in 1969, I was injured opposite the former school with a lorry coming by I won't give you all the details, but myself and my brother were quite injured. After that,

54:24

I remember being taken to a meeting for them to see my injuries.

54:30

And there was a public campaign to build alleviation a snap code, and it resulted in the end of 69 being built. And because of this, there were a lot of similar incidents as well. It wasn't confined to me and my brother.

54:48

The M 69 was built with the restricted sleds because it was felt that at the time that if the traffic was coming from rock nasty encounter sort of direction

55:00

Shouldn't it would go down the old number Road, which was the original a 46. I've just now the before 114 into Leicester.

55:09

But it was felt that if you're going to contract, you will go through satin cut in the light of all those accidents. That is my understanding is why it was built that way. And I think, but I can't put my hand on the document. I believe Stoney Stanton parish council have looked at it. But in the original Ministry of works document for the F 69. In 1974. I believe this was looked at. Yeah, it was interesting. It was who says it if people were able to find it doesn't matter where it could be anywhere you would find a document which you'd see today, it would be really useful for us. Obviously,

55:47

if somebody you know, National High was gonna have to have a dig through their records. And I'm sure listeners, you could do the same. But if anybody does happen to be able to find a copy of the documentation from the 70s, it would be really useful to us, please. Yes.

56:04

It's, it's a sort of a classic thing of being a local historian would have somewhere. Yeah, I mean, I was taken to meetings at the time for the protest groups. I remember looking at my interest and when I was a small child. Yeah, you know, most motorway, most motorway junctions are built always. So it is, there's likely to have been a reason for it. I'm just trying to find out what it was, if any, if it was documented at the time.

56:34

Right, as far as moving on to the design of the proposed new junction,

56:40

it's part of the representations national highways, if indicated, isn't content, we'll design the two new slip roads,

56:47

man silences this is a function of the strategic modeling not agreed.

56:52

But do you confirm that if the strategic modeling is agree, then the design of the two slip road should be able to be sorted out relatively straightforwardly?

57:01

Thank you, sir. Mr. Benson national highways. So the strategic modeling provides us with the flows on which the design parameters and standards which need to be applied on dmrh are set. So that's that's the hurdle we have at the moment. We need to agree that with the message sets, we need to agree the finessing and everything else. Once we are in that process, yes, we should be able to start a degree to design parameters. And and and whether there are any departures from standard. I should note that we've already accepted in principle, one departure from standard from the applicants, but we need to go through that process to do that.

57:39

I will leave it there. So that's fine.



57:43

Well, what are next trying to understand is what differences design between would would occur for if we want a better expression, your terms, the worst case outputs. What I appreciate this set out in CD 122 of dmr

57:58

dmrb Design Manual for roads and build bridges. It's essentially the from the book that honestly electronic these days, the book that that highways, national highways and their their sister bodies around Wales Northern Highlands of Scotland use to design roads, it's guidelines rather than anything else. So they can have a bot because that's what it is.

58:25

What I'm really want to know is what would be in lay terms, the physical differences between a worst case scenario and what's in the owner table in front of you at the moment.

58:37

I think in a worst case scenario will be a greater lunch take to provide greater capacity at the slips to be accommodated. And that also includes the existing slips as well to provide the capacity that the junction needs to ensure that there's no queuing back onto the M 60. Main and 69 mainline from our perspective as as national highways. We also need to understand that in terms of its relation with the existing bridge structures as well to make sure they're that they're not undermined and suitable earthworks and drainage.

59:09

It should be noted though, that Lester's should county council actually operate the circulatory above it a quirk of the strategic road network we have to slips. Leicestershire county council has a circulate so it might be so I might defer to them if they wouldn't like to provide anything additional very happy to move on to Leicestershire county council bekende Celeste chair county council worst case scenario so would be the requirement for additional lanes on the circulatory which I don't believe could be delivered with the existing structures

59:45

the applicant Mr. Men respond to those two complex comments and and what might be a worst case scenario. Yeah, I think we have modeled in a worst case scenario from the PRT M and the the vizeum that we've produced for junctions.

1:00:00

So

1:00:01

the current modeling shows the no queues backing on to 169 Junction two and that the layout that we've proposed within our application is suitable and fit for purpose

1:00:18

should be noted it also uses mover so optimization as well

1:00:32

Does anybody else have any thing they want to say about that particular junction as opposed to the effects of traffic which we'll come to later in the agenda?

1:00:42

Yep, gentlemen.

1:00:51

Thank you Councillor might show the labor District Council.

1:00:57

If the science banned slip road is built traffic coming from the rail freight wishing to go southeast, which will be along the AFI five will go on to the 69 and then there'll be a backup of traffic at junction one of the 69.

1:01:21

That backup which will go back to the new slip road will mean that traffic will use the rat runs through

1:01:35

SAP Kurt Huston sambil Stoney Stanton, this has already happens even before we haven't route freight in that chamfered has seen an increase in traffic flows over the last four years from 3 million vehicles a year to 3.5 at the end, and of course that will increase even further

1:02:02

by having that junction you are encouraging vehicles to go down with the M 69 towards Coventry. And also with the new

1:02:16

a 47. Is it slip prone, which joins up with the 847 to include your encouraging other vehicles from the AK 47 to come down past the railfreight? onto the 69. Southbank. Thank you, thank you.

1:02:39

Well, gentlemen,

1:02:42

thank you very much template also from Barwell this another of column settings and please forgive me if it's already in the model. But that junction to Coventry will obviously relieve the queues of people trying to get into and through Hinkley on the current junction. One is the one who's just down the road. I haven't seen a volume of traffic in any of the models. I think against that and common sense. People wanting to travel through Hinkley going north south or whatever will then use the new access slip roads to get where they want to go. And there will be a volume of traffic wanting to go to the last step and

avoid the huge backups there are during rush hour and other times the MCC night and Warren junction by coming off the new split a lot of the A 47 and entering Lester on the west side on that route. Thank you I have other concerns as it affects pile up. And I'll come to that later. Yeah, thank you.

1:03:39

Yes, because we're going to now move on to one junk 21 069 Junction three.

1:03:46

The applicants evidence

1:03:48

peruse if I paraphrase incorrectly, is that principally due to the new a 47 link road and the six nine southern slip roads, there will be a reduction in the amount of traffic approaching this junction in the ANP heading north.

1:04:02

They said from these that allow them to get to ask them to expand on some routes and then there will be only a small increase in the HTV traffic in the pm peak. The issues at the Zhang M 69 M one junction are well known, and the only methods available to seek resolve this are so large, effectively enlarging the roundabout, that it would not be proportionate for this scheme to resolve them. The applicant also points out there are no schemes in the roads investment strategies, either and risk to or s3 for this junction to be upgraded. Meaning that there's no scheme against which it could we'd be reasonable to collect a contribution against anyway. Can I just have confirmed that is a quick summary of your overall position.

1:04:47

Yeah, if you want me to expand that was what that was. That was one that was going to be exactly my next question. Yeah.

1:04:54

I think it's important to highlight that there are current capacity constraints at junction 2021, which are long

1:05:00

We're standing in driven by the restricted width of 100 bridges on the circulatory carriageway. The main mainline flows on the M one, the baseline traffic already triggered the need to upgrade north and southbound slip roads. widening of the under bridges to address such constraints will be of significant magnitude and require considerable levels of investment. Whilst there's a Cochlear aspiration for both LCC and NH to improve the junction there's currently no scheme identified

1:05:27

or proportionate capacity improvements of either being carried out four lanes under the the southern circulatory or now secured by another development Atlas with East we're the opinion that there is no proportionate highway scheme possible on this section and are set out in paragraph 49 of circular 122.

planned improvements. The SRN are the local road network should be considered in any assessment where there's a high degree of certainty that they will be delivered. Given there's no scheme committed even for the foreseeable to address these existing issues at junction 21 LCCs PRT M 2.2 model reflects the current arrangement, this was agreed with the TWG as part of the infrastructure log for PRT M 2.2. And it should be noted that

1:06:14

the in table 8.7 of the transport assessment

1:06:19

the PRT M as assigned 321 development trips to junction 21 In the morning peak hour before 143 different trips in the evening peak hour. However, due to capacity constraints, background traffic is rerouted away from junction 21 as shown in table 8.6 of the transport assessment, the combined impact would be a net difference of minus 10 vehicles in morning peak and 114 vehicles, or 1.8% of total traffic in the evening peak hour.

1:06:48

And the wider HLR RFI mitigation package accounts for the influence of the traffic redistribution resulting from the congestion at junctions once you won't have those predicted to be small negative residual impact in the evening peak hour at junction. This is not considered to be severe, and in accordance with a 122 is proportionate and reasonable mitigation is proposed to reduce traffic demand through sustainable transport measures. These include the implementation of comprehensive car sharing scheme and the enhancement of the X six bus service from weapons to mastery in Coventry, and the encouragement of office staff to work from home as part of their working week.

1:07:27

Do national highways and Leicestershire county council have any comments on their stolen national highway? Thank you, Sir Ben sim national highways.

1:07:38

I acknowledged in the note that national highways has no scheme at that location and no proposals to how it's quite clear that every application has to demonstrate that it can meet try and mitigate its impact upon the strategic bouquet recall any low network to a certain degree.

1:07:55

During pre application discussions, there was discussion about proposed mitigation and one junction 21. However, nothing was forthcoming to ourselves.

1:08:04

And we acknowledged that the submission proposed is showing that they are not having a substantial impact, but that is based upon the sustainable transport measures. We are concerned about sustainable transport measures and whether they're achievable and deliverable and actual provide the benefits because the bus service that runs between Leicester and the site would also be using the M 69

and therefore will be caught up in the congestion itself. So is that a viable alternative to car based journeys?

1:08:35

I think further work is needed around MP six and one junction 21 Sir, and further clarity is sought. I'll hand over to colleagues from Leicestershire county council

1:08:47

Beck Hennessy and Leicestershire county council.

1:08:50

Just to confirm so we are only asking the applicant to address their own impact at this junction not to mitigate against an existing problem.

1:09:02

So far, the applicant has declined to carry out further visit modeling that we've requested including in an unconstrained scenario where we could actually establish what the impact of the development would be at this junction.

1:09:16

We are aware, sir, that a scheme of mitigation has been designed for this junction by the applicant it was presented to Leicestershire County Council's archaeologist for consideration of its impact on a significant archaeological features. It hasn't however, been presented to Leicestershire county council in its capacity as the local highway authority.

1:09:40

And just to confirm, so without this scheme of mitigation here, a single scheme of mitigation, the consequences that impact on the 45 junctions on the local highway network and the associated requirements for mitigation.

1:10:00

Thank you.

1:10:02

Does anybody else we are fully aware of the problems off the junction. But please take that as a as read what I'm in Worcester therefore, our what I'm interested in is

1:10:15

anything that anybody has said today rather than telling us about the province of the junction, which we're fully aware of

1:10:22

that

1:10:33

it will, the parish council sorry, it won't come at the end. So that is our last chance to comment. I think.

1:10:41

The traffic the traffic builds up at four o'clock every day from junction 21. All the way back.

1:10:53

All the way back Ashcroft and sometimes almost to two Burbidge. And what I can't understand and never have understood is was the link road proposed link broke lower again, how will drivers HGV drivers and others driving north along the link road, make their way through the traffic in Leicester to join em one going north. It's a torturous journey, which is going to add problem

1:11:23

produce additional problems all over the place. But it's it's never been clear making the documentation how our drivers are meant to get driving north on the NY was they can't do junction 21.

1:11:37

Thank you and CBRE?

1:11:40

Yes, Joe Marriott CBRE Leicestershire. I think I heard two statements this morning, one from Leicestershire county council saying that the model is based on observed flows. And then and then we just heard the statement that the flow on the junction in Junction really one is going to reduce by a fact number by sorry, by 10. And I think that highlights two issues really, with the modeling

1:12:07

is trying to model a very congested network. And I think it's unclear how the model actually deals with a road network that is congested. And I don't think that's been it's it's a very interesting point to do with traffic modeling. And it's very easily hidden away in the black box. And we're we're we're out and about to actually come to that very point.

1:12:29

Because obviously, national highways view is that in high level terms, it makes sense for traffic to use the highest category model.

1:12:37

But the real question relates to the use of lower category roads, when they would either have a shorter in terms of distance or a quicker journey. Since most Sat Nav systems are set up to use the quickest journey models. And that could and that could lead to less data less congestion in the worst in the worst heavily congested areas, such as junction 21, or 21. It's equally a function of the visiting model, that traffic arranges itself on congested networks. So the cost of travel on all routes used between each origin destination pair is equal to the minimum cost of travel and unused routes of greater or equal costs. In other words, it doesn't the vizeum model doesn't use road hierarchy as a function of choice in the model.

1:13:24

And there, and this junction and a lot of others have used the vizeum model. So I'm, I understand the pm PRT mo model uses the same as vizeum. In relation to the assumption that use drivers will use the least congested route.

1:13:41

Can you confirm with that is the case?

1:13:46

If I can, unless your county council just confirmed that the applicant hasn't carried out the visit modeling of em 69 Junction 3am on TJ, I appreciate that. But I'm wanting to bid on it as a more as a more theoretical point. Absolutely. In terms of had the pan Regional Transport model, it works exactly what you said in terms of time and cost. And it assumes perfect knowledge of the network. I'm sure you've read my own critiques of his in the past.

1:14:17

So what so we do we have a functional dichotomy between the PRT M and visit models and national highways desire to encourage traffic on the highest category of road.

1:14:27

And you see it covered in the house that Kurt dealt with.

1:14:32

Is this M O P LTM. We'll use the most basic node not the not the highest category Road, bus free road.

1:14:44

Mr. Benson national highways. I think the case is in terms of the modeling as well. I think any model struggles potentially with the classification of load and trying to get YouTube users to utilize that vote. I think what's happening here is in this case, is that the junking

1:15:00

is so overloaded that the devote for my own review of the information is to development traffic is causing existing traffic to utilize alternative routes along the local road network, because there is no additional capacity in that in that network. So even if we did try and get the traffic to use the higher classification of route, if then main show actually show not showed the apps just use the word Splurge or traffic across the local mode network, if that makes sense. So you get a longer a longer delay on the strategic road network compared to local road network. The actual benefit of PR TM in this bands is showing actually the SR when junction has capacity constraints, and that's having a residual effect on the local road network around it. I don't know if I've answered your question. But hopefully that was helpful.

1:15:48

The best and simplest share can't cancel just to confirm so that you can run the pan Regional Transport model in an unconstrained scenario which will exactly tell you what development traffic would want to use that junction. If it weren't, it would in that sense use it on the basis of the higher hierarchy rather than on

1:16:10

capacity, empty capacity at any one time. It would it was still based on time and costs. But yes, the assumption is it would use the strategic road network because it would be the most appropriate network and that is the unconstrained scenario modeling we'd ask the applicant to undertake which hasn't been undertaken.

1:16:30

Now, now to the applicant having had that discussion. Yeah, so the PRT. So LCC and NH have had requested the rerun with an unconstrained flow. The reason for us to do the PRT in the first place is a reassignment model. So it takes account of

1:16:48

where there are whereas constraint in the network that those trips do find alternative routes for us to.

1:16:56

So for us unconstrained flow is a theoretical scenario whereby there's no congestion at junction 21. And traffic will choose the most convenient route. It wouldn't inform the assessment of H and RFI. Indeed, our development flows are still directed towards junction 21. It's the background traffic which is which is redirecting, and rather inform the requirements of an unidentified and unfunded and uncommitted improvement scheme. Hence, undertaking the assessment is considered an unreasonable requirement contrary to what Oh, 122.

1:17:29

Well, there's going to be some more of this coming out later on when we get some of some of the when we get our moving on to the HGV routing models and how they're going to be enforced. So we'll come back to that later. But I think you need to take that on board that there may well be, it may be a good good idea to consider the unconstrained model for reasons that will become a bit more compared to later.

1:17:50

I think we now move on to Yes.

1:17:55

Thank you for

1:17:58

just in relation, Could you give your name? Yeah, Jarrell Calth from CPRE in relation to the operation of the junction, it won't, of course, just the development traffic which will attempt to use



that junction or will want to use that junction once we introduce additional slip roads. So there will be additional traffic wanting to use that junction, potentially.

1:18:25

As we've said, there is potential for induction of traffic, that is the traffic that wants to use it which currently is going to different destinations, and the attempt to which the model can pick that out is a matter. But then the other issue that we've raised to the general issue is about how reliable the network then becomes which I think it's not just what is modeled to go through, but how reliable is it? How often will it break down? And we'll go on to other traffic. And we we don't unless and like just make the point, we have only just seen the new link road, things which came out

1:19:07

or days ago, but I haven't looked at them. So there is an issue about the reliability, and how often the network is likely to break down and what will happen at that point in terms of the HGV movement. We know in the extreme case that there's going to be this I think it was referred to as an emergency plan. But we don't know what that is. So clearly there is an issue about what happened as traffic breaks down in terms of HGV movement. And I think that's that's the question that we have. It may be that those who are more close to the modeling

1:19:45

can can can talk about the reliability of this. But we have an issue as to how much that is still true. I think we're going to come there's going to be discussion when we come to the HGV routing discussions this afternoon.

1:20:00

Okay

1:20:02

now move on to

1:20:05

J on my list which is the a 47 link road junctions which are the two

1:20:11

these if we if we go back to their initiative Master Plan

1:20:16

sorry

1:20:45

we have a broken broken Joy

1:21:06

Alright, the normal the top top left on this drawing may or may not be on that get just about and then the top left and then the roundabout at the top left of the thing and the the roundabout on the a 47 which exists but would be would be what

1:21:24

the applicant would have seen the Christians of Leicestershire county councillors regard those two roundabouts,

1:21:29

which are both shown as being overcapacity in the 2036 situation.

1:21:35

Can I ask the applicant for its response to the effective critique that design with the junctions will not be fit for purpose in the future and thus don't provide a satisfactory solution?

1:21:45

So I think the comment was made on the basis of the forecasts, the RTM outputs. We have addressed this within the transport assessment on a detailed junctions 10 assessment. We've also submitted a subsequent report in terms of the internal junctions within the on the link road itself coming to that in a minute. Yep. The roundabout on the before 668 within the transport system is shown to be working within within capacity. And we feel that that is appropriate for the situation

1:22:18

as necessary. The counting also wants to make a comment on the

1:22:22

backend Celeste your counter counter just to confirm so that the PRT M outputs show exactly what we've said individual maps that both of those functions would operate of capacity. They did appear to me that might be the case, but equally well, given the discussion we've been having earlier about the increase of height on the A family bridge and reduce possible redirection of traffic. If the model will rerun to take account of those, then perhaps this would not occur on that particular junction. He asked rhetorically

1:22:55

I think I think the the assessment we've done in more detail. So the outputs from the PRT on were taken. They reviewed through a more detailed model in terms of the the individual junction itself and therefore that's that's where the capacity assessment has been done. I would say that when I looked at the relevant junctions on the TMA on the TA did did a birthday appear to be working but over over capacity in the data which was provided to us.

1:23:26

If we can say, well, we'll we'll I'll check that. Thank you come back to later.

1:23:33

Which is yet as I say when we're going to come look at the deadline to submissions last week Acuario came is to release the link road and the proposed new roundabouts which you were talking about. A few seconds ago Mr. Ashe if we get up the applicants comments on local impacts reports Appendix B link road capacity assessment.

1:24:09

And then it's when you get the wishes up it's paragraph 3.2.

1:24:33

Paragraph 3.2

1:24:37

states, P R. TM assumes all vehicles accessing the site from the B 4668 and B M 69 and GenCon. Two will use the northern roundabout and southern roundabout respectable. So essentially This effectively means that no traffic is expected to travel between the northern and southern roundabouts. And if you look at the figures further in the document

1:25:00

didn't go down. But I don't need to look at them. Now, that appears to be the case. And that's confirmed. Could you confirm whether that is in fact correct, but nobody would actually use the the link between the two to between those two roundabouts.

1:25:15

I don't believe that to be the case, I think there are, there is traffic that is worrisome, but it doesn't appear to be on the model. So you go down the fact or if you go down further in this document on the link roads,

1:25:27

there appears to be a lot of notes.

1:25:30

Okay, we have done a worst case assessment on those junctions and it gives you

1:25:37

if you then go down and equally well if you can for the master plan up

1:25:44

thanks again.

1:26:12

Alright, so it should be

1:26:15

on the traffic flow diagram within that document should be some information on what I what I'm interested in is in reality is when we get this up, you get the master plan up.

1:26:26

Because if you're all the traffic coming in from junction two on the MCC nine, most wants them to get to say junction seven, unit seven, which is the furthest over to the left hand side, essentially what you see on here, we got to take up a bit out of it. That's

1:26:43

sorry, slightly further.

1:26:46

Morris, the whole drawing up, thank you,

1:26:50

essentially,

1:26:52

lovely. So essentially, what the model does appear to say is that somebody's going to unit seven, which is the bottom left hand corner, would essentially be traveling in from the bottom right, round the first northern roundabout because not a junction, just a corner, and then in through there all the way around the internal roads to come to junction seven in the top left. That's what paragraph 3.2 I forgot when that paragraph number right effectively says,

1:27:22

which I don't think that's realistic. For the purpose of the modeling there, there is a traffic flow diagram in the rear of that document, which indicates how how that traffic has been distributed. What we've done is a 50% on both of those roundabouts that asked, and then a further 65% on each each roundabout to test the functionality of those internal roundabouts themselves. But it's also going to go on in a minute.

1:27:51

And equally it's not it's not clear on the modeling data that I looked at with those zero figures as to how say somebody who uses the new link road unconnected with this development would go for example, say somebody's having from St. Tap, could we've been traveling thoughts facilities at the western end of the link road and how that's been included? Can you help?

1:28:15

The PLT, and flows are included within the the model itself is not within? If not If the figures are not, which is what I think I've saw, then they can't be.

1:28:27

We can test. I think that may be worth having a look at this over lunch for yourselves. That's fine. Just in response to your question about the before 668 and being over capacity. Yeah, table 8.5 of the transport assessment demonstrates that that's not the case. But I'm

1:28:45

gonna have another look at it.

1:28:47

And it's also the reason why this is massive because it flows into the data for the LinSig analyses and the Afia RFC. If the if the flows coming in on either side are not realistic, then the Lyndsy in the RFCs will also be incorrect. And as of late from the start, we will check that. Thank you. Yes.

1:29:08

Okay.

1:29:10

Given what we've got to where we are, I think given the next one is the effects on SAP cut, which I think is going to be take some time to go through each of the individual villages. I think it would probably make sense for us to have an adjournment at this point. There's a hand hand up there Ken has a hand up Can I have a

1:29:29

roving mic please? abarca sorry.

1:29:43

Thank you very for for our parish council, just revisiting the 847 it's not necessarily the junctions on the 847 link road, but it is associated to the A 47 inward

1:29:54

and there is a concern that in the event of an incidence of the link road which prevents

1:30:00

access through which isn't an impossible scenario, but the natural movement of traffic would be along the 581 through our sub through Stoney Stanton and back up to the six nine junction to it doesn't appear that any consideration or modeling or mitigation has been investigated or presented to us on this and we'd like to know where we stand. Please

1:30:23

respond to that point. I think in terms of emergency access, this is something that's managed at the time by the agencies that are involved, we can't mitigate all impacts of accidents on the the strategic or the local road network. What we have provided with the ace 47 link road is um the junction CEU slips is further alternative accesses to this strategic road network and connections through to the A road network which avoid

1:30:55

Local Roots within Hinkley itself. Okay,

1:31:00

okay.

1:31:02

Okay, right, in which case, I think it would make sense to have an adjournment now for lunch, I think an hour given the number of people here and that given we've got to get food has given them think accused may be quite, quite reasonable, if you will.

1:31:16

Try not to be too rude and junk you jump or anything like that, for instance. So if we give us an hour, if we come back at court to we will then if we're gonna have a look at the record revisit of the information on the link Roden, which was the modeling data which provided last week, and then we'll move on to the effects on SABC village. Thank you, everybody. The the hearing is now adjourned until quarter two