Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange

Development Consent Order

Project reference TR050007

Applicant's written statement of oral case at ISH2

Document reference: 18.6

Revision: 01

14 November 2023

Contents

Appendices

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This document presents the written summary of the Applicant's oral submissions for the following hearings that took place as part of the examination on HNRFI.

- **Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2)** – Traffic and Transport 31 October 2023

1.2. The hearing took place at the Leonardo Hotel Hinckley Island, Watling Street, Burbage, Hinckley and was a blended event with attendees on MSTeams.

2. SUBMISSIONS IN RESPONSE TO MATTERS RAISED AT ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 2 (ISH2) – TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
1	**Welcome and introductions** The ExA opened the hearing, introduced themselves and invited those parties present to introduce themselves.	On behalf of the Applicant, Tritax Symmetry Ltd. • Mr Paul Maile, Eversheds Sutherland LLP • Mrs Laura-Beth Hutton, Eversheds Sutherland LLP • Mr Andy Passmore, BWB Consulting • Mr Malcolm Ash, BWB Consulting • Mr Peter Frampton, Frampton Town Planning • Mr David Baker, Baker Rose Associates • Mr Sam Carter, BWB Consulting • Mr Ben Connolley, Environmental Dimension Partnership
2	**Purpose of the Issue Specific Hearing** The ExA explained the purpose of ISH2, to include discussion on the nature and scope of the application and the draft development consent order.	N/A
3	**Road Highway Network**	
3a	*Traffic Modelling* The ExA requested clarification on the future year date of 2036 used in the modelling, given the construction start date is stated to be 2026 and there is a proposed 10 year build period. The ExA wanted to understand whether 10 years	The Applicant explained that the 2036 horizon was confirmed through agreements with Leicestershire County Council (LCC). It was projected forward to that year on the basis that the Proposed Development had loaded the network with the full development horizon traffic. The Applicant also applied the same approach for 2026 in order to test it in the worst case scenario. The year 2036 came out of the PRTM modelling and so it was seen to be a reasonable approach to take for the 10 year horizon for the full build out. It is tested with the full capacity of the development itself onto the network. The Applicant reiterated that this was agreed with the local authority at the time. LCC, WCC and National Highways confirmed that this approach was agreed.

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	was the correct period or whether it should be 15 years.	
	The ExA noted the deadline 2 submission of the response to the DfT and IEMA guidance. The Applicant is only able to apply post model adjustments at the global scale. The ExA referenced the Rule 17 letter (dated 22 September 2023) and requested an update on when the analysis would be undertaken.	The Applicant submitted a note on their response to the DfT and IEMA guidance at deadline 2, all parties agreed that applying adjustments globally was an appropriate approach. The Applicant noted that LCC's NDI modelling team had been requested to review the data but the responses were only received on 24 October 2023 which left insufficient time to analyse and include in the Applicant's deadline 2 submission. The Applicant noted it was reviewing the initial guidance from NDI and providing feedback and would then arrange a meeting with the highway authorities to agree the modelling approach for the next phase. The Applicant has submitted A general transport update note (document reference: 6.2.8.1) at deadline 3 in response to this.
	The ExA requested the Applicant review the link plans submitted at deadline 2 and reissue at deadline 3 with a schedule outlining the changes.	The Applicant has reviewed and updated the link plans including a schedule of changes and these are submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 6.3.8.5-6.3.8.40).
3b	*Lorry Parking* The ExA requested clarification regarding the Lorry Park and whether this would be limited to those accessing the railport or those using the railport and the warehousing or just the warehousing units, and how this would be secured.	The Applicant stated that chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement (ES) paragraph 3.47 sets out that the access to the lorry park will be controlled so that it is available for HNRFI related traffic, which is traffic using the warehousing and traffic using the railport. As set out in the Highways Position Statement submitted at deadline 1 (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033), the Applicant intends to include a requirement relating to the governing of access to the lorry park to ensure that it remains for development related traffic only, this will be submitted as part of the next iteration of the DCO at deadline 4. The Applicant envisages that this will entail adherence to a scheme which will control that access. The Applicant has submitted a Lorry Park Management Plan at deadline 3 (document reference: 17.7).
3c	*Phasing, including timing of rail connection*	The Applicant has prepared a note on the rail returns area phasing, which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 18.6.2).

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	The ExA sought an explanation of the phasing and delivery of the railport returns area and lorry park in relation to the other development proposed both in terms of the timeline and the justification for this. The ExA noted that the returns area is due to be delivered in phase 4 and the railport becomes operational in phase 2 and what mechanism there would be to be to ensure that lorries would be able to park up without causing difficulty.	
	The ExA requested clarification on the approach to parking provision within the Proposed Development, specifically in reference to the Design Code reference to multi-storey parking, and the impact that this would have on traffic modelling.	The Applicant explained that as set out in the deadline 1 submission (document reference: 18.1.1) traffic generation has been based on floorspace, the approach has included the maximum amount of floorspace and then added the railport trips on top of this and from a modelling point of view the Applicant is confident that those trips are very robust in terms of parking. The requirement for parking is in line with LCCs maximum parking standards, and the provision is currently slightly below those standards. The parking levels are set out within tables 5.53 and 5.54 of the Transport Assessment (document reference 8.1, REP1-011). The Applicant has prepared a note setting out the parking strategy which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 18.6.4).
	The ExA requested an explanation of the phasing of the delivery of the associated infrastructure.	The Applicant confirmed that the model approach 'without development, with infrastructure' includes for the south facing slip roads on the M69 junction, the A47 link road and the B4668, but that it does not include for other mitigation works within that package. The Applicant explained that the scenario was modelled in order to understand the background redistribution of traffic, this was discussed with the highway authorities and seemed a reasonable approach to understand the impacts of the infrastructure on redistribution. Through this modelling the Applicant quickly realised that the majority of the mitigation proposed to the network would be required at that very early stage once the

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		delivery of the access infrastructure is in place and the first occupation happens on site, so the phasing was very much the reason behind the scenario being modelled to understand the background traffic movements. The trigger for the additional mitigation works is therefore first occupation. The Applicant confirmed that this phasing is secured in the DCO. Requirement 5 addresses the phasing of those highway works and works number 8 and 9 and these are required to be completed prior to the occupation of any warehouse floorspace. In relation to other numbered works forming part of the highway works, these are all to be completed prior to the first opening of either slip, so the package of measures is all in place prior to first occupation. In response to the point raised by National Highways requesting that the southern slips should be open prior to construction in order to ease construction access arrangements for the site, the Applicant set out that once the slips are open, then all other highway works need to be in place to provide mitigation for traffic rerouting to use those slips, so it would not simply be a case of building the slips to enable construction traffic then to access the main site as once the slips are open, the A47 Link Road needs to be in place, including the new bridge across the railway and all other highway works. The Applicant explained that the delivery of the slips is proposed in the first year of construction with the A47 link road being delivered at the same time and therefore for the majority of the construction period the slip roads would be in place. The Applicant agreed to prepare a Gantt chart setting out the construction programme for the Proposed Development setting out the triggers for the highway works and all other construction related activities, this is submitted as part of the Applicant's deadline 3 submission (document reference: 18.6.3).
	The ExA requested clarification with regard to the timing of the rail connection. Including the justification for the 105,000	The Applicant stated that requirement 10 of the dDCO is based on an amount of warehouse floor space, and that warehouse floor space correlates with the extent of warehouse floorspace on the parameters plan (document reference: 2.12, APP-047) set out for zone A,

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	square metres figure and whether this figure includes associated office space and how this is secured.	office space for this zone is 5-10%. This would be ancillary to the warehouse space and is inclusive in the 105,000 square metres figure. The Applicant agreed to provide clarification on this point in the wording of requirement 10 of the dDCO when it is submitted at deadline 4. The Applicant highlighted that all of the made DCOs including the recent amendments to the Northampton Gateway DCO, allow for occupation of floor space prior to operation of the terminal. This includes East Midlands Gateway, Northampton Gateway and West Midlands Interchange. In terms of the percentage of floor space, which the applicant sets its trigger for at requirement 10, the trigger is the lowest of all of the made DCOs. This demonstrates a commitment from the Applicant to deliver its terminal, effectively in an earlier stage of occupations than all of the other made DCOs to date.
	In reference to paragraph 4.88 of NPSNN, the ExA requested that the Applicant outlines how the Proposed Development complies with this. The ExA also requested that the Applicant outlines whether the draft NPSNN paragraph 4.84 makes a difference to the approach.	The Applicant has explained its position on the proposed timing of the provision of the rail terminal in respect to requirement 10 of the dDCO, with the clarification provided in the Highways Position Statement which was submitted at deadline 1 (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033). The statement says that the Applicant considers that it is reasonable for construction and operation to take place within construction phase A as identified within the illustrative works and phasing plan (document reference: 2.18.1 to 2.18.6, APP-050 to APP-055), then that would amount to 12% of the proposed total floor space. These early occupiers would be able to use the railport once it becomes operational. The Applicant highlighted the Market Needs Assessment document (document reference: 16.1, APP-357) which contains correspondence from Maritime who are the preferred operator for the railport at Hinckley, they state in the letter '*from our experience with other RFI startups we believe that the opportunity to allow warehouse occupation and operations to take place ahead of rail terminal operations is instrumental in allowing organic growth and encouragement of occupiers to use the SRFI to its full capacity so it is good news to have those early occupations*'. The Applicant's position is that like all major construction projects, there is a vast investment up front including investment in the slip roads and the A47 Link Road and the bridge over the railway. As the NPS says, these SRFIs are to come forward in a commercial framework and particularly here at Hinckley National we have the rail

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		connection on the west side of the site and the strategic road network on the east side of the site so you have works to connect as well in terms of the development. So the Applicant says that in terms of the flexibility that's referenced in the NPS and the realities of major developments coming forward, that it is appropriate for this developer to enable some advanced occupations and then the requirement stops the proposed development until the railport has been completed. The Applicant believes that it is an entirely reasonable approach and that it chimes with the emerging NPS and this recognition of the need for flexibility and commercial reality.
3d	*Use of the Rugby Rural Area Model (RRAM)* The ExA referred to the critiques of the RRAM set out in National Highways WR and requested National Highways and WCCs view on the overall effects that the critiques have on the overall effectiveness of the model. National Highways stated that they cannot be satisfied that there is a robust evidence base for the suitability of the development and whether it is mitigated on the strategic road network and there is likely to be a need for additional mitigation. WCC and National Highways agreed to have a meeting to discuss technical points in regard to the model prior to discussing with the Applicant.	The Applicant stated that the Rugby Rural Area Model was a subject of agreement of scoping with WCC and NH. WCCs consultants Vectos, the custodians as Mr. Dauncey (WCC) alluded to of the RRAM model, provided the outputs to the Applicant. Vectos have run the model themselves in discussions with WCC. The outputs were shared by the Vectos team and the highlights of impacts were provided across the Rugby rural area network. This follows a review of the outputs and flows by the Applicant's transport consultant BWB, which the Applicant submitted as Additional Submission - 6.4.8.1 Rugby Rural Area Model (RRAM) Modelling Summary, (document reference 6.4.8.1, AS-024). The summary noted the main impacts from the Rugby rural area model, the key ones being the approach on to the M69 junction one and this was concluded from the Vectos outputs. In terms of the modeling, the Applicant has taken M69 junction one and modelled that through a model which is a micro simulation model which has a facility to include a MOVA which is an optimization system which operates at the roundabout to give a better more realistic picture of how the junction operates in that scenario. The Applicant noted that National Highways have raised concerns regarding a number of other junctions but emphasized that the Applicant can discuss that in meetings with the highway authorities. Further discussions with NH have concluded that the RRAM is the best tool available for the

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		analysis of the Rural area, standalone models were produced to test the junctions on the SRN.
3e	*Furnessing* The ExA sought clarification on furnessing as concept when observed movements were at zero or close to zero and are likely to be significantly changed as a result of the development. The ExA requested comments on the accuracy of approach from the highways authorities. LCC and WCC confirmed that they do not question the methodology but have concerns regarding the age and appropriateness of the survey data that underpins it including the pandemic and committed development changes to the local highway network. Concerns raised that what the furnessing methodology does on those turning movement is exacerbate that so if you get that turning movement incorrect, the furnessing methodology will exacerbate that, in the survey data. NH confirmed that furnessing methodology was previously agreed, but position has now changed, set out in the deadline 2 submission.	The Applicant outlined the approach that has been taken with regards to furnessing. The approach has been iterative, the Applicant's previous transport consultant had signed off a version of the furnessing methodology with the highways authorities which looked at the difference between PRTM scenario and added the difference onto survey link flows. The Applicant's current transport consultants, BWB, produced the revised furnessing notes outlining that the agreed furnessing methodology would be taken forward with a different approach proposed for the site junctions which were completely new. Following extensive review and refinement and development, including input from various project stakeholders, this was signed off by LCC. The local highways authorities position remains that the Applicant's previous consultant's version of the furnessing methodology provided an exemplar approach. Therefore the Applicant revisited and produced an approach on this basis. In July 2022, LCC requested some clarifications on the convergence criteria for the site access junctions, the Applicant agreed that the proposed approach, whilst acceptable should be sensitivity tested. In terms of the flows themselves, the first methodology is to understand the turning flows in the future year. The Applicant has reviewed 2036 outputs from the PRTM model, the turning counts that were used were from pre pandemic and this aligns with the assessment that was done recently at Padge Hall Farm. The counts predated the COVID pandemic, and therefore do not require post COVID factors. It was also noted at the time that LCC has requirements for any new traffic counts, to factor to pre pandemic levels using COVID factors supplied by NDI As LCC are not accepting unadjusted post pandemic traffic counts, any new traffic counts would need to be rebased to 2019/early 2020 levels, and therefore the Applicant saw no merit in terms of reassessing those numbers. The feedback that the Applicant has had from NDI in terms of the global picture in terms of post COVID movement is that traffic movements within the PRTM area is still below the

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		values in terms of between 5% and 8% across the PRTM area at the moment. Therefore the Applicant maintains that the current pre pandemic turning movements are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment. The Applicant noted that it was happy to take the points raised by National Highways into scheduled discussions. The Applicant highlighted that approach that has been taken on the junctions which are new to the network had a slightly different approach due to those zero values. Further discussions have agreed a way forward on the furnessing with the TWG members. This will include targeted turning count surveys at mitigated junctions by Deadline 4.
3f	*Padge Hall Farm & A5/A47 Junctions* The ExA raised a number of queries in regard to Padge Hall Farm and how it has been taken into account in the modelling and the effects arising from the proposed development at the A5/A47 junctions.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised by the ExA and the highway authorities in respect of Padge Hall Farm and prepared a consolidated note of the matter which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 18.6.5). The Applicant has prepared a note on the effect of high-sided vehicles at relevant junctions which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 18.6.6) to address the matters raised on this point.
3g	*M69 Junction 1* The ExA questioned whether the model shows traffic coming around the west side of Hinckley and raised some queries in regard to the link plans provided at deadline 2.	The Applicant emphasised that it was important to note that the link plans are AADTs for the purposes of identification within the Environmental Statement. The impacts that the Applicant has reviewed are the peak hours within the transport system itself. The PRTM looks at peak flows. The assessments that have been undertaken are based on ES guidance and change in flows through the network. The PRTM outputs demonstrate the change in flow between 'without development' and the 'with development with infrastructure' case. The Applicant explained that this is how the ES chapter has been set out and those changes between the scenarios. This 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.

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	The ExA referred to LCCs concern that new bridge would increase the amount of HGV traffic on the stretch of the A5 and would also have the effect of allowing higher HGVs on the section which has not been included in this current model.	The Applicant confirmed that this was the recommended route from the site, 12ut the PRTM model can't distinguish between high and high sided vehicles and low sided., The Applicant confirmed that this was seen as an undesirable route for HGVs but not prohibitive. The Applicant has prepared a note on the effect of high-sided vehicles at relevant junctions which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 18.6.6) to address the matters raised on this point.
	The ExA noted that WCC also made the comment in relation to the B4109 and queried the issue at this junction. National highways and WCC wished to explore this further with the Applicant.	The Applicant stated that the RRAM modelling notes a queue increase from 12 vehicles on that northbound approach in the 2031 reference case to 55 in the 2031 with development with routing restrictions with mitigation scenario for in the RRAM modeling. In terms of RRAM modelling that has fixed timing signals within it within the Paramics model, the proposed development is re optimizing the M69 Junction one, the VISSIM document that was submitted with the application (document reference: 6.2.8.1) sets this out in a summary. It demonstrates that with re-optimization that there are improvements to journey time and delay throughout that junction overall, and so therefore, the Transport Assessment concludes that those measures are appropriate. The VISSIM has more detail to understand that with the MOVA optimization system added into the VISSIM model. In response to National Highways concerns, the Applicant confirmed that consultation has been undertaken with the MOVA engineer. They confirmed that the signal optimization at the moment is currently outdated, and therefore the Applicant is proposing to amend the MOVA configuration.
3h	*M69 Junction 2* The ExA raised a number of queries in regards to the history of Junction 2 of the M69 and why it was designed with only two northern facing slip roads. The ExA sought confirmation from National Highways once strategic modelling was	The Applicant confirmed that a worst case scenario has been modelled in the PRTM and the VISSIM that has been produced for junction 2. The Applicant explained that the current modelling demonstrates that no queues are backing on to the M69 Junction two and that the layout that has been proposed within the application is suitable and fit for purpose. The Applicant highlighted that the design also users MOVA optimization.

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	agreed, the design for the southern slips could be agreed relatively straightforwardly. National highways and LCC raised a number of concerns about the scale of mitigation required and the space allowed for in the red line.	
3i	*M1 Junction 21 / M69 Junction 3* The ExA asked the Applicant to set out the current position in relation to M1 J21 and M69 J3	The Applicant explained that it is important to highlight that there are current capacity constraints at junction 21 of the M1, which are long standing and driven by the restricted width of the M1 under bridges on the circulatory carriageway. The mainline flows on the M1, with 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. The Applicant is of the opinion that there is no proportionate highway scheme possible on this section. As set out in paragraph 49 of circular 01/22, planned improvements on the SRN or the local road network should be considered in any assessment where there is a high degree of certainty that they will be delivered. The Applicant set out that there is no scheme committed for the foreseeable future to address these existing issues at junction 21. LCCs PRTM 2.2 model reflects the current arrangement. This was agreed with the TWG as part of the infrastructure log for PRTM 2.2 and it should be noted that in table 8.7 of the Transport Assessment the PRTM has assigned 321 development trips to junction 21 in the morning peak hour, and 443 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 the morning peak and 114 vehicles, or 1.8% of total traffic, in the evening peak hour. The wider HNRFI mitigation package accounts for the influence of the traffic redistribution resulting from the congestion at junction 21 however it is predicted to be a small negative residual impact in the evening peak hour at junction 21. This is not considered to be severe, and in accordance with Circular 01/22, 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 X6

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		bus service from Leicester and Coventry, and the encouragement of office staff to work from home as part of their working week. The Applicant has updated the sustainable transport strategy (document reference: 6.2.8.1A) and framework Travel Plan (doc ref 6.2.8.2A) and these are submitted at deadline 3.
	The ExA held a discussion with LCC and NH in relation to road hierarchy and the PRTM and Vissim models and asked the Applicant to comment on whether there is a functional dichotomy between the PRTM and Vissim models and national highways desire to encourage traffic on the highest category of road.	The Applicant confirmed that the PRTM that LCC and NH have requested the rerun with an unconstrained flow. The reason for the Applicant to use the PRTM was because it is a reassignment model. So PRTM takes account of where there are constraints in the network, and those trips do find alternative routes. So for the Applicant to run an unconstrained flow is a theoretical scenario whereby there is no congestion at junction 21 and traffic will choose the most convenient route. It would not inform the assessment of HNRFI. Indeed, the development flows are still directed towards junction 21. It is the background traffic which is redirected. Hence, undertaking the assessment is considered an unreasonable requirement that is contrary to what Circular 01/22 requires.
3j	*A47 Link Road Junctions* The ExA requested that the Applicant responded to the critique that the junctions will not be fit for purpose in the future and so do not provide a satisfactory solution. LCC and the ExA queried that the Transport Assessment shows that they would be operating over capacity.	The Applicant confirmed their understanding that the comment was made on the basis of the forecasts of the PRTM outputs. The Applicant has addressed this within the Transport Assessment within the detailed junction capacity assessment. The Applicant has also submitted a subsequent report in terms of the internal junctions on the link road itself (document reference: 18.4.2, REP2-073). The report demonstrates that the roundabout on the B4668, is shown to be working within capacity and the Applicant feels that that is appropriate for the situation. The Applicant confirmed that the assessment has been undertaken in more detail. So the outputs from the PRTM were taken and reviewed through a more detailed model.
	The ExA queried the comments in the Applicant's deadline 2 submission,	The Applicant confirmed that a worst case scenario has been undertaken for the junctions. For the purpose of the modeling there is a traffic flow diagram in the rear of that document

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	Appendix B link road capacity assessment paragraph 3.2, which states, PRTM assumes all vehicles accessing the site from the B4668 and M69. Two will use the northern roundabout and southern roundabout respectively. The ExA required clarification why no traffic is expected to travel between the northern and southern roundabouts and why this is not on the model.	which indicates how that traffic has been distributed. The approach taken by the Applicant is a 50% split on both of those roundabouts, and then a further 65% on each roundabout to test the functionality of those internal roundabouts themselves. Both worked well and those were tested against the crossings as on the A47 link road itself. Flow Diagram Number 18 illustrates the flows used between the roundabouts.
	Elmesthorpe Parish Council raised concern with regard to traffic rerouting in the event of an incident on the A47 Link Road.	The Applicant noted that in terms of emergency access, this is something that is managed at the time by the agencies that are involved, the Applicant cannot mitigate all impacts of accidents on the strategic or the local road network. What the Applicant has provided with the A47 link road and the M69 junction two slip roads is further alternative accesses to the strategic road network and connections through to the A road network which avoid local routes to Hinckley itself. An M69 Emergency plan has been prepared which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 17.8).
		Post lunch clarifications
3k	*Effect on Sapcote* The ExA noted that the transport modelling shows an increase in traffic and HGV movements in Sapcote. Noting that they are undesirable routes in the HGV management and routing strategy.	The Applicant highlighted that the increase in HGV's is primarily to do with reassigned background traffic, which in the opening year 2026 is 50 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 the Applicant has identified those measures to try and mitigate that as much as possible. So it is traffic growth that is predicted in the model to result in the additional HGVs. The traffic calming and the signalization of the junctions either end of Stanton Lane, are aimed to try and reduce and minimize this increase as far as possible and ensure that the

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	The ExA and LCC requested detail on mitigation proposed and how it will address the additional HGV flows and further clarification on the link traffic flows.	environmental effects of those additional issues are mitigated. The Applicant confirmed that in terms of strategic modeling, that relates to peak hour flows. The HGV routing strategy identifies that only 25 HGVs will be rerouted as a consequence in the peak hours, and therefore the Applicant does not believe that will have any bearing on the peak hour transport assessments. The Applicant confirmed that when looking at the PRTM, a select link analysis was undertaken, which looked at the trips passing specific points within the village to understand the distribution of where those trips were coming from. The select link analysis is included in the forecast model reports (doc ref 6.2.8.1, APP-148) and it demonstrates that a lot of that traffic is generated from the local area in terms of dwellings and population within Stoney Stanton and Sapcote themselves.
	The ExA and other parties raised concerns about the suitability of the route for HGV movements and whether the mitigation proposed can be implemented within the space available. Parties raised concerns in regards to specific mitigation measures. The ExA and other parties queried whether the B road could be reclassified.	The Applicant has designed a traffic calming scheme to dissuade HGVs from using that route. HGVs which are reassigned as a result of the south facing slips as existing background traffic. With respect to points about specific mitigation measures, the Applicant confirmed that it does not have any on street parking identified on the highway plans on APP028. The Applicant confirmed that the gateway feature proposed is a one way shuttle operation, and the aim is to not just for speed reduction, but to increase delay, to make that route less attractive. The Applicant confirmed that these plans were submitted recently to an interim stage one road safety audit, the findings of which will obviously be taken into account, with respect of positioning of various features. The Applicant re emphasised the point that these are traffic calming features that are supposed to make this route less attractive to HGVs. In response to the question about the diversion of HGVs from Sharnford, with the comment that the M69 junction will attract those who instead of going directly across the A5 as they currently do, will turn and go through a cut through route on the M69 J2. The Applicant confirmed that this is the background traffic that it is indirectly related to the development.

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		The Applicant's approach 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 the Applicant is trying to soften that with the traffic calming to make that less significant . The Applicant confirmed that the situation is that in the opening year, those increases are fairly modest two HGVs an hour, it is when you get the traffic growth up to 2036 that the impacts could be greater. However, the Applicant feels that the measures that will be put in to try and dissuade HGVs from routing through there and improve the environmental impact of those HGVs is proportionate to the impact that is shown. Reclassification is further addressed in the Transport General Update Note submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference: 18.6.1).
3l	*Effect on Stoney Stanton* The ExA requested clarification on what the proportion of HGVs against non HGVs there would be in Stoney Stanton?	The Applicant set out that traffic actually reduces in those future years and that is a function of the rerouting that has been discussed in Sapcote. The reason for that is that the B581, which connects through across M69 into Elmesthorpe is moving to the B4469 and therefore the HGV movements are lessening.
	The ExA and LCC queried whether the mitigation in Stoney Stanton was safe, and deliverable within the highway restrictions in the area, specific reference was made to junction 38 by Stoney Stanton Parish Council	The Applicant confirmed that in terms of J38, there are restrictions on that. However, the Applicant believes that mitigation is achievable through other measures that are proposed in terms of travel planning, in terms of HGV routing and, and through public transport improvements. So the Applicant believes that it is not completely a situation where the impacts cannot be mitigated here. The Applicant also stated that with respect to the safety and deliverability of the mitigation schemes, the mitigation within Stoney Stanton and Sapcote is shown on the highway plans (doc ref 2.4) and within the Transport Assessment (doc ref 6.2.8.1) submitted with the application. Further it is in the process of being discussed with respect to stage one road safety audit. Throughout the process, there have been a number of meetings with LCC and requests to review the detail of these mitigation schemes, which has not at this stage happened due to acceptance of the traffic modeling. LCC have now stated that they are

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		willing to have a discussion about the preliminary design and discussions are ongoing in this respect. The Applicant confirmed that a workshop session had been arranged with NH to discuss mitigation and it hoped to be able to run a similar session with LCC. The Applicant confirmed that it would provide the highway plans at a different scale requested by LCC for deadline 3 (document reference: 2.3 to 2.6).
	The ExA and other parties raised concerns regarding the traffic impacts at Elmesthorpe, concern raised that links in Elmesthorpe have not been tested. Elmesthorpe Parish Council raised concerns about the implications should the A47 link road fail or not be able to take a flow of traffic for any traffic related incidents.	The Applicant confirmed that links in Elmesthorpe have been tested, they have gone through the PRTM and they have been reviewed through the Applicant's analysis. The important thing to note specifically to Elmsthorpe is that the B581, with the introduction of the A47 link road, has a reduction in traffic across it as traffic diverts to the A47 link which provides a clearer and higher capacity link to the B468 and A47. In terms of the point on emergency access on the M69 and A47, the Applicant highlighted that the link road itself provides an emergency access point between the M69 and the A47 link roads without the reliance on local roads. It is to some extent dependent on the situation and the emergency responses that are required at the time, which the Applicant cannot model for, cannot account for, but the Applicant believes that with the presence of the additional roads and slip roads that they do provide alternative access to higher capacity roads, which the Applicant thinks is appropriate. In terms of the permeability of a site, this is addressed further in public rights of way, but there are diversions and routes that still are able to be accessed by the public through the site that do connect through to the south and to facilities in Hinkley itself. An M69 Emergency plan has been prepared which is submitted at deadline 3 (doc ref 17.8).
	The ExA and other parties raised queries in relation to the apparent inconsistency and concerns that there has been an over estimation of the number of HGV miles removed from the public highway.	The Applicant confirmed that the 83 million figure referenced is quoted within the climate change chapter (doc ref 6.1.18, APP-127) as a headline figure. The 1.6 billion figure was reported on the Tritax website in error and the Applicant confirms that this figure has been removed from the website as soon as the error was identified. In response to the ExA and other parties request to understand the basis for the calculations, a document has been

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		provided at deadline 3 setting out how the figures have been calculated (doc ref 18.6.7).
3m	*Narborough Level Crossing (road and NMUs)* The ExA requested that the Applicant explain the Narborough Level Crossing information requested through the Rule 17 letter (September 2023) that has been submitted to date and to set out when the road information will be made available to the examination.	The Applicant explained that the data that had been used in the application was historic data based on Network Rail's information. The Applicant instigated a video survey, which would actually track both questions that the ExA asked about transport movement, and whether cars could clear the level crossing, which isn't available data that Network Rail would have. The Applicant has completed this survey and the information is being assembled from the video survey. At the same time, the survey 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. The Applicant has then mapped that against the actual train movements through on that day. The Applicant now has the data for all the train movements for a week from the 11th of October and all of the level crossings ups and downs. The Applicant can now complete the schedule and it is submitted as part of the deadline 3 submissions (doc ref 18.5.3), and it does effectively correlate. The Applicant wanted to point out that in that schedule, the definition of an hour changes, this is because trains do not necessarily pass exactly on the hour. In response to concerns that part of the surveyed week fell into a school holiday period, the Applicant stated that it was keen to get the data in as quickly as possible in order to be able to assess it ahead of deadline 3. The Applicant highlighted that the split across a term time and school holiday period provides a comparison between traffic flows, which is useful in terms of the analysis itself. The Applicant however notes the concern from other parties and therefore to further validate the data gathered through this survey, has commissioned a further term time survey, the results of which will be made available at deadline 4.
	The ExA and other parties raised concerns in regard to the downtime at Narborough Crossing and the impact that this has in terms of traffic and the effect on the communities. Concern that in operational years this impact will increase because of other developments, and concern about	The Applicant set out that in terms of highway traffic modeling that has been undertaken to date, it does demonstrate that the development traffic itself is very low. The modelling does show that there is a slight increase in background traffic that is reassigned in the morning peak. But when the evening peak hour assessment was modelled, extra downtime was added as a worst case scenario to cater for another freight train coming through, this resulted in the redistribution of background traffic to avoid that additional delay. The Applicant's viewpoint is that this is not a case of longer queues, it is additional frequency of

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	accessibility for pedestrians and non-road users.	queues. The Applicant has responded to this in its deadline 3 submission Hinckley NRFI Narborough Level Crossing Note (document reference: 18.5.3).
3n	*A5/A426 Gibbet Hill Junction* The ExA noted that there is no longer a mitigation scheme for the junction, which was confirmed by WCC. WCC confirmed that National Highways are doing a study which looks at a potential Mitigation Scheme for cumulative impacts at the junction. So there's a lot of developers that are making contributions towards an ultimate scheme, which will mitigate their own specific impacts. And WCC and NH would like to see the same approach followed here. And the same assessment methodology as well through the vissim.	The Applicant confirmed that in terms of the traffic increases at Gibbet Hill, the proportion of impact from RNFI is 1.7% or 1.9% in the peak period. The Applicant originally modelled the outputs on the basis that there was a signalized scheme that was being brought forward as part of another development and the review was based on that. The Applicant confirmed that it was happy to work with NH and WCC in terms of the contribution approach and suggests this is completed by Deadline 4.
3o	*Cross in Hands Roundabout* The ExA and WCC raised points regarding comparison with the RRAM model and demand turning flows at the junction.	The Applicant stated that they have taken on board the comments from Gazeley that came in through the written representations in terms of their Mitigation Scheme no longer being on the table. The Applicant accepts that the combined mitigation proposal is required to be delivered at first occupation.
3p	*Other non-modelled junctions* The ExA noted that there were three junctions that LCC were missing.	The Applicant confirmed that models for Rugby Road, Brookside Road and Desford Road were available and these would be shared with the highway officers by or soon after Deadline 3. The information has been updated in the Transport Assessment update (doc ref 6.2.8.1B). The Applicant confirmed that both junctions have a reduction in traffic through them.
3q	*HGV Routing and Enforcement* The ExA questioned the HGV Route	The Applicant stated that the HGV routing strategy is intended to be deployed on occupation and that these routes are defined within the report itself. The Applicant has prepared an updated version of the HGV Route Management Strategy for deadline 3 (doc ref 17.4A) and

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	Management Plan and Strategy and the use of desirable and undesirable routes. The ExA asked the Applicant to set out what happens should the M69 be closed and what the emergency plan and effects would be and the acceptability of these.	in liaison with National Highways a M69 Emergency plan has been prepared which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 17.8).
	The ExA questioned the approach to enforcement mechanisms to ensure HGV routing is appropriate and why this approach was selected.	As stated earlier in the ISH, the Applicant noted that B Roads are not subject to weight limits, and therefore, in order to prevent HGVs from the development routing along routes that are considered to be undesirable, there needed to be a different way of addressing the issue. The Applicant's transport consultants have experience of operating such a system in Warwick with the Redditch Gateway site which has been operating for two years, and it is working well, and therefore it was selected as the approach to adopt here. Further discussions with LCC confirm that the B4669 is on an identified HGV route through their Route Management Plans and Environmental Weight Limits are not deliverable or enforceable on such routes. The Applicant explained that in respect of penalties, a persistent breach would be one that the HGV strategy working group would define. That will be based on the views of not only the developer, the site management company, but also the local highway authorities. To date, the Applicant's transport consultants been successful with the HGV routing strategies that they have operated and the breaches have been very modest. The Applicant confirmed that it was happy to consider that any penalties be administered to the communities impacted.
	Other parties queried, why if enforcement is successful will there need to be traffic mitigation measures in the village.	The Applicant explained that there are two components to the HGV impact. Firstly, there is the background HGVs and, secondly, there are the development related HGVs. The HGV routing strategy aims to take those development related HGVs off the undesirable routes through management and enforcement by the development itself. It then looks to discourage existing or diverted HGVs that would be there as a consequence of the introduction of the M69 slips rather than the development itself, by trying to discourage those with traffic calming and other environmental measures.

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
3r	*Road Safety Audits* The ExA requested an update on road safety audits.	The Applicant confirmed that the briefs for Leicestershire are currently being updated as there was some collision data which was out of date, which has been resubmitted as part of a deadline 2 package and with respect to National Highways, GG 119 states that the Road Safety Audit takes place at the conclusion of the preliminary design and given the discussions ongoing with NH, this point has not yet been reached. The Applicant has however, progressed interim stage one road safety audits so that the inputs and the findings of those are available to be taken into account whilst progressing the design for the preliminary design work, and then once the briefs are agreed the Applicant will revisit those to the satisfaction of the highway authorities and publish the responses in due course. The Applicant confirmed to LCC that vehicle tracking is included in the brief and contained within the updated package of information.
3s	*Lorry Parking in Vicinity* The ExA raised questions for the two district councils in regards to lorry parking in the vicinity. NH confirmed that they are at 98% occupancy for HGV parking provision across the East Midlands.	The Applicant has prepared a Lorry Park Management Plan which is submitted at deadline 3 (document reference: 17.7).
4	**Rail Connectivity**	
4a	*Rail Approvals* The ExA requested clarification on what level has been reached in respect of the pace approval process and what certainty there is that the project would gain remaining approvals required to both the connection and necessary rail paths on the line to enable the initial rail terminal to be constructed and operational as part of the first phase of development.	The Applicant stated that essentially, a lot of historic schemes work to GRIP 2, which is a very basic feasibility study and then go into an application. The Applicant has taken this further and gone to what is effectively GRIP3. The pace system is designed to speed up the process of getting schemes approved and dealt with. ES stands for engineering stage, and the Applicant is between ES 2 and ES 3. The definition of ES 3 is that the constraints have been identified and project feasibility has been confirmed by Network Rail, and the Applicant is now into the single option identified and endorsed. The particular reason that the Applicant has gone beyond the standard approach is because Northampton Gateway have had difficulties over signaling because they had reached stage GRIP2 and they had not identified the signaling solutions, and on that line, that became a major issue and a big delay. The Applicant has therefore been through review by the signaling panel, approving the scheme

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		that the Applicant is looking at doing, therefore the principles are agreed with Network Rail.
4b	*Rail Directional Split* The ExA requested clarification on rail split, based on a number of representations about congestion on the mainline in the Nuneaton direction and the reliance or otherwise, of the Nuneaton crossover to allow traffic to travel south and west. The ExA also requested clarification on how much of a constraint the crossing of the main line in the vicinity of Nuneaton would be to traffic coming from the south and west	The Applicant explained that they are not predicating the scheme on connections via Nuneaton. The Applicant has stated all along that the primary routes are the southern deep sea ports of Felixstowe, London Gateway, and the East Coast ports, and conurbations which have got serviced SRFIs and the northwest and Scotland, we're very well aware that it's not just a question of going through Water Orton, South Birmingham Leamington spa, but Oxford has significant constraints to get into Southampton. Mr Baker explained his background which included work on the gestation and development of the market for London Gateway as a port, and extensive work in terms of the international movement of freight through the ports in the UK, their destination and origin. The Port of Southampton is not a target market for Hinckley, due to the rail connectivity. When East West Rail comes on board, it is highly probable that Southampton and DIRFT could benefit from that movement. From HNRFIs perspective, Network Rail have confirmed there is capacity, but it is not predicated on any of those movements.
4c	*Interaction with Croft Quarry* The ExA questioned what discussions that there have been between the parties, including the operator of the quarry, as to the pathing of trains into Croft Quarry, particularly as I understand it, there are construction of the southern section of HS2, the spoil will be sent to that site	The Applicant explained that it won't actually be used by HS2 now. Croft quarry has consent for some landfill and will be taking spoil from various parts of the country. This was predicated it on southern HS2 which will not happen; nor the fall back. So it will be drawn out and Croft will be in the market trying to find connections. Baker Rose act for FCC as a business, and know that market well, and three to four trains a day is perfectly capable within this line, which is lightly used in rail terms.
4d	*Passenger Services* The ExA raised questions in regard to passenger rail, firstly, what effects increasing passenger train frequency would have? And secondly, what consideration if	The Applicant stated that there is a report being finalised by Network Rail which will have this information and it is intended that this would be submitted at deadline 3. The Applicant confirmed that in terms of the capacity study, the assumption was that the Midland Connect services two extra trains was patched in and it does work.

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	any, did the Applicant give to providing a passenger train station stop at this at the application site?	In response to the ExAs query regarding provision of a passenger station at the site, the Applicant confirmed that it did have discussions with Network Rail and that they pointed out that there was proposals as part of the Fosse Village Plan for a station at Stoney Stanton, and the net result of that was that they would strongly resist any temptation for another passenger station nearby, which Elmesthorpe would be, so it would not be viable in terms of passenger services between two points that are so close because they would not gather enough speed and then they would be decelerating again. The Applicant highlighted that the other issue is one of physicality of having a rail freight terminal which is next to the railway line and there is not actually then the space to put in a passenger service and connect it for passengers to use on that occasion. In response to the ExAs point regarding a one-sided station, the Applicant outlined that it would require significant engineering works and that it would be disruptive of the mainline. The Applicant confirmed that it did engage with Network Rail who confirmed they would not support it due to the same conversations that Midland Connect had who were looking at Stoney Stanton and this was in the Fosse Village Plan.
4e	*Narborough Level Crossing (rail)* The ExA queried the status of the 40 minutes downtime standard referred to in the application. In regard to the Narborough Crossing information provided by the Applicant, the ExA requested clarification whether the data averages the mode, the median or the mean that please, the ExA request the note in an Excel spreadsheet.	The Applicant noted that Network Rail have provided clarification to the ExAs first point as part of their deadline 2 submissions. In response to the ExA and other parties comments on this issue, the Applicant has prepared a note submitted at deadline 3 on the Narborough Crossing (doc ref 18.5.3), the Applicant has also provided an Excel version of the data in pdf form (doc ref 18.5.1).

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
4f	*Other Rail Level Crossings* ExA note that latest documents do not refer to other level crossings.	The Applicant confirmed that the other level crossings have been reviewed outside the limits of the DCO. This matter has now been resolved amongst parties and will be confirmed in the SoCG's by Deadline 4.
4g	*Railway Bridge Design* ExA referred to comments raised in Rule 17 letter (September 2023) with regard to the railway bridge design and requested clarification on the lines.	The Applicant confirmed that the original design submitted with the application was presented to show that it was possible to get four tracks under the bridge. This was because when you do a bridge agreement, Network Rail's standard is that in the event that they try to expand the railway, it is the owner of the bridge who has to pay for the cost of the change to the bridge. So for the benefit of the highway authority, or whoever owns the bridge, the Applicant has demonstrated that you can provide four lines without having to do any further works.
	Other parties raised concerns in regard to safety at uncontrolled crossings	The Applicant confirmed that with regard to the diversion of the public right of way at Bostock Close, this is subject to the stage 1 safety audit process that the Applicant is currently going through, the diversion has been positioned with due regard to visibility to the crossing for users of the B581, and the Applicant will take into account any recommendations put forward by the road safety audit. This will also take into account the point regarding accidents and collisions at this location also. The Applicant highlighted that based on the current arrangement for that particular public right of way, the Applicant sees this as a significant improvement.
	The ExA queried the arrangement of the illustrative rail port line diagram.	The Applicant stated that it is an illustrative masterplan and it shows a scheme within the parameters but the final configuration is in discussion with the operator at the moment. The Applicant has looked at the configuration and confirms that it can be delivered in the approach presented.
4h	*Quantum of 'rail connected', 'rail accessible' and 'rail served' warehousing* The ExA noted that currently there is no requirement for any of the warehouses to include a rail siding to allow enclosed transfer of goods, and requested that the Applicant provide an explanation on	The Applicant's rail consultant explained that he was involved in the original DIRFT which has got rail connected buildings which at the time was viewed as ideal and morphed into what we see now as a SRFI and the concept of having rail linked buildings. Rail linked buildings are a specialist market, there are not that many people who can benefit from them, you would not want to put containers in them and you could not serve containers from them directly. But there is a market there sometimes and DIRFT has got those. The Applicant has allowed for the ability to put those in and has looked at opportunities to run the rail cord, which would actually also allow for an electrified terminal so that individual trains can then be run

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	various split of types of accessibility and what measures were considered.	to individual buildings and be serviced from reception sidings. So all of the infrastructure is capable of going in and serving the benefit of a variety of different users subject to market demand.
4i	*Relation between the scale of warehousing floorspace and the potential for road to rail transfer of freight* The ExA requested the Applicant to advise how it determined the split between those areas which are used for warehousing compared with what was used for the rail port or the non rail access.	The Applicant explained that they have designed a very efficient rail terminal which allows 775m train in straight under a gantry or next to a slab for reach stackers in early phases. The net result of that is that you build your yard behind it in order to optimise the ability to use it for stacking containers. Using reach stackers in the early years and then rubber tyred gantries in later years. The Applicant worked with a port designer who did the rail terminal at London Gateway and worked to make it really efficient. The premise was therefore minimum handling, maximum efficiency, getting trains in and out because this is a hub location and a location that can do really well on the network.
4j	*Implications for cancellation of HS2 north of Birmingham*	The Applicant has prepared a response on the implications of the cancellation of HS2 north of Birmingham on the HNRFI, this is submitted at deadline 3 (doc ref 18.8.1).
	Elmesthorpe Stands Together requested clarification on when the trains will have to slow down to enter the interchange.	The Applicant confirmed that trains will have to slow down going through Elmesthorpe. Other level crossings (Thorney fields), both being closed and diverted, if they were to hold they would be held there and speed that they can enter the site is 25mph. They will be passing residential properties slowly.
5	**Sustainable Transport Connections**	
5a	*Active travel and response to DfT Circular 1/2022* Discussion on the circular between the ExA and highway authorities, regarding the weight to be placed on the circular.	The Applicant stated that Circular 1/22 promotes development in sustainable locations. Paragraph 22 states that it excludes SRN dependent sectors, such as logistics and manufacturing. Paragraph 30 expands on this by acknowledging that the approved future of freight plan sets out that a joined up approach between the planning system, local authorities and industry can safeguard and prioritise the land needed for these uses. Footnote 14 states that this may include opportunities for a rail network connection, in addition to having a close proximity to the SRN. Whilst there is not a stated vision for the scheme, because a lot of the transport work commenced in advance of Circular 1/22, the vision is clear, close to the SRN and rail connections, improvement of M69 Junction 2 to provide the strategic connection, a focus on car sharing and public transport and encouraging active travel where it is reasonable to do so. As with other SRFI, such as East Midlands Gateway, where less than 1% of staff walk and less than 1% cycle. Circular 1/22

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		recognises that the requirements to be close to rail and strategic highways can often limit the scope to encourage significant numbers of active travel trips. Consequently a balance must be struck between providing facilities to encourage travel by these modes and recognising that the travel distance can often preclude such movements and proposed development expecting to employ between 8,400 and 10,400 staff with the majority working shifts, as with other large employment sites, shift working lends itself to the successful implementation of both car sharing and financial contributions to public transport and demand responsive transport services. Consequently in accordance with Circular 1/22 the sustainable transport strategy focusses on these modes given the concerns raised by various stakeholders, further examination of sustainable travel has been undertaken. The Applicant has updated the sustainable transport strategy (doc ref 6.2.8.1A) and Framework Travel Plan (doc ref 6.2.8.2A) and these are submitted at deadline 3.
5b	*Cycling* The ExA and other parties raised queries in regard to cycling provision, including the potential for dedicated cycling facilities on the B4469, provision of street lighting on cycling routes, HGVs crossing cycling routes, and provision from Barwell and Elmesthorpe.	The Applicant confirmed that the cycle strategy will be reviewed as part of the update to the sustainable transport strategy, which is submitted at deadline 3 (doc ref 6.2.8.1A). In response to the queries regarding the annotation on highway plan 1 of 8 for the cycleway and lighting, the Applicant confirmed that it would resubmit a fully annotated plan at deadline 3 (doc ref 2.4A).
5c	*Bus connections* The ExA and other parties raised a number of questions in regard to bus connections and provision.	The Applicant confirmed that the bus connections will be reviewed as part of the update to the sustainable transport strategy, which is submitted at deadline 3 (doc ref 6.2.8.1A). The Applicant clarified a misconception, by confirming that the traffic modelling does not include or account for any modal shift. So it does not take the benefit of taking traffic off the roads and therefore the dis benefit of that not happening whilst we are obviously charged with identifying a sustainable transport strategy that is fit for purpose for the site. Therefore there is not actually any linkage between the traffic modelling that has been undertaken and the modal shift. The Applicant further confirmed that trip generation was based on highly

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
		robust flows from a number of different sites, one of the ones for light vehicles was Swan Valley which is a very car dominated site so we've taken account of those very robust figures coming out of the Hinckley site as well.
5d	*Public Rights of Way network (including amenity considerations* The ExA set out a number of questions related to PRoW. Including, physical changes to the public rights of way network, in simple terms the proposal in the right application system deleting all rights of way through the main site and the creation of effectively two new bridleways both at one end at junction 2 of the M69. The first question I have relates to those who want to travel from Elmesthorpe, say a proposed termination point of Burbage Common road to the Bridge to get across to the other side. These are points 1 and x on the access and rights of way plans 2.3A and 2.3B. How would you get between those two points? How far would each of those routes be? The next one is the proposed right of way bridge over the railway line for use by those with mobility issues. Could I ask the applicant to respond to the proposition that there are plenty of all terrain wheelchairs and buggies- and not ensuring	The Applicant outlined that from Burbage Common the existing road passes through a three metre wide surfaced connection under the underpass with a one metre verge on either side. Cyclists can use the bridleway as can pedestrians, as for car you wouldn't be able to use that bridleway link. From the outset the Applicant considered the rights of way network within the site to see if it was possible to retain them on their existing alignment considering the different user groups and the functionality of the proposed scheme. Footways within the site were a viable option and we liaised with the British Horse Society in terms of access through the site. The decision was made given the number of likely crossing points and given the functionality of the rail freight interchange to move that user group within a generous green corridor to the edge of the site which sits along the M69 and corridors up to fifty metres wide. This takes that user group off Burbage Common Road which is an open vehicle route to ride the bridleway within a dedicated green corridor which wraps around the site. The Applicant has taken on board the comments raised by the ExA and other parties in regards to the accessibility of the footbridge over the railway line, and confirms that a ramped bridge can be provided at the Outwoods crossing, this also addresses any suggested issues related to equalities and accessibility. The Applicant accepts that there is a change in character to the bridleway route which is inevitable given the current agricultural use of the land. The new route retains as much green character as possible. In terms of the character there is change but in terms of the usability there is an improvement.

Agenda item	Matter	Applicant's submission
	that a route is fit for purpose could be argued to be seen as not seeking to minimize discrimination? If left until later how would the secretary of state know it would be secured? ExA requested confirmation that the replacement of the bridleway which currently runs from junction 2 past woodhouse farm and comparing that to the new bridleway between the strategic freight interchange provides a nosier and less rural environment than the current one	
6	**Concluding remarks**	On behalf of the Applicant. In terms of agenda item three, I don't think we need to add anything to the summary that was given at the end of that session. On agenda item four, I think you've heard about good progress that's been made with Network Rail around achieving the various approvals and also the capacity that lies within the network to deliver the project and we will respond on some of the detailed points that are outstanding around Narborough level crossing at deadline three. Then lastly on sustainable transport connections, you've heard our response to circular 01/22 and how we're interpreting that in the context of the particular scheme that is being proposed here and we will be providing further details upon an updated sustainable transport strategy at deadline three, which will include commitment to providing a minimum level of bus services as you've heard described.
7	**Next Steps and Action List**	N/A
8	**Closing**	N/A