

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Development Consent Order

Project reference TR050007

Appendix A - Transport General Update Note

Document reference: 18.6.1

Revision: 1

14 November 2023

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
Regulation 5(2)(q)

PROJECT NAME	Hinckley Rail Freight Interchange		
DOCUMENT NUMBER	HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0037 Doc Ref: 18.6.1	BWB REF	NTT 2814
AUTHOR	Malcolm Ash	STATUS	S2
CHECKED	Shirley Dumigan	REVISION	P01
APPROVED	Andy Passmore	DATE	14/11/23

1. INTRODUCTION

HNRFI Examination Deadline Three

- 1.1 The Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on Traffic and Transport for Hinckley Rail Freight Interchange took place on 31 October 2023. It was agreed with the Examining Authority (ExA) at the hearing that a statement be produced by the Applicant following ongoing discussions with the Transport Working Group.
- 1.2 The purpose of this note is to outline progress made against the key issues highlighted by each of the Authorities through their Written Representations submitted at Deadline 1.
- 1.3 A full day workshop took place on the 13 November 2023 at BWB's offices in Birmingham. This was attended by representatives from Leicestershire County Council, Warwickshire County Council, National Highways and their respective consultant team. The following sections provide a short summary of the actions based on the agenda items discussed – due to the timing of this workshop and the Deadline 3 submission date, it has not been possible to formally agree this written note with all parties in attendance in advance of submission. It is intended that further workshops will be held to continue positive engagement, and seek to reach final agreement on as many of the outstanding matters as possible.

2. DATA AVAILABILITY

- 2.1 Items had been raised within NH's Written Representations regarding missing data in connection with modelling outputs.
- 2.2 BWB set out key dates for data drops on the TWG sharepoint site and that modelling information was fully uploaded. It was agreed that with changes in supporting consultant staff, links for all will be recirculated with an amended spreadsheet of formally issued documents, background information/data (e.g. modelling files themselves), and dates these were uploaded.
- 2.3 A circulation list was shared and updates to key staff discussed and agreed.

3. SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY (STS)

- 3.1 A presentation on the updated elements of the Sustainable Transport Strategy was provided – discussions will continue with the TWG in order to refine the final position/mix

of measures to achieve the target mode shift. The following sub-sections summarise the comment/agreements on topic area:

Mode Shift

- 3.2 Revised mode share figures were set out based on MSOAs census, observed mode share at East Midlands Gateway RFI (EMG) and projections from Coventry Gigafactory. Revised targets identify a 65% mode share for single occupancy car trips with revisions to public transport, active travel and car sharing. A combination of these modes, supported through the Travel Plan will be the key targets for mode share at the earliest stages of occupation at the site.
- 3.3 Targets were seen as reasonable, NH shared a document from Coventry Gigafactory which set out the off-site transport provision across all sustainable transport, public transport and highways mitigation. This is with the view to use as a precedent for the the Circular01/22 Vision and Validate approach.
- 3.4 It was highlighted that the proposals for improvements within the STS will be implemented largely on first occupation to embed preferred staff travel habits from Day One and fully supported by the Travel Plan- which has been amended to remove the 5 year limit- it is to be a live document for the lifetime of the site.

Public Transport, Demand Responsive Transport and on-site provision.

- 3.5 Further bus services are to be provided to Nuneaton and were broadly welcomed. The X6 and DRT services remain a core part of the bus measures to the site, these link with rail services and the wider bus network in Hinckley. Implementation of services from the earliest phases was reiterated as an updated commitment.
- 3.6 The Applicant committed to service level agreements for the proposed bus routes highlighting frequency, timings and days of operation.
- 3.7 The position of the public transport hub was discussed in detail and compared with the EMG site provision. The current site plan puts the PT hub on the westbound part of the A47 link road with an interconnecting signal-controlled crossing. Following further debate on the need for a hub to be on the northern side of the A47 Link Road, the resolution from the Applicant was to change the position of the PT hub to sit on the 'site' side of the A47 link (eastbound) with a layby facility retained on the westbound link.
- 3.8 Linkage between the public service bus stops and the more remote units are to be accessed by a shuttle bus funded by the Applicant. This was accepted by the TWG members as being a requirement.

Active Travel

- 3.9 Catchments for both cycling and walking were shared with population centres indicated.
- 3.10 Distances for pedestrians were reported as outside standard commuter journeys. However, it remains a clear opportunity for settlements such as Earl Shilton, Barwell and

parts of Hinckley. LCC maintained that walking is a popular mode choice at greater distances at equivalent sites, such as DPD depot on the A5.

- 3.11 Cycle routes were then highlighted, with several future enhancement options discussed connecting to the population centres where propensity of cycling is likely to be greatest.
- 3.12 LCC highlighted that they expect routes to be designed and costed for provision by the Applicant. Provision to the villages east of the M69 were also debated- LCC consider that provision should be included despite population numbers being lower when compared with the wider cycle catchment area. The DRT has been provided to cater for the travel in this area.
- 3.13 LCC confirmed that it would not accept a funding 'pot' for the delivery of cycle facilities around Hinckley.
- 3.14 It was agreed that the cycle route delivery could be through S278 if wholly within the adopted highway network, BWB will consider further design options of an appropriate route to connect to Hinckley and established cycle routes in the vicinity of the site.

Travel Plan

- 3.15 Modeshift stars standards to be used within the travel plan with initial targets for silver accreditation. Obligation will be placed on future occupiers to achieve accreditation. This was agreed with the authorities.
- 3.16 Details on EV charging, cycle parking (BREEAM excellent) are to be included within the STS and the Travel Plan.
- 3.17 The travel plan now commits to the delivery for a 'travel pack' style website including offers for discounted travel.

4. POST COVID PRTM UPDATE

- 4.1 The members of the TWG all agreed that the modelling through the PRTM and signed off inputs remain appropriate for the purposes of the strategic models.
- 4.2 BWB acknowledged that the ExA has requested an agreed approach to the post Covid TAG update The global factor approach was accepted by the TWG authorities at the time. LCC'S NDI team has provided global factors for the PRTM area as the key deliverable option within the examination period. The global factors are significantly lower than the baseline flows used in the initial modelling (-6.5% AM and -9% PM). As they are projected forward to 2036 the difference increases against the worst case agreed modelling.
- 4.3 LCC prefer localised updates for turning counts based on their written representations specific to the Furnessing inputs. Further comment on this is included in section 8 of this note.
- 4.4 It was agreed that a note be produced following the re-run of the post Covid update providing a risk assessment of the differences. This is in line with the approach taken at the recent London Luton Airport DCO.

5. HGV ROUTING

- 5.1 A run through of the HGV routing was discussed, including indicative positions of ANPR cameras on the local highway network in Warwickshire and Leicestershire. LCC shared their latest HGV Network Management Plan which includes routes that are retained for HGV access. The B4669 and the B4114 remain as designated routes.
- 5.2 Environmental Weight Limits were discussed regarding Sapcote. This is not policy for LCC nor the Leicestershire Constabulary, due to issues with enforcement. The B4669 through Sapcote is also an identified route to the M69 and forms part of LCC's HGV network strategy.
- 5.3 BWB has carried out tracking exercises through Sapcote and further consideration of the interim RSA has been carried out to consider road safety as per recommendations by LCC in their Written Representations.
- 5.4 HGV routing on the A5 was debated. NH were to provide evidence for the 20% uplift in high sided vehicles reviewed within the Padge Hall Farm development assessment.
- 5.5 It was agreed that BWB run the A5 VISSIM model with the HNRFI PRTM flow to address points raised within the written representations from NH. This will add the projected 20% uplift in HGV traffic and Padge Hall Farm flows. NH to provide the scope agreed for a recent application.
- 5.6 Clarity in the HGV routing plan is to be provided around 'undesirable routes' and 'prohibited' routes.
- 5.7 GDPR protocol to be shared by BWB with LCC Highways and Legal team.
- 5.8 Paragraph 5.34 within the HGV routing plan to be updated to reflect the comment within LCC's written representations (paragraph 2.101). This relates to clarity around the private enforcement by the Travel Plan Coordinator and reporting to the LHAs rather than the onus being on the LHAs.
- 5.9 An additional camera position was also requested by Warwickshire between the Fosse Way and Pailton/ Monks Kirby. This was agreed by the Applicant team to be added to the HGV Routing Strategy.

6. CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC

- 6.1 The Construction Traffic Management Plan will be a live document with requirements to update for each phase by the Principal Contractor (Requirement 24).
- 6.2 Spreadsheet of the construction traffic trip generation as referenced in the CTMP is to be shared with the TWG. The routes aligned with the Construction Phasing Gannt chart are to be shared /submitted at Deadline 3.
- 6.3 The Applicant team is to work up Construction Access drawing for National Highways for submission at Deadline 4.

7. INCIDENT MANAGEMENT/EMERGENCY CLOSURE PLAN

- 7.1 Discussions have taken place with NH and their incident management team. An initial routing strategy has been suggested by the Applicant team. National Highways are to carry out an operational review with detailed submission at Deadline 4.

8. FURNESSING DATA

- 8.1 LCC agree that the methodology submitted at DL2 is accepted. However, the background data was questioned, and the request remains for updated turning count data.
- 8.2 The applicant and the TWG agreed that updated 2023 counts are to be carried out at the junctions which feature as part of the mitigation strategy ahead of December. Checks and commentary/ design will be submitted at Deadline 4.

9. NARBOROUGH LEVEL CROSSING

- 9.1 In line with comments provided within the Rule 17 letter from the ExA, further analysis has been carried out to quantify the projected impacts of increased barrier downtimes at Narborough Level Crossing and the associated queuing and delay.
- 9.2 The data has been based on a week of observed traffic at the Level Crossing from 11 October 2023.
- 9.3 A spreadsheet model and explanatory note has been produced which is submitted with the Deadline 3 package. This supports the operational rail impacts spreadsheet with a review of highway impacts within the village of Narborough. It highlights the methodology of projecting to 2036 for queue clearance and the impact of re-routing within the PRTM.
- 9.4 LCC has requested a further survey of queues extending the study area to the B4114 to the northwest to fully understand wider interactions in Narborough.
- 9.5 It was agreed that supplementary images of queuing extents will be added to the note ahead of Deadline 3. Further queue surveys are to be carried out before December.

10. JUNCTION MODELLING

Junction 21 M1/Junction 3 M69

- 10.1 The Applicant team has carried out additional theoretical analysis including adding development traffic on to the 'without development' scenario to understand impacts with little to no diversion of background traffic. This has been carried out in a Linsig model replicating the format of the Lutterworth East Urban Extension model carried out by AECOM for LCC and agreed through S106 sign off in May 2022.
- 10.2 The LUE mitigation scheme of widening the northbound slip and the eastern section of the circulatory carriageway was not included within the PRTM, but the scheme flows were accounted for within the Uncertainty Log.
- 10.3 The subsequent residual impact calculated, in the Applicant's team's view, would not be severe and therefore it was suggested that a sensitivity test with reductions in light vehicles included to account for the modal shift targets for single occupancy car trips.

- 10.4 LCC currently retain their position to agree to disagree upon this approach. NH accept that a scenario test will be useful with the travel plan targets accounted for to enable further consideration at this location.

Gibbett Hill Roundabout

- 10.5 A scenario test with the travel plan targets accounted for will be undertaken.
- 10.6 NH are reviewing the design of the junction with the view to introduce a more comprehensive scheme. A contribution to the scheme is preferred, this is to be developed by NH with an agreed mechanism. WCC are likely to hold funds for the works, as for other schemes.

Cross in Hand

- 10.7 A scenario test with the travel plan targets accounted for will be undertaken.
- 10.8 It was agreed that protective provisions are shared with all three authorities. This is primarily a legal rather than technical point.

M69 Junction 1

- 10.9 A scenario test with the travel plan targets accounted for will be undertaken.
- 10.10 NH and LCC agreed that an update to the MOVA signal timings is reasonable and aligns with requirements of the DPD site off the A5 in 2019. The update will improve optimisation of the signal timings to account for the changes in traffic flow projected.
- 10.11 NH to investigate how this can be secured.
- 10.12 WCC queried the use of the VISSIM and the RRAM Paramics model. This was clarified by the Applicant team that the VISSIM included the MOVA signal timings whilst the Paramics model is for a wider area, is more strategic and operates on fixed signal timings. The VISSIM is therefore a more accurate representation of the junction operation both now and in the future year.

Rugby Rural Area Model

- 10.13 NH confirmed that the RRAM model is the accepted tool for understanding impacts on the local rural area, and advised that the comments within their Written Representations would be formally addressed and 'withdrawn' in their Deadline 3 submission.

AOB

- 10.14 LCC outlined a response which will be submitted at Deadline 3, this will raise points on:
- The agreed trip generation numbers based on the ancillary nature of the lorry park not being adequately secured.

- Updated 3year collision data being additional to the information in the TA and not amalgamated within it requiring cross referencing across the two documents to review 5 years.
 - Queries with PRow plans and tie-in to the railway bridge.
 - The decked parking within the site (addressed through short note in Applicant Deadline 3 submission)
 - Further comments on Narborough Level Crossing and queue lengths.
 - Requirements through the DCO on STS and TP.
 - Research into historic reasons behind the lack of south facing slips at J2 M69, which indicated this was due to a lack of a suitable Business case and not on highway grounds.
 - Confirmation that Plot 100 is adopted.
 - Commentary on maintenance of the rail overbridge. LCC confirm that the County do not adopt such structures.
- 10.15 NH highlighted the Junction 2 lighting position is to be resolved through the design meeting with the BWB team.
- 10.16 It was agreed that a separate design session is to be scheduled within the next fortnight to discuss off-site mitigation and interim Road Safety Audits. This is to be arranged by BWB and include LCC and NH.
- 10.17 WCC raised the need for the Glbbett Hill sensitivity test to be proven for CiL compliance.
- 10.18 The Applicant thanked NH, LCC, WCC for their attendance and commitment to continued positive engagement to progress outstanding matters.
-