

Position Statement from National Highways

Title:	National Highways Update – Traffic & Transport
Reference:	TR050007
Applicant:	Tritax Symmetry
Proposal:	Application by Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange
Author:	National Highways (20040073)
Date:	14 November 2023

National Highways (“we”) has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

This note and associated table provide an update on National Highways position in relation to matters around Traffic & Transport which were set out in our written submissions provided at deadline one.

Since our submission, National Highways has been actively engaged with the applicants on several matters to identify a way forward to address the outstanding matters. This has enabled a few of the matters to be resolved as are shown in the following table provided in Annex A.

In addition, National Highways attended a workshop hosted by the applicants on the 13 November 2023, which was also attended by the Local Highway Authorities. This was a productive day in which a number of ways forward were identified.

National Highways remains committed to working with applicants and the Local Highway Authorities to resolve the outstanding matters to ensure that the development can come forward in a sustainable manner.

BLANK PAGE

ANNEX A:

National Highways Update on Outstanding Matters – Traffic & Transport

BLANK PAGE



	Matter Outstanding	Updated Position	Status & Next Steps
Active & Sustainable Transport Strategy			
	<p>National Highways has significant concerns that the proposals for active and sustainable travel have not been fully considered, and what is provided is exceptionally limited. We have therefore concluded it doesn't meet the requirements of the Circular and there is no clear vision or transport strategy for the development proposals.</p> <p>Our concern is that trips to and from the site by employees will be car dominated, having significant impacts upon the operation of the SRN.</p>	<p>National Highways has been working with the applicants on the development of an active & sustainable transport strategy. We have provided impact and case examples to aid the applicants in developing the document.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going:</p> <p>Applicants to provide a draft Active & Sustainable Transport Strategy for consideration by ourselves and the Local Highway Authorities.</p>
Furnessing Methodology			
	<p>Whilst the general approach to applying the Furness process is acceptable, two areas of concern were identified:</p> <p>Where an observed (2018/19) turning movement is zero, or close to zero, the Furness process will not reflect a reassignment of traffic into the corridor where this is indicated as an effect of the scheme by the forecasting scenario outputs from the PRTM v2.2 traffic forecast model. There is a risk of underestimating the demand for a turning movement at an assessed junction.</p> <p>Where a large observed (2018/19) turning movement has had negative growth applied, due to reassignment effects in the PRTM v2.2 forecast outputs, then this could result in the suppression of a flow demand. This might be important to the junction's operational assessment if the suppressed flow demand is (say) a right turn.</p> <p>These two concerns may be addressed by undertaking a sense check using the PRTM reassignment impacts and turn movements; paying particular attention to the magnitude of flows that turn right at an assessed junction. Alternatively, the operational assessments of the junctions could include sensitivity testing of the derived turning proportions.</p>	<p>BWB Consulting Limited (BWB), on behalf of the applicant, has provided an explanation to National Highways on the data sets provided with clarity on the data sets provided to enable us to take a further assessment of the furnessing spreadsheets which have been submitted for our assessment.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going:</p> <p>National Highways to undertake a further review of the furnessing methodology and associated outputs which have been provided by BWB on behalf of the applicant.</p>



	<p>3. For those junctions along the Development’s spine road, the report contains no description of how design reference flows were derived from PRTMv2.2 forecast outputs (which model loads all development trips at a single zone) combined with a ‘first principals’ method of distributing trips generated by the development. It is noted that the design of the spine road is not a specific concern for the SRN, such as the M69, A5, M1 corridors.</p>	<p>National Highways has raised this matter with BWB, on behalf of the applicant during the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going: BWB to look into this matter and provide National Highways and the Local Highway Authorities with a response</p>
	<p>4. There is no traffic forecasting set for the scenario ‘With development generated trips’ demand assigned to a ‘Without HNF1 infrastructure network’. This forecasting set would identify if all the link and junction improvements are necessary. This forecasting set would also assist in determining construction phase timing and sequencing of improvements.</p>	<p>It is understood that all mitigation will be required up front to support the development and the rerouting of traffic across the SRN and LRN. Therefore, no such scenario would be required.</p>	<p>Matter resolved</p>
<p>Strategic modelling methodology and outputs</p>			
	<p>National Highways are not able to fully consider the suitability of the strategic modelling undertaken at present. The justification being that not all parameters which have been used within the PRTM modelling methodology have been agreed with us including the furnishing methodology. This has prevented us being able to fully review and consider the outputs which have been provided to ourselves until our concerns regarding the methodology have been addressed.</p> <p>Furthermore, we have not been able to undertake a full review of all the transport supporting information as a Transport Addendum is awaited which will provide further modelling methodology and outputs based on modelling through Rugby Rural Area Wide Model (RRAM) which is managed and maintained by Warwickshire County Council. This information is crucial for us to fully understand the impacts the development proposals will have on the SRN.</p>	<p>National Highways confirms that the PRTM and RRAM model are the correct tools to be utilised to understand and identify the impact that the development proposals will have upon the operation of the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnishing data in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>

PRTM Review		
<p>AECOM on behalf of National Highways undertook a review of PRTM v2.2 Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Application: Forecasting Modelling version 3 dated the 3rd May 2022 and supporting additional data and plots provided in September 2022. This review was completed on the 29th September 2022, and the technical note is provided in Appendix C</p> <p>National Highways has requested a further review be undertaken by AECOM of the supporting PRTM modelling reports. This review has highlighted that no further assessments or refinement have been undertaken by BWB. Based on this the following matters need to be addressed.</p>	<p>National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnishing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p>1. Whilst the modelled trip distributions appear logical, some of the routing patterns to and from the development do not use highest standard routes to the destination. If traffic can be persuaded to use the most appropriate roads, this would result in an increase in traffic on some parts of the SRN.</p>	<p>National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnishing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p>2. On some roads, particularly the M69 to the north of Hinckley NRFI going up to M1 Junction 21, the increase in traffic flow on the road is less than the assigned traffic from the development. This is a demonstration that development traffic is causing existing traffic to divert away from the preferred route. The roads being used are of a lower standard.</p>	<p>National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnishing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p>3. Assuming that all traffic uses the most appropriate roads may mean that more mitigation would be required to avoid adding to congestion at the most congested junctions.</p>	<p>National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnishing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>

Rugby RAM Modelling			
	Based on our consideration of the RRAM modelling outputs provided, National Highways is unable to agree to the modelling at this moment in time until the following matters are resolved.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved
	1. The claimed reduction of 22 seconds 'mean delay' benefit obtained from across the RRAM network is substantially less than the range of accuracy that can be obtained from an application of the RRAM traffic model. There is a low level of assurance in stating this conclusion.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved
	2. Journey time Route "R1" along the M69 did not validate against observed journey times in the base Year. Without knowing the narrative behind why the RRAM is simulating vehicles as travelling too slowly along the M69, it is difficult to attribute a level of confidence to the tabulated results.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved
	3. Similarly, the difference in journey times along the A5 strategic route ("R7") could be due to a number of modelling parameters and might not be attributable to using an alternative forecasting scenario alone.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved
	4. The locations where journey times increase are described in bullet points at paragraph 3.5. However, the wording in brackets is confusing. The journey times presented in Table 1 are total journey times for the full route lengths.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved

TR050007

Application by Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange



	5. Care needs to be taken when examining journey times along route segments. The average journey speeds were not validated in the Base Year for links with short lengths.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved
	6. RRAM was built by Vectos using S-Paramics microsimulation software. BWB is using VISSIM microsimulation software. The claimed betterment appears to have been achieved by changing software packages.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved
	7. Paragraph 3.8 and Table 2 present journey time changes for the PM one-hour peak. The same comments apply as for paragraph 3.4 and Table 1 above.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved

Development impact upon the SRN		
<p><u>J4 – A5 The Longshoot Junction:</u></p> <p>The assessment of the A5 Longshoot junction is not correct. This is because operationally the A5 Longshoot Junction and A5 Dodwells Junction work as one. Therefore, they must be assessed together. In addition, all three Highway Authorities have agreed a modelling protocol for this junction, which we expect applicants to accord with. A copy of this protocol is provided in Appendix E.</p> <p>In addition, the following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted LINSIG model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Signal Controller not provided so the modelled setup cannot be compared to the on-street setup. – CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the model cannot be checked. – The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked. – The Saturation Flow has been calculated using LinSig’s built in RR67 calculation, however, turn radii have not been entered. 	<p>At the workshop on the 13th November 2023, it was agreed that the A5 the Longshoot and Dodwells Junctions will be assessed in accordance with the modelling protocol provided in Appendix E of National Highways written submissions.</p> <p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p>	<p>Applicant to undertake modelling in accordance with the A5 The Longshoot and Dodwells Modelling Protocol.</p> <p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p><u>J13 - M69 Junction 1</u></p> <p>The following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted VISSIM model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Signal Controller not provided so the modelled setup cannot be compared to the on-street setup. – CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the model cannot be checked. – The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked. – No model has been provided so cannot be checked. 	<p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>



<p><u>J14 - A5 Dodwells Junction</u></p> <p>The assessment of the A5 Dodwells junction is not correct. This is because operationally the A5 Longshoot Junction and A5 Dodwells Junction work as one. Therefore, they must be assessed together. In addition, all three Highway Authorities have agreed a modelling protocol for this junction, which we expect applicants to accord with. A copy of this protocol is provided in Appendix E.</p> <p>In addition, the following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted LINSIG model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signal Controller not provided so the modelled setup cannot be compared to the on-street setup. - CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the model cannot be checked. - The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked. - The Saturation Flow has been calculated using LinSig's built in RR67 calculation, however, some turn radii have not been entered. For example, Lane 10/1. - Some of the Saturation Flows are also quite high (in excess of 2000 PCU/Hr). These may be too high to accurately model behaviour on a roundabout. 	<p>At the workshop on the 13th November 2023, it was agreed that the A5 the Longshoot and Dodwells Junctions will be assessed in accordance with the modelling protocol provided in Appendix E of National Highways written submissions.</p> <p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p> <p>Applicant to undertake modelling in accordance with the A5 The Longshoot and Dodwells Modelling Protocol.</p>
<p><u>Junction 26 – A5 / A426 Gibbet Hill (Existing Layout)</u></p> <p>It has not been possible to verify the roundabout geometry values input into the Existing Layout model without a scaled plan of the junction. This should be provided. Please also supply any traffic flow spreadsheets developed to demonstrate how the traffic flows used in the submitted models have been determined.</p>	<p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>

<p><u>J26 - A5 Gibbet Hill (Proposed Layout)</u></p> <p>The following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted LINSIG model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the models cannot be checked. – The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked. – The Saturation Flows have been entered manually rather than using LinSig's RR67 calculation. The calculations that resulted in these Saturation Flows have not been provided so cannot be checked. – Custom lane lengths have not been entered. This isn't necessary incorrect, however, it would depend on the junction's measurement which have not been provided. 	<p>The proposed layout is not being progressed by National Highways nor any other party. Therefore, this assessment is no longer required.</p>	<p>Matter resolved.</p>
<p><u>Junction 27 – A5 / A4303 / B4027 Coal Pit Lane Roundabout</u></p> <p>Although the proposed layout drawing has been provided within the Transport Assessment, it has not been possible to fully verify the roundabout geometry values input into the Existing and Proposed models due to the extent of the junction shown on the plan. Please can further information be provided to demonstrate how the roundabout geometry has been calculated.</p> <p>National Highways requests the provision of any traffic flow spreadsheets developed to demonstrate how the traffic flows used in the submitted models have been determined.</p>	<p>A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.</p> <p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>

<p><u>Junction 30 – A5 / Higham Lane Roundabout</u></p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment does not summarise the capacity results of this junction. Please clarify its absence from the report and update as necessary.</p> <p>It has not been possible to verify the roundabout geometry values input into the Existing Layout model without a scaled plan of the junction. This should be provided.</p> <p>National Highways requests the provision of any traffic flow spreadsheets developed to demonstrate how the traffic flows used in the submitted models have been determined.</p>	<p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p><u>M69 Junction 1 and M69 Junction 2</u></p> <p>Traffic modelling work was previously submitted for review, with comments provided by National Highways within the formal S42 Consultation Response dated 8 April 2022. This response stated that although VISSIM base model validation for M69 Junction 1 and M69 Junction 2 had been agreed, models assessing the with development scenarios were not provided for review. Although we note that the TA summarises results of these assessment scenarios, will require the accompanying model files to be submitted before impacts at these junctions can be agreed.</p>	<p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p> <p>Discussions on-going regarding the proposed mitigation for M69 Junction 1.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p><u>M1 Junction 21</u></p> <p>From review of the PRTM forecast flows at the junction, TA Table 8-6 shows that the most significant impacts shall be in the PM peak, with an overall increase of 114 vehicles across the junction as a result of the development. 107 of these vehicles however are on the A5460 local road link, with minimal change in demands on the M1 or M69 approaches in either peak period.</p> <p>A merge-diverge assessment has been carried out, which based on these flows demonstrates that the development impacts shall not trigger the requirement for upgrade to the junction's merges or diverges.</p>	<p>The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnishing methodology.</p> <p>National Highways continues to note a considerable concern about the impact at this junction and the lack of mitigation being identified by the applicants at present.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>

Development Mitigation Strategy for the SRN		
<p>The Applicant and their consultants have not discussed the mitigation strategy with National Highways at this present time. It should also be noted that some locations have mitigation identified whilst others, the documents note, mitigation is required but a scheme has not been identified.</p> <p>At present we are unable to agree the development mitigations strategy. This is because we have been awaiting the completion and sign off of the strategic modelling with the Applicant's consultants and other stakeholders to understand the traffic flows at the junction in the base and future year assessments. This data is key to setting the design parameters and design standards and understanding whether any departures from standard are required in accordance with DMRB.</p>	<p>National Highways has actively engaged with applicants to identify the range of mitigation being identified to resolve the development impact.</p> <p>There is agreement that this consists of a variety of tools including sustainable and active travel interventions as well as physical mitigation schemes where required. Inclusion of these will be required through the requirements.</p>	Discussions on-going
<u>Deliverability of the Railhead and capacity on the Nuneaton & Leicester Railway Line</u>		
<p>National Highways is concerned whether the railhead on the Nuneaton & Leicester Railway Line is deliverable as we have not seen the assessments nor agreement from Network Rail.</p> <p>We also have concerns that the acceptance of the scheme would limit future capacity on the line to the detriment of passenger services which are crucial as a viable alternative to car based strategic trips between Birmingham, Nuneaton, Hinckley and Leicester.</p>		<p>Matter outstanding:</p> <p>National Highways awaits the submissions from Network Rail on this matter as part of Deadline 3.</p>
<u>M69 Junction 2 – Slips</u>		
<p>National Highways has no objection to the principle of the slip roads and their implementation however there are still the following aspects which need to be confirmed, some of which are also linked to environmental matters as well:</p>	<p>A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.</p>	Discussions on-going

	Agreement of the strategic modelling to agree and identify traffic flow to enable the agreement of the design parameters and required standards or where departures are required in accordance with DMRB	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Discussions on-going
	Departure from Standard submitted for approval in principle in regard to the removal of the hard shoulder through M69 J2 to create all lane running for the inclusion and provision of the new slips.	Approval in Principle has been given by SES at National Highways for this departure.	Matter resolved.
	Understanding of the suitability of the bridge structures to accommodate the additional traffic and the introduction of the slips, access arrangements and improvements to the circulatory.	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Discussions on-going
	Agreement of the WCHAR and RSA Stage 1 Briefs and CVs when National Highways is satisfied with the design of the slips and access arrangements for M69 Junction 2	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Discussions on-going
	<u>Landscaping:</u> National Highways notes that the introduction of the northbound on-slip and southbound off-slip will impact the landscape in the vicinity of M69 Junction 2. This is mainly due to the removal of substantial and well-established vegetation on the embankments adjacent to the M69. Landscaping has an important role of limiting the impact on the landscape of the visibility of the SRN whilst also having a role in mitigating noise impact of the network.	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Discussions on-going
	<u>Lighting / Lighting Impact:</u> the landscape impact assessments need to consider the potential visual impact that the lighting of M69 Junction 2 will have on the landscape. Whilst the existing circulatory of the junction is lit, the need to accord with the requirements of standards set out in DRMB, may require the new proposed slips, and existing slips to be lit and for this to extend onto the M69 mainline in the interests of highway safety. It should be noted that the existing M69 mainline and existing slips are not lit.	Discussions have taken place between the applicants' consultants and the asset management for lighting and an agreement in principle has been reached regarding to the requirement and extents of lighting.	Discussions on-going

<p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Based on our assessment we would also note that the proposed works at M69 Junction 2, also need to be considered through relevant biodiversity assessments. National Highways also requires details of biodiversity off-setting for the loss of habitats which potentially exist on the verges of the M69 at junction 2.</p>	<p>A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p><u>Drainage:</u> National Highways needs to fully consider the full drainage strategy for the development proposals and how it relates to the SRN. However we are unable to fully consider the drainage implications of the proposals related to the SRN until further clarity is provided in the feasibility and development of the highway schemes notable for M69 Junction 2.</p>	<p>A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p><u>HGV Routing Strategy & Enforcement</u></p>		
<p>National Highways requires further clarity on the proposed HGV routing strategy and notably around its enforcement. At present National Highways cannot agree to this as who is responsible for the strategy and enforcement is not clear. We also require additional information for the potential location of any associated infrastructure and who would be responsible for its maintenance.</p>	<p>National Highways has been working with the applicant's consultants, BWB, to identify the HGV Routing Strategy and suitable routes.</p> <p>National Highways also accepts that none of the infrastructure will be on its network.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going</p>
<p><u>Construction Management Plan</u></p>		
<p>National Highways requires further clarity on the construction management plan due to how it will function with the implementation of the development proposals and the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>In addition, the routing of construction traffic also needs to be fully considered during the phasing of the development and implementation of the associated infrastructure. As works to M69 Junction 2 may warrant for this junction to be closed for significant periods to traffic movements whilst works should the development be approved are implemented.</p>	<p>National Highways has been working with the applicant's consultants, BWB, to identify the HGV Routing Strategy and suitable routes.</p> <p>We are also awaiting the publication of the GANNT Chart which has been requested for Deadline 3.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going:</p>

TR050007

Application by Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange



<u>Emergency Response Plan</u>			
	<p>It was noted that during the examination by the ExA about providing details and modelling on what would happen should the M69 be closed.</p>	<p>National Highways and the applicants have discussed the matter. An emergency plan with routes identified is being prepared by the applicants.</p> <p>National Highways has submitted a note which sets out our current operational plans for the M69.</p>	<p>Discussions on-going:</p>