

## Warwickshire County Council Comments on Applicants Response to Written Representations

Name/Organisation	Summary of Representation	Applicant Response
<b>Strategic Model Outputs</b>		
Warwickshire County Council	<p>Following this modelling work, the outputs from the PTRM model runs were not reviewed and agreed by the Highway Authorities, for two principal reasons 1) because the planning situation within the Area of Influence continued to change and new committed development and network changes needed to be scoped in, or at least assessed as a sensitivity assessment to understand the potential changes that could occur, such an instance is the Padge Hall Farm development; and 2) the approach taken to furnessing in order to derive turning flows at junctions was not agreed with the Highway Authorities, the PRTM model provides link flows and not junction turningflows.</p>	<p>See detailed Deadline 1 submission Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033).</p> <p>The Highways Position Statement does not address this matter.</p> <p>The network changes as a result of the Padge Hall Farm committed development will be material to the network and the assignment of background HGV traffic and those from the HNRFI development. Therefore sensitivity assessment for junctions between and including A5/Longshoot/Dodwells through to M69 jct 1 (both directions) should be assessed to ensure additional traffic impact can be accommodated.</p> <p>Further to a meeting with the applicant team on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2023, this sensitivity assessment modelling is due to be undertaken using the National Highways VISSIM model. It will be scoped with the three Highway Authorities prior to being commissioned.</p> <p>On the matter raised concerning furnessing, the applicant has agreed to obtain and review current traffic survey data for those junctions identified to require mitigation works. This is in order to assess whether the 2017-19 data utilised is sufficiently representative of current turning proportions.</p>

Whilst the Padge Hall Farm application was submitted in 2021, and has not yet been granted whilst the section 106 agreements are being finalised, the resolutions to grant were made at Rugby Borough Council's and Hinckley and Bosworth's Borough Council Planning Committees in March 2023 and June 2023 respectively. In the run up to this period, the highway mitigation proposals were in the public domain (August 2022).

The access and mitigation proposals include:

- Introduction of a signalised site access junction onto the A5 (between A5/A47 Dodwells junction and Nutts Lane railway bridge which passes over the A5) that does not provide for a right turn out of the site access
- Changes to the A5/A47 Dodwells junction to facilitate u-turning traffic on the A5 east arm from the Padge Hall Farm site
- Lowering of the carriageway beneath the A5 Nutts Lane railway bridge to allow high sided HGVs to use this section of the A5 (A47 to M69 junction 1)

The Highway Authorities requested that these proposals be modelled as a sensitivity test given the impact they could have on the assignment choices for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange HGVs, particularly high sided HGVs, and therefore the potential impacts that could occur should high sided HGVs assign to/from the site via the M69 junction 1 and A5/Dodwells roundabout rather than to/from the

To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3

[See above – sensitivity modelling to be undertaken.](#)

	<p>site via the A47/Dodwells roundabout.</p> <p>This modelling assessment has not been carried out, and therefore the impacts are unknown.</p>	
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>Further to this issue being raised, a Technical Note has been submitted to the Examining Authority. This sets out the furnessing methodology, and whilst helpful with the detail provided, there are some outstanding queries that need to be addressed, for instance the treatment of turning movements which were observed to be zero or close to zero. It is understood that this matter has been raised by National Highways with the applicant team and will be discussed further following the submission of documents required for Deadline 1 set out in the Timetable within the Rule 8 letter.</p> <p>As a consequence of these two issues, the PRTM outputs have not been agreed by the Highway Authorities.</p>	<p>See detailed Deadline 1 submission Appendix A Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033).</p> <p>Highways Position Statement and Furnessing TN does not deal with the detailed issues raised. See above, recent traffic data to be used to assess suitability of older traffic data used.</p>

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>WCC has requested that in order to assess the impact of the proposal on critical parts of the Strategic Road Network that interface with both Warwickshire and Leicestershire networks, the following junctions should be assessed in the National Highways VISSIM models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· A5/A426 Gibbet Hill (NB. the A426 is part of the Major Road Network)</li><li>· A5 Longshoot-Dodwells</li><li>· M69 Junction 1</li></ul>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3. Attempts to discuss ahead of the ISH2 were made by the applicant but a date where all parties of the TWG were available was not identified.</p> <p>The applicant has agreed to undertake a sensitivity modelling assessment of the A5/Longshoot/Dodwells and M69 junction1 junctions to take account of the network changes as a result of Padge Hall Farm and the HNRFI impacts. This will provide the three Highway Authorities with an assessment within VISSIM which is the preferred model for this part of the Strategic Highway Network.</p> <p>Further discussions are ongoing with respect to the modelling required for A5/A426 Gibbet Hill. WCC's position is that this is still required, whilst appreciating that National Highways are the lead authority for this junction and will be responsible for the delivery of an improvement required to accommodate current commitments.</p>
------------------------------------	---	--

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p><b>A5/A426 Gibbet Hill (NB. the A426 is part of the Major Road Network)</b></p> <p>This junction was to be signalised to mitigate the impacts of DIRFT III in accordance with their planning consent, but they have not yet triggered for this improvement. However it is understood that the promoter of that development site is in discussions with National Highways.</p> <p>This junction was also to be signalised to mitigate the impacts of Symmetry/Magna Park as required as part of that planning consent. However, as part of their discussions with National Highways with regard to the detail around the scheme design, the promoter of Magna Park South used the VISSIM model to assess development impact given the junction interactions with M6 junction 1 and the A426 corridor on the Major Road Network (MRN) in North Rugby, and we would expect the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange promoter to use the same approach to assess the impact of development traffic.</p> <p>National Highways considered the junction signalisations proposals and recognised that due to these committed developments and other Local Plan led growth in the area, the proposed signalisation scheme will not accommodate the cumulative impact of various consented developments. As a</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p> <p><a href="#">See above.</a></p>
------------------------------------	--	---

consequence the traffic signal scheme assessed as part of the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Transportation Assessment is no longer proposed.

National Highways is currently working to identify a scheme that can accommodate the forecast growth, and secure contributions, so that the network, travelling public and businesses do not have to suffer the queues and delays associated with multiple improvement schemes each of which would have roadworks and diversions associated with them if several different schemes are delivered in succession. Furthermore, the queues and delays forecast in the LinSig assessment for the proposed traffic signal junction (with the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange traffic) are significantly lower than those in the VISSIM model (without the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange traffic).

Whilst BWB has noted in its response to point 19 in HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XXRP- TR-0031 Rev P01 that there is not full correspondence between the 18 entry points identified within the VISSIM model and the traffic flows derived from PRTM, Warwickshire County Council consider that it is still important for the VISSIM to be used to assess development impact for the reasons set out below:

National Highways does not have a committed scheme at this junction as highlighted previously and therefore the baseline position for the modelling must be the existing non-signalised junction arrangement (i.e., a Do Nothing)

Blocking back towards M6 Junction 1 along the A426 and platooning of traffic between M6 Junction 1 and the Gibbet Hill junction can only be considered within the VISSIM model.

Whilst Warwickshire County Council understands that flow correspondence may only exist across 8 loading points, we do not necessarily consider this to be a limitation which invalidates the use of the VISSIM model.

For example, if the loading points within the VISSIM model which correspond to the PRTM data include the A5 (2), the A426 north and south (2) the M6 (2) and Gibbet Lane (1) then there is sufficient network correspondence to assign the development trips across the study area from the PRTM outputs.

Warwickshire County Council does not require the interaction on the minor roads (i.e., Lutterworth Road or Arthur James Drive) to be considered in terms of changes in development flows and, as such, impacts at these locations can still be considered, particularly

	<p>in the context of the effects arising from delivery of any proposed mitigation at Gibbet Hill.</p> <p>Therefore for these reasons Warwickshire County Council does not accept the modelling or proposed mitigation at this location, and requires the VISSIM modelling to be carried out.</p>	
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p><b>A5/A47 The Longshoot/A47 Dodwells</b></p> <p>The Transportation Assessment identifies a 3% impact at the A5/The Longshoot junction within the PRTM modelling, and conclude that this is not considered a sufficient impact to warrant further assessment.</p> <p>This is a critical junction on the Strategic Road Network, and its efficient operation is critical to the local road network. Any additional queues and delays will impact on the network, and in order to consider the safety and efficiency of the network that modelling has been requested.</p> <p>All developments that are shown to be assigning traffic through the A5/Longshoot/Dodwells junctions, including Padge Hall Farm, and several other large sustainable urban extensions (within Warwickshire and Leicestershire) have been required to use the National Highways VISSIM model and we would</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p> <p><a href="#">See above.</a></p>



	<p>expect the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange promoter to use the same approach for consistency.</p> <p>Therefore Warwickshire County Council does not accept the position that the impacts on this part of the network are acceptable and that further assessment is required.</p>	
	<p>Whilst National Highways are responsible for this part of the network, the B4109 Hinckley Road connects at this junction, and the junction is a controlling factor on vehicle route choice from other routes such as the B4455 Fosse Way, and the A426 further east.</p> <p>The modelling carried out within the Rugby Rural Area Model includes this junction, and from the information below, the modelling has highlighted some notable impact on the Hinckley Road approach which we require to see further assessment of by way of modelling in the VISSIM model.</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p> <p>The applicant is to provide further information in regard to the Hinckley Road approach to M69 junction 1 as modelled in the reference and the do-something with mitigation ie. MOVA recalibrated.</p>
Warwickshire County Council	<p>Results of the Rugby Rural Area Model confirm no instances of impact on the rural road network east of the M69 and north of the M6.</p>	<p>See response to WCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 5)</p> <p>Noted, HGV Routing Strategy supported with measures such as ANPR cameras and enforcement measures within Travel Plan will support compliance with the documents</p>
Warwickshire County Council	<p>There are notable impacts at M69 junction 1. Given the nature and location of this junction Warwickshire County Council would wish to defer to National Highways as to whether this junction operates effectively but reserves the right to provide further commentary on the M69 junction 1 VISSIM model, in</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p> <p>See above</p>

	<p>particular we would expect that modelling to be able to demonstrate that there are no impacts observed on the Hinckley Road approach to junction 1 or that mitigation can be provided.</p>	
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>It is considered prudent to also raise concerns with regards the journey time impact on R7 S6 SB which indicates that there may be impacts which occur on the A5 SB approach to the Cross-in-Hands roundabout during the PM peak. Further analysis of this impact is required to determine if it is the Crossin-Hands roundabout or the Mere Lane junction which is the root cause of the delay.</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p> <p>To be reviewed following confirmation of furnished turning flows modelled in the ARCADY capacity assessments and compared with the RRAM data</p>
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>There are also issues which are apparent on the approach to the A46 Binley Woods junction east of Coventry which could be related to the operation of the junction, since that has also indicated an increase in queueing between scenarios.</p>	<p>This junction is remote and impacts from the HNRFI are minimal. However, this will be reviewed and discussed with the TWG ahead of Deadline 3.</p> <p>RRAM shows reduction not increase so issue resolved</p>

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>Adjustments were made to reassign HGV trips identified on the local roads within the PRTM such that they were completed within the microsimulation modelling via alternative routes. PRTM appears to indicate around 60 HGVs across the modelled period could interact with the local road network and Warwickshire County Council believe these have been omitted from the RRAM assessment by being assigned to other OD pairs. Confirmation on this point, and how the HGV movements identified in PRTM will be managed, is requested</p>	<p>This will be reviewed and discussed with the TWG ahead of Deadline 3.</p> <p>Following discussions with the applicant it has been agreed that additional ANPR cameras will be provided to ensure that there is a mechanism by which any HGVs generated by the development which use the 'undesirable' routes, as will be set out in the HGV Route Management Strategy, can be monitored and enforced. The HGV Route Management Strategy document is to be updated (presumably Deadline 4) and WCC will provide comments following that.</p>
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>The queueing analysis indicates potential issues around the Cross-in-Hands junction which is confirmed in the RRAM journey time analysis. We require further evidence that the network will function acceptably in this area.</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3</p> <p>See above</p>

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>The analysis presented by BWB concludes that the VISSIM modelling, coupled with the fact that it operates under dynamic signal control, is sufficient evidence to conclude that M69 junction 1 will operate effectively. We would require National Highways to be satisfied with this point and, additionally Warwickshire County Council wish to see the supplementary modelling in detail so that we can be confident that the impact on Hinckley Road will not be severe.</p>	<p>Noted. The signal timing amendments, through our analysis, mitigate the development impacts.</p> <p><a href="#">See above</a></p>
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>We consider that BWB should provide further detailed evidence, most likely by way of statistical analysis (e.g., Confidence Intervals) to demonstrate that the queueing observed at the Binley Woods junction will not impact Warwickshire County Council's local road network.</p>	<p>This junction is remote and impacts from the HNRFI are minimal. However, this will be reviewed and discussed with the TWG ahead of Deadline 3.</p> <p><a href="#">See above, issue resolved</a></p>

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>In order to check the validity of the input turning flow data used in the ARCADY assessments for this junction, we require evidence to be submitted in the form of a spreadsheet which includes a comparison of RRAM modelled and demand turning flows for the scenarios listed below inclusive of the A5 calibration adjustment at the Smockington junction (assuming 1 HGVS = 2.3 PCUs) with turning flows from the corresponding scenarios in the ARCADY analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>2018 Base</li><li>2031 Reference Case</li><li>2031 HNRFI Development + HGVS Routing Restrictions + Mitigation</li></ul> <p>The spreadsheet should highlight the absolute difference between the RRAM and ARCADY turning flows and use the GEH measure to assess the significance of these differences.</p>	<p>To be discussed with TWG members ahead of Deadline 3.</p> <p><a href="#">See above</a></p>
------------------------------------	---	---

<b>Mitigation</b>		
Warwickshire County Council	Given the significant scale of the proposed development, we would encourage the applicant to set up and administer a forum akin to the Magna Park Lutterworth Community Liaison Group (MPCLG) and a Transport Review Group as set up for the DIRFT III/Rugby SUE (Houlton). Both forums were established in order to address concerns by local communities and those experiencing impacts as a result of the developments.	This can be considered as the HGV Routing Strategy and Travel Plan evolves.  Inclusion in those documents would be welcome
Warwickshire County Council	The DCO does not include a S278 agreement. This would be Warwickshire delivery mechanism.	The Applicant is awaiting detailed comment from WCC in respect of Work No. 16 which needs to be dealt with between all three highway authorities. The Applicant is continuing to attempt to engage with WCC as the Applicant requires suitable protective provisions within the Order to deal with the relevant highway works, which is consistent with the approach taken with the other local highway authorities.  WCC and the Applicant met on 7 <sup>th</sup> November to discuss the protective provisions within the dDCO, and comments have been provided at Deadline 3.
Warwickshire County Council	It would be Warwickshire County Council's preference that s106 contributions should only be secured towards schemes/infrastructure already identified, any new schemes/infrastructure required to mitigate the proposal should be funded and delivered via a s278 agreement to avoid the cost burden falling on the public purse.	

Warwickshire County Council	It is not clear if all of the mitigation proposed is within the highway boundary or on land within the applicant's control. Given the issues highlighted above with modelling, there is insufficient information to judge whether such mitigation is appropriate.	Land for highway works is contained within the Order Limits, the majority of the land is within the highway boundary, where land for highway works is not within the highway boundary compulsory Acquisition powers are being sought through the dDCO, these would be enacted should the applicant not achieve voluntary agreement with the landowner. The Applicant confirms that all land required for highway works within Warwickshire County Council's administrative area is within existing highway land and therefore that the inclusion of appropriate provisions dealing with the highway works (akin to a s278 agreement) within the Order is sufficient. The Applicant is seeking to engage with WCC on the inclusion of such provisions.  See above, and confirmation that all land for Works No. 16 are all within the extent of Highway Maintained at Public Expense is noted.
<b>HGV Routing</b>		
Warwickshire County Council	The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange proposal includes for a HGV Route Management Strategy, similar in form to that implemented for the Redditch Eastern Gateway development. However there are elements of the document submitted that do not make reference to Warwickshire's network and the roads/villages, and therefore the detail contained within this document would require further revision for Warwickshire County Council to agree to it.	See response to WCC LIR for further detail (document reference 18.4) (response number 9)  Noted, and understand following meeting 13 <sup>th</sup> November 2023 that the HGV Routing Strategy is to be updated.

<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>The measures included within the Framework Travel Plan and Sustainable Transport Strategy are generally in accordance with the type of measures that would be expected. However these documents do not provide any detail as to how employees living in Warwickshire, albeit the northern part of the County most likely, would realistically be able to access the site using sustainable travel modes. Further the baseline percentage mode share applied within the assessment is based on 2011 census data and whilst using the local middle super output areas (010 &amp; 012) for Blaby, the percentage for walking is noted as being high (11%) given the rural location of the proposal. This matter was raised at the Transport Working Group meetings.</p>	<p>Sustainable transport Strategy is to be updated with further detail ahead of Deadline3.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>Public Transport most viable option from Warwickshire.</p> <p>Nuneaton and Bedworth, Bulkington, Wolvey, Rugby, Atherstone and Tamworth, the public transport provision needs to provide suitable bus services that connect the site with those population centres.</p>	<p>Sustainable transport Strategy (document reference: 6.2.8.1, APP-153) is to be updated with further detail ahead of Deadline 3.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p>	<p>???</p>	