

National Highways Response to Questions from the Examining Authority

Title:	National Highways – ExA Questions Response
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:	9 January 2024

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, provided below provides responses to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) which relate to National Highways regarding the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange.

National Highways has submitted a requested in the form of a letter for an extension to provide a full response to the following questions by deadline 5. This will enable us to complete the obtaining and analysis of requested the data to provide a full and informative response for the examining authority.

1.11.8 – Diversionary Routes – M69:

- b) Could NH please provide a schedule setting out how many times, for what period of time and the reason for closure in each case this section of the M69 has been closed in the last three years? Is there any indication that this pattern would not be repeated in the future.

1.11.10 – Diversionary Routes – A5:

- b) Could NH please provide a schedule setting out how many times, for what period of time and the reason for closure in each case this section of the A5 has been closed in the last three years? Is there any indication that this pattern would not be repeated in the future.

The following table below provides National Highways responses to the written questions set by the Examining Authority.

Question Number	Question:	National Highways Response
1.5. – Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) & Explanatory Memorandum		
1.5.13	Schedule 2, Part 1 – Requirement 5 Could NH, LCC, BDC and HBBC confirm that they are content to be the relevant approval bodies as set out in this table, and whether they are content with the drafting or whether they should be considered via the relevant planning authority? If they consider alternative drafting should be utilised, could they please provide it, explaining why they prefer this drafting.	National Highways (NH) are satisfied.
1.11 – Traffic and Transport		
1.11.8	<p>Diversions routes – M69</p> <p>c) Could NH please provide details of the various diversionary routes that are currently utilised in the event of the M69 between junctions 1 and 3 being closed, either for planned works or in an emergency.</p> <p>d) Could NH please provide a schedule setting out how many times, for what period of time and the reason for closure in each case this section of the M69 has been closed in the last three years? Is there any indication that this pattern would not be repeated in the future.</p> <p>e) Does NH envisage any changes to diversionary routes if the Proposed Development were to be constructed? If so, could these be set out?</p> <p>f) Do any of the diversionary routes for nearby strategic highways include the M69? If so, could NH provide details?</p> <p>g) What contingency plans does NH have if the M69 is being used as a diversionary route and the M69 were to become non-operational?</p>	<p>a) NH provided the details of the diversion processes and routings in the information provided at deadline 3 (REP3-138). These are the procedures which are in place to deal with emergency and unplanned closures on the SRN. In most cases traffic will managed to remain on the SRN utilising the most appropriate route, however there are instances when the Local Road Network is utilised.</p> <p>Regarding planned works, the diversion routes are identified and developed as part of the works programme for the scheme implementation. These routes will be consulted on with stakeholders including the County Councils and information shared with our customers including residents and businesses at the earliest opportunity so they can plan accordingly.</p> <p>b) National Highways is in the process of obtaining the data to provide to the Examining Authority, and would request this can be provided at Deadline 5.</p> <p>In relation to the other aspects of this question, there is no indication that closures are due to a pattern and can be for</p>



		<p>a variety of events and reasons. NH will always seek to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the SRN and meeting our Key Performance Indicator (KPI) which requires us to have cleared more than 86% of lane compromising incidents within 60 minutes of the incident occurring.</p> <p>c) With the development proposals linked to the A47 Link Road provision there is potential for diversion routes to be change, but this would require extensive consultation with out stakeholders. At present no such discussions have taken place as the development proposals have not been approved.</p> <p>d) The M69 can be utilised to divert traffic due to incidents on the M1 and M6 to ensure traffic can continue to move efficiently north and south across the Country.</p> <p>e) NH does not have specific contingency plans for this hypothetical eventuality, but will seek to work with key stakeholders including the emergency services and highway authorities to ensure that suitable diversion routes are identified and that the impact can be managed to ensure the network safe and efficient operation whilst instances are resolved and the network re-opened at the earliest opportunity</p>
<p>1.11.9</p>	<p>M69 Closure In the M69 Closure Plan submitted by the Applicant [REP3-043] the Applicant states “when the SRN is temporarily closed, the additional traffic movement from HNRFI will not have a significance to the frequency of such interruptions in the free flow of traffic, or the extent/ duration of consequential inconvenience on the surrounding LRN”. Do the NH, LCC and WCC concur with this view. If not, could they explain why they</p>	<p>The statement made by the applicant is not incorrect. Due to a closure of the M69 all strategic traffic that would have utilised the motorway will be rerouted via alternative routes. NH aim to manage this by ensuring as much traffic continues to utilise the SRN or the identified diversion routes to mitigate and limit delay and inconvenience as much as possible.</p> <p>However, motorists may utilise alternative routes which they know or are being guided on through satellite navigation devices</p>

	hold a differing view and what this may have on the effects of the Proposed Development?	which may encourage them to utilise the LRN. Such traffic would then be added to by traffic wishing to access the development as its preferred routes on the M69 is not available.
1.11.10	<p>Diversiónary routes – A5</p> <p>This question refers to the section of the A5 from its junction with the A4303 at Magna Park to junction 10 of the M42.</p> <p>a) Could NH please provide details of the various diversionary routes that are currently utilised in the event of this section of the A5 being closed, either for planned works or in an emergency.</p> <p>b) Could NH please provide a schedule setting out how many times, for what period of time and the reason for closure in each case this section of the A5 has been closed in the last three years? Is there any indication that this pattern would not be repeated in the future.</p> <p>c) Does NH envisage any changes to these diversionary routes if the Proposed Development were to be constructed? If so, could these be set out?</p> <p>d) Do any of the diversionary routes for nearby strategic highways include this section of the A5? If so, could NH provide details?</p> <p>e)) What contingency plans does NH have if this section of the A5 is being used as a diversionary route and this section of the A5 were to become non-operational?</p>	<p>a) There are not set diversionary plans for the A5 in the same manner as the M69. This is because the A5 is a trunk road, with multiple at grade junctions of varying type along its length. NH therefore works with the relevant authorities in manage incidents on the A5 and implement closures when required alongside the relevant police force.</p> <p>Regarding planned works, the diversion routes are identified and developed as part of the works programme for the scheme implementation. These routes will be consulted on with stakeholders including the County Councils and information shared with our customers, including residents and businesses, at the earliest opportunity so they can plan accordingly.</p> <p>b) National Highways is in the process of obtaining the data to provide to the Examining Authority, and would request this can be provided at Deadline 5.</p> <p>In relation to the other aspects of this question, there is no indication that closures are due to a pattern and can be for a variety of events and reasons. NH will always seek to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the SRN and meet our Key Performance Indicator (KPi) which requires us to have cleared more than 86% of lane compromising incidents within 60 minutes of the incident occurring.</p> <p>c) With the development proposals linked to the A47 Link Road provision there is potential for diversion routes to be change, but this would require extensive consultation with out stakeholders. At present no such discussions have taken</p>

		<p>place as the development proposals have not been approved.</p> <p>d) The A5 can be utilised to divert traffic due to incidents on the M1, M6, M42 and M69. It also can be used to manage traffic due to incidents and closures on the Local Road Network in its function as a Trunk Road.</p> <p>e) NH does not have specific contingency plans, but works with key stakeholders including the emergency services and highway authorities to ensure that suitable diversion routes are identified and that the impact can be managed to ensure the network safe and efficient operation whilst instances are resolved and the network re-opened at the earliest opportunity</p>
1.11.1	<p>Hazardous Substance Zones of Influence Are there any Hazardous Substances Zones of Influence which potentially could impact on the M1 (between junctions 19 and 22), M69 (whole length) and A5 (between the A4303 junction and the M42 junction), and could result in closure of the motorways/ A5?</p>	NH is not aware of any Hazardous Substance Zones of Influence which could impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN based on the locations identified.
1.11.12	<p>Junction of M1 and M69 As set out in the Note of USI3 [EV1-003] the ExA noted the length of the northbound queue on the M69 towards the M1 junction at around 16:00 hours on Thursday 2 November.</p> <p>Could NH and LCC advise the ExA as to whether there were any particular traffic events that may have affected the length of the queue on that occasion? If there were such events, could NH and LCC provide details so that the ExA can appreciate the context of what it saw.</p>	NH advises that there were no events which would have influenced the northbound queue on the M69 towards to the M1 Junction 21 at around 16:00 hours on Thursday 2 November. To our knowledge what was observed were normal traffic conditions.

1.11.13	<p>HGV Routing</p> <p>a) How would the Applicant, NH, LCC and WCC respond to a proposition that there should be either no development or no occupations until the proposed lowering of the height of the carriageway on the A5 under the railway bridge has been completed?</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant, if necessary, on a without prejudice basis, provide a draft Requirement to this effect?</p>	<p>a) NH understand and would support the premise of what is proposed, but would question whether this would be reasonable as the applicant would be subject to the delivery of the scheme by a third party. If this was delayed could have implications on the applicants ability to enact their permission or bring the site into operational use.</p> <p>If the requirement was to be placed upon the applicant to deliver the scheme, we consider this would prevent the development being able to come forward. The reasoning for this is that significant flood alleviation is required to accommodate the scheme which the applicant would not be able to achieve without the ownership of third party land.</p> <p>The Padge Hall Farm is able to deliver the scheme as the flood alleviation measures required can be incorporated within their boundary extends and forms part of their planning permission.</p>
1.11.21	<p>Padge Farm Development</p> <p>It is indicated that carriageway under the railway bridge will be reduced, increasing the maximum height of vehicles that can pass under the bridge to 5.1m (paragraph 3.3 of [REP3-051]). Could NH please provide information on the maximum height of 'normal' HGVs, and indicate what arrangements are there for overheight vehicles on the Strategic Road Network in the vicinity of the Application site?</p>	<p>There is no legislation, standard or regulation which sets the height of HGVs. It is the responsibility of the HGV driver to know the height of their vehicle and whether it s appropriate for the route which the taking between their origin and destination.</p> <p>In addition, there is not legislation which requires the duty to sign low bridges or to seek approval to move high loads. However, it is acknowledged by National Highways that under the Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 highway authorities are required to sign all bridges over highways which have a headroom less than 16'6" (5.03m) at any point over the carriageway and must maintain such signing.</p>



<p>1.11.31</p>	<p>Non-Car mode enhancements Revision 5 of the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan [REP3-022] sets out several proposals and options for enhancement to non-car facilities and modes. While appreciating that further work is to be done on the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Could the Applicant confirm how the committed proposals are to be secured? b) Could the Applicant explain how the potential proposals for postdecision would be evaluated and, where appropriate, how they would be secured. c) Could the Applicant please undertake an analysis on the operation of the A47/ B4668 roundabout in relation to the introduction of a Toucan crossing as shown (Enhancement 1) and what effect it would have on capacity and queuing. d) Could IPs comment on the weight that should be given to these elements, particularly in relation to elements that are not definitely secured? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) NH considers that considerable weight needs to be given to the sustainable transport strategy and supporting travel plans as these are critical methods to mitigate the developments impact and to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014), National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023), and Circular 01/2022 – Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable transport (December 2022). <p>NH considers that without these measures secured and in place at an early stage of the developments implementation, employees will not have the opportunity for modal choice and the development will become car dominated contrary to national planning policy as set out in the documents identified.</p>
----------------	---	---