

Hinckley_ISH6_24 Jan_PT3

Created on: 2024-01-24 14:31:24

Project Length: 01:16:36

File Name: Hinckley_ISH6_24 Jan_PT3

File Length: 01:16:36

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:23 - 00:00:17:01

You know, everybody. It's 2:00, so the hearing is resumed. Um, can I just confirm that the recording is working and that the, um. Oh, yes.

00:00:21:19 - 00:00:35:25

That'll look goody goody. Good on the on the on the video as well. So you can catch it up later and see what's why everybody's laughing. Uh, before we move on, was there anything else sort of a, um, administration or point of view before we move on to the next topic?

00:00:37:13 - 00:01:10:23

Seeing nothing and lying down. I don't think so. We'll keep going and we'll now move on to the next item on the agenda, which was road safety audits. Um, there were a number of comments in the road safety audits about low and very low traffic flows when the auditors visited the site. Um, it's not clear from the road safety audits as to whether the auditors were provided with the information on the lack of traffic flows flowing from the proposed development. In other words, the transport assessment and the various linked flow indicators, so their assessment was undertaken with that information included.

00:01:10:25 - 00:01:19:11

I appreciate the difference between the geometric, geometric and volume. But again, if just wondering whether they had that information, it's just simply not clear.

00:01:19:17 - 00:01:23:16

Sam Carter representing the applicant. Yes. They had the transport assessment. Good.

00:01:23:20 - 00:01:38:10

Thank you. Um, next is where we are in relation to safety. Was that all the safe and audits have now been completed and various amendments have made as a result. Um, is that a fair summation? And where do you next hope to go in that process?

00:01:38:12 - 00:02:13:28

Sam Carter representing the applicant. Uh, we've completed interim road safety audits. Uh, off essentially off our own back. Um, the reasons for that, uh, as alluded to by Mr. Sam and others earlier that, uh, we haven't been able to get briefs signed off by the highway authorities as yet, but we've done these so that we have advance notice of safety issues. We've amended the design where we've said that we've amended the design and submitted that deadline for there are items in there that we believe, uh, are detailed design matters.

00:02:14:00 - 00:02:50:08

And we've said that in the response as well. Um, as of where we are now, uh, my I have submitted formal briefs with the latest design information, which was part of the deadline for submission, um, to, uh, both Leicestershire and National Highways, although this week uh, that that was National highways had come back, as I mentioned earlier, saying that they are not able to sign off that briefing

this time. Um, my discussions with Leicestershire have been that they would be, uh, willing to do so, but I'll let them respond formally on whether that is the case or not.

00:02:51:11 - 00:02:58:21

Okay. Yes. National highways. You don't need to repeat things you said this morning. So it's more. There's more. Anything else you wish to.

00:03:00:06 - 00:03:11:20

Thank you. Sir. Mr.. Mr.. Chairman of national highways now, I think I outlined where we were with the road safety audits this morning, and that remains the case on all four junctions where we're regarding to add any mitigation junctions.

00:03:13:24 - 00:03:15:09

Um. So.

00:03:16:25 - 00:03:49:08

Kenton County Council. Yes, we've seen the results of the interim road safety audits, which have raised some concerns. Um, we have our own fundamental highway safety concerns, and we do over the revised submissions, not least of which was the the scheme through SAP code. Um, we received the briefs for the road safety Audit one at 1012 yesterday morning, and therefore we haven't had an opportunity to review them.

00:03:57:21 - 00:04:13:28

Okay, fine. Um, I'm just one thing I'd like to ask the applicant is whether he's considered any of the proposed alterations and responses to the road safety audit should have been submitted as a potential change to the application. Um, particularly those affected may consider them and make representations.

00:04:22:09 - 00:04:38:23

Uh, some counsel representing the applicant. Uh, it's not our belief that any of the changes made for substantial are in line with the sorts of things that you would normally say at this stage in terms of road safety audits and, um, not substantial changes to the development.

00:04:52:02 - 00:05:07:24

Clarifying that as a result of those changes, there were no changes to the description of the works. Well, clearly there was there were some deletions from some of the work, some of the mitigation, in fact, that deletions much changes as an addition.

00:05:11:05 - 00:05:11:20

Yes.

00:05:13:14 - 00:05:21:21

I'm just about to say I think Mr. Carter's. Yeah, I've got this, Mr. Carter, which I've taken on board, but I'm just making the point that at least as much changes as in addition.

00:05:26:08 - 00:05:27:06

Mr. Coulson.

00:05:29:10 - 00:05:35:23

Thank you, sir. Just a couple of brief points, and I'm aware that the RFA.

00:05:36:25 - 00:06:06:27

Looks at whether the mitigation is the danger, the mitigation. It doesn't look at the question of whether the route itself is safe and suitable with and without the mitigation. I'm also aware that, um. Rg1 one nine, table C3. Refers to pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian desire lines. Detail the pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian movement in the vicinity of the scheme.

00:06:07:16 - 00:06:36:21

And I'm not sure that I have seen evidence that, um, the blind and the pedestrian movements, um, have been elucidated, for example, in fact, out of the obvious example, where do people actually walk in the center of that coat? Um, and in that regard, um, and I put it in big letters because I was told in, in big letters, no one had asked people in Fat Coat how they behave.

00:06:38:08 - 00:06:45:17

Um, but then I wanted to make two specific points, quite simple in terms of para three, three,

00:06:47:03 - 00:06:48:16

three, three. The response fit.

00:06:49:27 - 00:06:50:12

Um.

00:06:51:00 - 00:07:21:04

When I looked at it, my, my, I consider that the issue of a putting a zebra crossing with limited visibility. Um, I could see people acting in a dangerous way because they thought they could go out onto a pedestrian crossing where at the moment they don't. So that that was something I noticed. But the other point is regarding the bus stop and the narrow footway and the road safety audit. It's kind of compartmentalised.

00:07:21:26 - 00:07:53:06

And the one thing that it doesn't do is join up the. And there may be other issues, um, relating to bits of it that we may, I may comment on in, in redress. But I particularly want to emphasize that fact, because the most obvious fact about moving that bus stop is that it is not next to the center of the village. So the most obvious thing that will happen is that people get off the bus to go to the co-op, and they will have to walk down the very narrow pathway that if the problem.

00:07:54:00 - 00:08:23:18

And that seems to me far more, uh, of a safety issue than delays caused by traffic behind that bus stop. That seems to me a very fundamental. And it's not in the road safety audit, but it is something that, you know, people, in fact, are very aware of. So I, I put that in I'm aware that a road safety audit person goes in one day, doesn't do it every day, like the people who are there likely do. Thank you sir.

00:08:24:04 - 00:08:33:26

Okay, fine. Thank you. Do any of the highway authorities have any particular comments they want to make on where we are with the road safety audits, other than anything else at this point?

00:08:39:25 - 00:08:43:03

We'll cover it in our deadline for response.

00:08:43:24 - 00:09:15:25

Okay. That's fine. Okay. There's nothing else on that one. So. Right. When I pulled together all our discussions from from today so far, um, a couple of airs which haven't featured yet featured in our discussions. First is the effect of Covid 19 on the overall traffic model and the comments made today. My overall reading is there's been a reduction in peak travel, but not taking into peak times and not taking heavy volumes.

00:09:16:07 - 00:09:21:11

Do people think that's a fair summary summation? Uh, the applicant.

00:09:24:09 - 00:10:04:24

Welcome on behalf of the applicant. Um, the Covid 19 report that we submitted at, um, deadline for its, uh, an overview of the effects, the global factor, which we agreed in the previous um, hearing was, was applied. And, um, the, uh, the results were reported in the deadline for submission. Um, in terms of overall, um, reductions that the peak hours, uh, and that I understand is the general, um, traffic across the 24 hour period reduces, um, as a result of, um, the post Covid effect on, on the network.

00:10:04:27 - 00:10:30:20

I think what we have done since then is the, um, the updates to the, the localised modelling, um, which is obviously looked at the mitigation junctions, um, and reevaluated those with 2023 um traffic flows. So that modeling that we've done of mitigation in the 2023 update provides, um, a good summary of the localised impacts on the junctions that we affect.

00:10:36:08 - 00:10:41:12

To have authorities start with the national highways and work our way through it. That's all right.

00:10:42:10 - 00:10:58:02

Thank you, sir, Mr. Benson. National highways. Um, we have reviewed the Covid update. Uh, note that was provided at deadline. Sorry. Um, we have no comments to make on it. We're quite comfortable with the approach that has been taken and the outcomes that were in that note.

00:11:01:10 - 00:11:02:04

Should County council.

00:11:03:24 - 00:11:39:00

Recommend county council? Um, we responded to the examining authority's question in this regard. And Leicestershire County Council have permanent automatic traffic counters throughout the county, and in them are in the vicinity of Hinckley and so on. Um, a summary of the data presented was that automatic traffic counter data did not, um, align with the data presented by the applicant.

00:11:39:16 - 00:12:10:14

So the applicant presented, um, a reduction of 5.8% overall in the MPG. The LQ local data based on the permanent automatic traffic counters confirms the contrary 3.9% increase in the PMP. The applicant stated a 1.1% reduction, and the Leicestershire local data confirms a much smaller 1.4% reduction.

00:12:11:04 - 00:12:18:01

So there does appear to be some discrepancy between the globally applied figures and the local data.

00:12:21:20 - 00:12:23:14

Learning implications of that.

00:12:26:16 - 00:12:29:06

Because if he. Otherwise it's a bit of a. So what?

00:12:31:19 - 00:13:01:20

In terms of, well, I guess the assumptions by the applicant team are that actually that there is a reduction in the AMP background traffic and that's not borne out in the local data. Um, where we have had those 20, 23 new surveys commissioned, I guess the the flows will be picked up there. But those

surveys have only been commissioned on some of the off site junctions that where mitigation is proposed, not all of the offsite junctions.

00:13:05:17 - 00:13:07:12

Knock it off. Could you hang on a second?

00:13:16:11 - 00:14:00:09

Yep. Welcome. The applicant. Um, the the reporting that we had from, um, from the Leicestershire Network data intelligence team, um, was to understand the overall global factor. It was an for information only the RTM outputs that we recorded in in as the for the submission we use um throughout um and as agreed in the 13th of November with the local authorities, we had, uh, looked at those, uh, specific junctions that were subject to mitigation and agreed that we would we would survey those to understand how those flows had changed and how that would affect the overall modelling in in that regard.

00:14:01:05 - 00:14:01:21

Thank you.

00:14:02:08 - 00:14:32:07

Um, sorry. So can I just correct something that happened? Um, it was corrected in our deadline for respondents. So Mr. Ash said, um, that the LCC modelling team had supplied the data to the applicant team, and that is not actually the case. Um, the the data was provided by, by a consultant commissioned through the framework managed by the LCC team, but not supplied directly by that team.

00:14:34:12 - 00:14:55:02

The passport on behalf of the applicant. Just wanted to confirm that the the, um, global factor, um, was produced to inform yourself, sir, um, as you requested, that at the last hearing and it hasn't been used in any of our assessment work. It was just as a for information for yourself.

00:15:07:13 - 00:15:10:21

Does Warwickshire County Council have any comment they wish to make?

00:15:11:28 - 00:15:42:20

Thank you, Sir Nicholas Jauncey, Warwickshire County Council. I think we had some initial concerns with the global factor adjustment method initially, but I think in view of how things have progressed, I don't think we can, um, sort of reraise that at that particular issue. We were sort of questioning the differences between the more urban and rural parts of the network. But looking at the spread of ATC camp sites, that that does appear to be a sort of moderately reasonable coverage in terms of different road types.

00:15:43:06 - 00:16:16:10

Um, I think our main concerns that have not directly related to the to that adjustment per se, were going back to the furnishing in terms of some specific movements at various junctions, that of interest to us. One of those is Gibbet Hill, and I think that the Aam labelling in the finessing spreadsheet seemed to differ from the the ARM labeling in the in the results in the table. That was where the results were presented. So I think that that that would that is the main focus of our uh sort of interrogation and desire for further discussions with the applicant at the moment.

00:16:17:06 - 00:16:48:01

Thank you. Yeah, because that was going to be. What I was going though. The other next one was the question of whether managers were should be out of scope or included within the traffic analysis, because you've seen the questions and the responses that have been seen to that, because obviously

they were taken out of scope from the traffic generation. Uh, I think it was originally and I think most correspondents think they should be in.

00:16:49:04 - 00:16:50:19

What's your response to that?

00:16:53:27 - 00:17:13:20

But which is the mark for the applicant? Could you repeat the question in the in the scope of the analysis, the traffic assessment, the essentially managers scoped out of the traffic generation figures? Um, most uh, uh correspondents thought that they should be included.

00:17:17:12 - 00:17:25:19

And your response to those? To that the same with what your response was to they should be included.

00:17:28:01 - 00:17:58:22

That's because they were. It would appear they were excluded because they were scoped out. And and the correspondents are saying they should have been excluded in. And that'll obviously have an effect on the overall traffic generations to and from the site. I figure I've seen a figure of 10% put as I think one of the authorities, which one think is Leicestershire. But but but it's um yeah, yeah. Apology the the management the 10% change in in terms of management, um work. Um, uh, sorry.

00:17:58:28 - 00:18:35:25

Um, the change in, um, uh, worker profiles. Yeah, yeah. Um, we went back to the, um, the, uh, consultant team that works on behalf of NDC to get that right. Um, to. They produced the original trip generation trip distribution. I say yeah, and their response was that they had used, um, similar sites. So for example, Delft and Magna Park to distribute the um, trips across that network, which would allow for an element of management, um, usage management, occupational types.

00:18:38:03 - 00:18:51:27

Could you make sure that's confirmed in writing and could you demonstrate that? How could you provide us with a demonstration that they were included? Um, because otherwise it does put a question mark and circa 10% of the traffic.

00:18:54:01 - 00:19:09:15

The amount of traffic to and from the site. It's more more about the distribution of the traffic than the trip generation. So the trip generation accounts for all and it accounts for the the land usage rather than the occupation types.

00:19:17:21 - 00:19:18:06

Thank.

00:19:37:19 - 00:19:38:04

Come on.

00:19:44:22 - 00:19:49:22

Yeah. I'll come. Come to that. That come there later. Okay.

00:19:52:01 - 00:20:09:18

Absolutely. As promised. Um, I'm going to give the opportunity for parties to make any comments as to where they where it believes we are particularly hiding, if there are any outstanding matters and whether it considers that's likely to be agreement will be achieved before the end of the examination. Can we start with Warwickshire, please?

00:20:15:11 - 00:20:15:29

Thank you, sir.

00:20:18:24 - 00:20:35:21

I think our summary of things is that we we need to, um, more fully understand how the furnaces sing has resulted in specific traffic movements that particularly Gibbet Hill and Coal Pit Lane. Um,

00:20:37:19 - 00:20:48:25

we have some, um, concerns about the pit lane junction in terms of the, the, the interim safety audit that we've I think we've highlighted those.

00:20:52:18 - 00:20:53:03

Um.

00:20:54:22 - 00:21:10:12

You've got to provide some of the background information on the Redditch Gateway planning agreements and how that was. Facilitated. So that's a that's an action for us. Um, there are a few points we'd like to make about sustainable transport, and.

00:21:10:25 - 00:21:13:16

We'll come to that. We're coming to those in a minutes. Thank you. Yeah.

00:21:14:14 - 00:21:24:07

Um, there are some outstanding points of disagreement we've got with the draft DCO. Um, I think that's probably.

00:21:26:20 - 00:21:31:18

Unless Joe has anything further to add. I think those are the key points in terms of the modeling.

00:21:33:27 - 00:21:52:05

Yeah, I'd agree with that in terms of modelling that the only other point of that whole agenda item would be to say that there are outstanding items that, unless change would prove the road safety audit comments, unless they were addressed, we would be recommending an objection to any other LPA. Yeah.

00:21:52:17 - 00:21:56:13

Thank you. Uh, Leicestershire County Council.

00:21:58:14 - 00:22:41:03

This is Reconciliation County Council. Um, I'm afraid so. If the question is, do we think we'll have reached agreement on traffic modeling in the next seven weeks? And I'm afraid the answer is no. Um, in respect of the strategic modeling, we. Can haven't had questions answered in respect of trip generation comparability from previous submissions. Um, you've heard today a number of the models we don't have or have only just received a deadline for, and we won't have had an opportunity to necessarily review all of those and, um, come to a positive conclusion.

00:22:42:03 - 00:23:12:12

We still don't agree with the approach in respect of M1 junction 21 and the displacement of traffic onto the local road networks and the lack of mitigation at that junction. And indeed as, as, um, tortuous, um, just mentioned that junction specific models will need to be updated following the findings of the road safety audits and then design revisions and changes to geometric inputs. Um, and.

00:23:13:15 - 00:23:16:17

Best thing in the world. I'm afraid we're rapidly running out of time.

00:23:19:11 - 00:23:21:29

The National Highways. Want to make a comment at this point?

00:23:23:00 - 00:24:05:07

Thank you sir. Mr. Benson, on behalf of National Highways, in terms of ourselves, there's some further work still required to do versus our agreeing to finessing methodology and trying to resolve that matter so we can actively review the modeling outputs and come to a conclusion. Our outstanding concerns still focus on the A5 longitude to wells we didn't really touch upon today about the operation of the longitude to Wells Junction. However, I am going to propose that if it's acceptable as part of deadline, five National Highways in a position statement around that junction, we are working on a number of appeals in that location, have taken some survey work, and which we have a slide deck that shows visualizations of how the junction is operating.

00:24:05:09 - 00:24:45:03

I think that might be useful to yourselves and all parties. We propose to provide that deadline. Five and same as Leicestershire County Council. We have still concerns regarding M1 junction 21, M65 junction three and the lack of mitigation there and the observed concerns around the way the networks are operating and the impact on the local road network. As well as that M60 nine junction one. Just in terms of looking around that and understanding what the development impacts are in terms of the existing observed, um, potential coming back onto the M 69 main line on the northbound slip as well, which we've commented upon earlier.

00:24:45:28 - 00:25:00:18

And and Gibbet Hill just agreeing the approach that we need to take. Um regarding that Onley um road safety audits remain a key aspect for National Highways to get to. We want to get there, but it's all predicated on resolving the.

00:25:01:22 - 00:25:08:26

Thank you very much. Um, having heard those. Is there anything the applicant wants to say? Sort of final before we move on to Brent?

00:25:10:03 - 00:25:45:15

Get your passport on behalf of the applicant, and we accept that the authorities have some more work to to undertake. We've undertaken some considerable additional work to address the comments that have been raised. Um, and as we, uh, as we alluded to at the previous hearing and as expected, not materially changed the main conclusion of the mitigation presented in the transport assessment significantly. Um, this is this is what's our assertion? Um, and it's been a common theme during the process where detailed technical amendments have been requested that don't actually change the assessment or the conclusions.

00:25:45:21 - 00:25:58:27

Uh, we believe we continue to demonstrate a reasonable and proportionate approach to addressing the impact associated with the proposed development, and look forward to working with the authorities over the next few weeks to to resolve as much as possible. Okay.

00:26:00:00 - 00:26:27:09

Thank you. Okay. That's the I appreciate other people do want to speak, but we need to move on the agenda. And as you as we've previously said, this is predominantly a written procedure. You feel something is missing that you want to put in inputs. Please put it in writing. Following today's

hearing. The next deadline is on the ninth of, um, February. Thank you. Okay, so I want to move on to item four, which is rail connectivity. Uh.

00:26:31:00 - 00:26:33:17

And there's a movement in the movement from the applicant team.

00:26:35:09 - 00:26:52:05

Um, I suspect this will probably be quite quick because we haven't got Network Rail here, which is, as I said, we're very disappointed about. Um, but the first item is, uh, rail approvals. And really an update is where you, uh, applicant can provide us with a matter of progressed any further since our meeting in October.

00:26:56:10 - 00:27:29:22

Uh, yes. Uh, sorry again. And, um, apologies for, uh, Network Rail. Obviously, I've worked very closely with the individuals there, and, uh, it's with considerable regret that, uh, the as you know, the circumstances are that, uh, couldn't attend today, uh, because otherwise they would, but they will they are actively working on all the things that you need. I was there was nobody else who could help, but it's because of the nature of putting so many different skills together. Uh, you could have a cast of thousands. Uh, so I, I appreciate it's not it's not a criticism of you.

00:27:29:24 - 00:27:37:05

It's a criticism of Network Rail. It's just that, you know, they. I'm afraid they're not here, that they gotta get criticized.

00:27:39:05 - 00:28:11:29

A. As far as the approvals and the statement of common ground. Um, we I think that was sent through last night, uh, to the point where we've got it with Network Rail's final position, and we just need to to sign it off and get that document signed. But essentially that's settled. Uh, so as far as rail approvals are concerned, um. Prior to the DCO being uh, consented granted that um, but Network Rail are content with all the positions that they've set out in both their airport and station to common ground.

00:28:13:07 - 00:28:45:12

So that, um. The next one I'd like you may want to not be able to answer this. Um, and you'll see in the updated report, there are two reasons why there are significant, quote unquote, there are significant undesirable challenges to locating a passenger station on the opposite side. As from first these rates, the running gradient is said to be too steep to accommodate platforms. You may not know the answer to this, um, to an unacceptable an acceptable level without major works to reprofiled the gradients on either side to create an alternate level platform.

00:28:46:02 - 00:28:58:25

Um, as you will be aware, we've asked Network Rail to indicate what the maximum gradient for a passenger station is. Can I just finish? Because obviously in your your response to the.

00:29:00:21 - 00:29:16:27

Previous one was said that the rail terminal design includes a virtually flat, no more than 1 to 500 gradings in accordance with Network Rail standards. So you're wondering what was different, whether there was a difference between. That freight in this context and passengers.

00:29:18:16 - 00:29:52:03

I appreciate that. One of the two reasons I'm just. No, I understand completely your questioning. And there will be a formal written answer from from Network Rail. But the there is a difference between freight and passengers. And there's also more work has been done by Network Rail to see what what could be achieved and what can't be achieved. Because if you set an engineering problem to an

engineering business, it will find a solution. But it's a combination of cost and land implications that go on from that. And essentially the passenger station might be put on that line.

00:29:52:05 - 00:30:24:22

It would need to move the track track. I've got that bit. And indeed and then in doing that, you're going into the area which has got the funding for our scheme, and the net result of that is that you're then having to acquire further land, which would include the farmer's land beyond, which then brings into whether that is then viable. But the issues are really around the impacts that trying to put a station on that side with the gradient and at the, um, cutting would mean a huge amount of work in removing Earth and everything else.

00:30:24:24 - 00:30:56:11

There's nothing asking does which would prevent that happening should somebody decide they wanted to do it in the future. But they would obviously have to look at that in the context of its impact on the common biodiversity, the band, the bridleway and everything else. That's in part of our application. And obviously it isn't part of our application. And in terms of the viability, and Network Rail have said in their report that they don't see the catchment area generating enough airbox. And of course, if you don't generate enough air box, then department Transport has to fund rail.

00:30:56:21 - 00:31:29:07

Oh yeah. No, I guess just as you would appreciate from the first set of questions, they, they their initial report didn't seem to include the those who'd be working at this site in that in their analysis. And it didn't it didn't express that in that. And they did go back and then they had to go back and look at it. Yeah. But if that was the reason why we had this, correct. Yes. Okay, fine. The last thing on here was on the Red cross, which obviously we discussed this morning, which you've indicated they're going to provide the data on closures.

00:31:29:09 - 00:32:07:08

Yeah. Or minimum times or more accurately openings and minimum times. Yeah. I think I think in one of the sheets that we've provided you with that minimum time that is actually experienced in that survey is there. But we will get the actual data. Yeah. Thank you very much. So we're now going to move on to item five which is sustainable travel connections. Right. Um, I'd like to now. Start with a general update on active travel options and how they have been integrated into the proposed development, and particularly would find it useful if the applicant could update us with the changes that are made to the proposed development since we last together in November.

00:32:09:22 - 00:32:44:22

Request on behalf of the applicant. Um, I just wanted to set the scene really with, uh. Um, the development seeks to address two, uh, key government transport policy. Transport policy objectives. Firstly, transferring freight from road to rail. Secondly, encouraging sustainable travel. To achieve the first objective that proposed development must be. First and foremost, uh, it must provide excellent access to both the strategic road and rail networks. This has dictated its location and as with other rfis, the requirement to be close to rail and strategic highways can limit the scope to encourage active travel trips.

00:32:45:00 - 00:33:19:13

These specific locational requirements are recognised by circular 01202, and in keeping with a similar large employment shift based sites, the proposed Development Sustainable Transport strategy primarily focuses on encouraging modal shift to bus and car sharing. Uh, walking is considered to be um. It is unlikely to contribute to modal shift at the proposed development. Uh, existing pedestrian routes are available. However, the low population within walking distance and the rural nature of these routes are significant barriers to encouraging such trips, particularly for shift workers.

00:33:19:15 - 00:33:51:20

On the other hand, cycling could contribute to the modal shift. It would be attractive to a staff originating from the existing and planned areas, such as Farwell and oh oh Shilton to the north and west Hinckley, Burbage and north Nuneaton to the south. Balance must be struck between providing improvements to encourage you to encourage active travel, whilst recognising the inherent locational barriers to such travel, and improvements need to be both effective and viable. Consequently, the proposed development Active travel improvements are focused on encouraging cycle trips to and from the most attractive areas.

00:33:51:24 - 00:34:39:07

So since the last hearing, uh, the sustainable transport strategy has been revisited. Um, we've, um, assessed potential cycling enhancements and identified those considered viable options to encourage, encourage modal shift. This has been based on simple, uh, initial assessment of um, um, the distance from the site and the populations within, within, within various areas. Um, and that has led to the identification of a number of enhancements, nine in, in total, I think, um, and then we've assessed those, um, in terms of their, their effectiveness at achieving modal shift, um, and their viability in terms of um, uh, sort of cost and delivery and suchlike.

00:34:39:09 - 00:35:22:03

And we've, we've identified from that, uh, three measures, uh, to, to improve, uh, connection to, to Barwell, um, with um, from the, across the A47. Uh, and then a second measure, um, which became um, initially from our assessment and then uh, supplemented uh, by comments from the to uh transport working group to provide a footway cycleway, uh along SAP Cote road, um down to uh, to the strategic um, uh, cycle routes within within Hinckley at Westminster Road, I think Winchester Road.

00:35:24:24 - 00:35:28:19

And so that's where we've we've got to fine. But just from an active travel perspective.

00:35:28:21 - 00:35:44:10

Yeah. Well we'll come to the yes, we're going to come to the other side, which is a slightly different question. Um, uh, can I go through the I'll go through the all the local authority's going to start with those. And most likely to be affected will start with Leicestershire.

00:35:45:10 - 00:36:24:11

Thank you, sir. Rebecca Henderson, county council. Um, the question, I think so is where have we got to since last November? Well, unfortunately, um, from Leicestershire's perspective, I think we've we've gone backwards. Um, so, um, you'll remember when we we last met, we hadn't provided the one 500 readable drawings of the link road provision. Um, we've subsequently received those. And contrary to, I think, what we were, um, understood to believe before that there was continuous footway cycle, um, provision on both sides of the link road.

00:36:24:24 - 00:37:12:17

Um, we see those choices confirm that is indeed not the case. And there is no continuous footway cycleway on both sides of the link road. Indeed, there's a need for pedestrians and cyclists to, um, continuously cross to navigate it. Um, your note from our deadline for submission that we, um, dedicated an entire day to the applicant team in November, along with our colleagues at Warwickshire and National Highways, and highlighted a number of walking and cycling, um, proposals that we thought the development should, proportionately, as a consequence of its scale and the number of employees, um, and its location.

00:37:12:20 - 00:37:51:23

Um, I thought the applicant team should consider delivering, and there was a commitment at that time to reviewing them. Um, we met again in December, and that commitment, um, was was almost rolled back on. And as if you've heard that they've looked at potentially looked at nine options and and we're

now down to three. One of which is, um, a short section of surfacing in Barwell. Um, the other is a toucan crossing on the A47, which we've seen no modelling assessment and don't understand what the impact of that is on traffic flows.

00:37:51:26 - 00:38:25:03

Um, and the adjacent roundabout junction. Nor have we seen a road safety audit of those proposals. Um, and then, uh, the, the third option, uh, or third option that's put forward for delivery is, um, new cycle lane on the beef. Four six. Six nine. Um, second row. Burbage. We obviously welcome that, but then it connected. We haven't seen how it actually will connect to the link road, because it appears to Peter out at Smithy um, Lane.

00:38:25:05 - 00:38:58:10

And again, as we've said, there's no continuous provision for linking to on the link road. Obviously emissions to this of all of the eastern villages where no footway cycleway provision is provided to Southcott, Stoney, Stanton and again to um lack of provision into to Hinkley. Um for well elms the all of which we suggested possible um. Proposals um, which appear to have been discounted.

00:38:58:27 - 00:39:27:08

And we also notice from the submission there is a reliance on the applicant team on the use of public rights of way to access the site. Um, you'll note that the public rights of way strategy doesn't include for any commitments to improve these public rights of way in terms of surfacing, lighting, etc.. So it's unclear how, um, they're going to be attractive to use for employees of this site. Working shift patterns.

00:39:35:25 - 00:40:00:23

Yeah. Um, I also just noted that Mr. Passmore said that walking was not an option. So I do wonder then, if the site is in the correct location. And also if walking is not an option and the focus is purely on cycling. We're also unclear how the percentage reduction assumptions have been calculated. The only realistic option is cycling.

00:40:01:23 - 00:40:06:15

When they've come to car sharing as well. Thank you. Um.

00:40:08:06 - 00:40:10:24

Lady District Council. Do you have any comments you want to make on this?

00:40:14:08 - 00:40:14:23

Um.

00:40:15:22 - 00:40:50:16

No. At this stage, sir. As you know, Labour doesn't have functions as a local highway authority, but is concerned about traffic impacts. Um, we're reviewing the the updated sustainable transport strategy. Um, I think our overarching concern, um, is that it isn't clear enough on the, the actual obligations that bite in that strategy, given that the DCI requirement requires compliance with that. I think it's important that that document is clear on exactly what the obligations are.

00:40:51:06 - 00:40:55:00

And that's a sort of overarching concern that maybe has at this stage. So thank.

00:40:55:02 - 00:40:57:18

You. Um, Hinckley and Bosworth.

00:40:59:03 - 00:41:38:01

I think for most of them, you're just a few points to make a strategic level about active travel. And first of all, um, Mr. Pottermore mentioned that the site is almost isolated, not close to an urban area. I think in this particular case, the whole of Hinckley and within easy cycling distance of the site. So we're in a unique position. We've got a 10,000 employees very close to an existing urban area in even though the sites are not mainly in Hinckley's planning area, it's very close in terms of its communities and all the new development that's going into those places.

00:41:38:04 - 00:42:08:19

So it's very important to have those connections. And the second point is that even though some of these sites are not walkable from, let's say, for example, a very close walk catchment, um, it has been shown elsewhere, for example, East Midlands Gateway, that with enough investment and proper investment in facilities, you can get good motion. But it does need an investment. You can't get by with one bus an hour or um, a very poor cost sharing scheme. With the right investment, you can actually make and make a bit of a difference.

00:42:09:03 - 00:42:45:04

Um, we also think that there's many. So these points are right to the overarching sensible transfer strategy in the travel plan, which are the kind of principles from the documents. And we have worries about the vagueness and lack of definite delivery of, of elements of those plans. And we think it'd be a good idea for the next deliverable to sort of set out very clearly what is actually delivered under each of those plans, so that when the condition is, is, is, um, is used, you can see what what needs to be delivered. Um, we also think that there's issues with the targets and objectives in both those documents.

00:42:45:18 - 00:43:19:06

They're not they're reasonably vague objectives and targets. There's no real way of seeing if they're going to be achieved or not. And we think that in some cases they're not really appropriate. They're not that they afford to, um, too high a baseline and too low emphasis on change. And we can count on that in line five. Um, and really the final point is just about the, a bit like the HGV strategy, what the final section responsibility is, because in this case we have a site wide travel plan with individual travel plans.

00:43:19:15 - 00:43:38:12

But in our view that the final responsibility in section should be for the site wide, um, landowner, because they're the ones responsible for things like buses, walking, cycling connections and all those issues. So, so um, yeah, those are, those are the main points we'd like to make, and we'll make them. Thank you very.

00:43:38:14 - 00:43:49:03

Much. Um, I'm now going to go to the other stakeholders. I think they're like maybe shorter can start with national highways. Obviously there's like this list directly affected by this.

00:43:49:15 - 00:44:51:00

But thank you, sir. Mr. Benson, on behalf of the National Highways, we could just take a holistic view. At the moment from national national Highways perspective, we have kept reiterating the importance of sustainable transport modes as a way of reducing a car dependency. However, it is an area that we feel we haven't made much progress and at the moment we feel that we're falling foul of the national planning policy framework and the circular, notably in regards to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 114 of the use of the new uh framework, which says in assessing sites that may be allocated for development plans or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be or have been taken up, given the type of development in its location, and that be safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, and if it is referred to the circular in paragraph 19 of the new circular 011 of 2022, I just I'll quote this element of of the paragraph and the whole paragraph.

00:44:51:02 - 00:45:24:08

Moreover, the company will need to be satisfied that all reasonable options to deliver modal shift promote walking, wheeling and cycling, public transport and shared travel to assist in reducing car dependency and locate development in areas high accessibility by sustainable transport modes have not have been exhausted. Before considering options for new connections to the SRN, now just count the last section about before considering options. Two new connections to the SRN, because we believe they're needed in this case, but it's more about sustainable transport is a key element of enabling the site to come forward.

00:45:25:03 - 00:45:59:11

Our concerns at the moment that we are not at sustainable transport seems to be a slight afterthought, and the focus seems to be on highways mitigation as a lead. I attended those meetings alongside Leicestershire County Council and Warwickshire County Council with colleagues from National Highways and our consultants. And. There have been certain elements where it's not been perceived. Perhaps it's important, especially in the first phases of the role, that sustainable and active transport can have engaged people into the site. For example, we talked about a bus stop being located on the side of the link road where people will have to walk across the dual carriageway to get into the site.

00:45:59:13 - 00:46:46:05

Now hopefully we had good discussions and I think the applicants have taken away that to look forward. But this is a huge stumbling block because I think this is a real area where the applicants could do some innovative matters and to mitigate their development and and resolve some of the mitigation concerns. We've worked closely with what we've been down to recently, see what people have done, and it is achievable. Um, in terms of that, they have a site travel framework, each site has a travel plan, and they've also been working with the bus companies to get bus companies in building linkages, building connectivity to new housing estates and existing communities, as well with and even promoting a new footway uh bridge link over the A5 to get to the site between the new would be massive site that's currently in development.

00:46:46:07 - 00:46:59:10

So there's opportunities and I think we just need to be explored more and perhaps, you know, some innovation taking forward in this place. But I'll leave that there for National highways position. My cancer.

00:46:59:14 - 00:47:02:20

Thank you. Um, and Warwickshire County Council.

00:47:05:07 - 00:47:36:20

Thank you sir. Joanne Archer for Warwickshire County Council. Yeah. Reiterate everything that everyone has already said. Really sustainable travel. It can't be ignored. It needs to be, um, at the forefront of what's trying to be delivered. Um, I think there are opportunities that people could walk from the outer areas of Hinckley to get to the site. And cycling, I think, is an area where with some. Limited amount of investment, you get probably more payback in terms of mode shift.

00:47:40:14 - 00:47:41:19

Thank you very much.

00:47:43:06 - 00:47:53:11

Okay, finally, Mr. Quick, this is not this is more a general discussion over several months and work with the applicant.

00:47:53:16 - 00:48:12:29

I just wanted to add one point, which is that if the event cycle provision to the villages, it is not a standstill position that it's been prevented. It is because the traffic will go up, the cycling will actually go down. We don't do anything.

00:48:22:02 - 00:48:22:17

So

00:48:24:01 - 00:48:27:08

there's that, and there's somebody else at the back who wanted to say something was there.

00:48:30:14 - 00:48:36:04

I will see, I said right over this side. Sorry. Let's just wait for the microphone, please.

00:48:43:03 - 00:48:47:20

As David David Howard Stoney Stanton Action Group I. I had my hand up for the.

00:48:47:22 - 00:48:48:20

Previous item.

00:48:48:22 - 00:49:09:29

The, uh, rail connectivity. So I, um, I yeah, you've we've we've gone beyond that. I'm afraid I can put out a written warning or you can put. Please put it in writing. Yeah. Thank you, thank you, thank you. Right. Um. The applicant, it's sort of a final. There are a couple of other things I want to say beyond this, but just the way. Yeah. And you pass.

00:49:10:03 - 00:49:42:03

On behalf of the applicant. I think we've been there's been, uh, some good points made by by, uh, others. Um, but we've been conflating active travel with sustainable travel. Um, we are in, in keeping with East Midlands Gateway, which has been very successful with public transport being very successful with car sharing, which are two modes of sustainable travel that are that lend themselves perfectly to large shift based um developments.

00:49:42:14 - 00:50:22:08

The strategy has always focused on that. What we have done in the in the recent version of the sustainable transport strategy is beef. That up from the outset, uh, recognizing that some of these things need to be in place whilst recruitment is, is going on. So we need to have clarity on that. Um, previously we probably were looking at more of an, an increase, um, in terms of East Midlands Gateway. Um, there has been a lot of investment in walking and cycling and yet there and we've used this in the single transport strategy, only want less than 1% of people are walking and less than 1% of people are cycling.

00:50:22:10 - 00:51:00:11

And that's a classic example of where investment has gone into facilities that not are not effective and have proven now to be unviable. We're trying to ensure that we put the investment in the areas that will achieve modal shift, and we totally concur that cycling is an option for people, particularly from Barwell, from old Shilton, from the new shows in that area, from Hinckley and Burbage there are existing routes. There is a um a route to the, to the, to the on the A47 linking with Barwell Lane down into to Hinckley.

00:51:00:24 - 00:51:32:21

Um, we are enhancing those. Are there others that you know? We've gone through a an evidence based approach to look at each of those options to see what whether they give the the benefit that we need or not. So, you know, this isn't. But we haven't done the work. It's just we've come up with

conclusions that the authorities aren't, uh, don't agree with. Um, in terms of walking. We are not saying that people cannot walk to the site.

00:51:32:23 - 00:52:08:10

We're saying that those there will be very small levels of people who walk to the site, and investment in trying to encourage more people to walk to the site will not be effective use of that investment, because there are inherent barriers to people walking to large distribution sites like this. And the location of this site is dictated by its proximity to the strategic highway network and the rail network. To achieve the government's freight road of transferring um freight from road to rail.

00:52:11:12 - 00:52:13:12

Yeah. All right. Um.

00:52:15:08 - 00:52:49:21

One thing I do got a detail on is relates to the outwards bridge. Rail. New rail crossing. Leicestershire County Council has indicated its present unable to confirm whether be able to take responsibility for it. My reading of the comment is that's because it wants detailed design materials and a safety assessment. But the default response from Leicester is that it believes the applicant applicant has undertaken the design. Can the applicant help as to whether this has been forwarded to the county council for review? Um, and I'm sure you understand this, it will need to be something will need to be resolved sooner rather than later.

00:53:00:24 - 00:53:01:09

That's.

00:53:06:01 - 00:53:37:29

Big part. And I was thinking of the wrong bridge. That's not helpful. Um, your friends are outwards. Yeah. And the pedestrian bridge. Yeah. Um, in terms of the design and specification, um, it will, as per any bridge with Network Rail's involvement, um, they would need to go through a process of the design, uh, dealing with it. Network rail are still confused as to why ramps are required, to be honest. Um, the standard. Because that's the only method. That is, it provides access for all.

00:53:38:01 - 00:54:07:03

Bluntly, yes, I know, I understand that completely. It's just given the location and the route, the the pro going through the edge of the golf course, and it's a bit further down. And the, uh, pro has actually got restrictions with a kissing gate and high walls to stop people other than pedestrians using it. So that's that's a sort of we'll never change anything because we can't change something else in the future. Yeah, yeah, I understand that. So don't please don't try to defend network rails. Not what you're here for past,

00:54:08:21 - 00:54:44:21

um, but in terms of the design and and the work, we've had some further work from, uh, Network Rail just received yesterday from, from them in terms of what they're expecting, uh, in terms of how the bridges would work and who take responsibility for what. And so that's not to provide it hasn't been provided yet because we need to go through that's only been provided to me yesterday as part of a collection of material. We need to now go through the bridge, the bridge design people and then feed that in and give that to to Lester. But my query in terms of the development consent order is that the principle of losing that level crossing is agreed with Network Rail.

00:54:44:23 - 00:55:27:28

The principle of putting in a bridge is a frequent Network Rail and in all processes where that comes then down to the detail that that is beyond necessarily not necessarily. Because if we need to know that can be delivered and who's going to maintain it thereafter. Right. And, and the point that Leicester

is making is that without seeing the design, how they've been asked to look after it, well, they're not ready to take on something which they're not happy with design. I think in simple terms, my understanding, um, unless I, I guess correct me, is that Network Rail would only structure and it's only the, um, surfacing that would be the responsibility of the.

00:55:28:23 - 00:55:29:14

It is a pro

00:55:31:06 - 00:55:34:15

and Leicester Leicestershire county, I have to say.

00:55:34:26 - 00:56:06:02

Mrs. Brackins, Leicestershire County Council so over a protracted period of time we have been asking for the applicant to facilitate a meeting between Leicestershire County Council and Network Rail, and unfortunately that still hasn't happened in respect of the Outwood footbridge. You quite rightly say we can't commit to maintaining something we've never seen, and Mr. Baker has just said was there might be a meeting arranged with the Network Rail designers. The bridge is not yet designed, hence we haven't seen a design.

00:56:06:05 - 00:56:13:15

So we can't commit to maintain a surface of a bridge when we don't know what it is.

00:56:16:24 - 00:56:25:18

I don't recognize some of what has been said, so we'll take this away. Deal with it. Thank you. And for D5? Absolutely.

00:56:27:24 - 00:56:30:13

And obviously if you can try to maintain contact.

00:56:31:00 - 00:56:36:18

Absolutely. And we can afford the emails back to the applicant team if they can't find them.

00:56:37:24 - 00:56:38:09

Uh.

00:56:40:01 - 00:57:02:24

Moving on to the next item, which is cycling. I put it on a specific heading on the agenda. Um. I just wanting to check who was raised earlier by Leicestershire. Um. About. The cycleway adjacent to the A47 link road have been designed and received by the applicant and understood. I need to try and sort out the lack of crossings and make sure it's continuous.

00:57:04:14 - 00:57:44:21

Some help from the applicant. Um, we can certainly look at it in conjunction with LCC. It's, uh, it's my view, though, that we provide a connection at the north end onto the B4 6.68. We have a segregated left turn lane on that roundabout, which precludes, uh, or makes more difficult crossings and what have you on the eastern side of the link road, so that crossing the B4 six, six, eight is made from the western side of the link road. The development is on the eastern side of the link road, and we provide, uh, a number of crossing points along that link, two of which are controlled, one of which is uncontrolled, and several others, uh, roundabout splitters.

00:57:44:23 - 00:57:58:02

So it's, uh, it's our view that the provision is there and does not require several, several crossing points and all that sort of thing. But we're happy to, uh, discuss it in, in more detail if needs be.

00:57:59:17 - 00:58:01:03

Message of council. Mrs..

00:58:01:05 - 00:58:18:18

Reconciliation council. Council. Um, we've raised this matter a number of times with the design team, and, um, the response we've received is the extension of the red line boundary. Um, preclude the delivery of footway cycleway on both sides of the link road?

00:58:21:05 - 00:58:34:03

There's also the need to widen the bridge over the railway on the A47, which is also running out the design of that continuous route.

00:58:35:03 - 00:59:29:15

Some of the applicant. There's a footway cycleway on both sides of the A47 Link Road bridge as it stands. So that's not true. And um, the there is there's plenty of red line along the link road for a connection or for a footway cycleway on both sides North of the railway bridge is on this one side as that is a it's a rural section of the link road. It's in keeping with several other very similar routes. The A47 nearby as it goes past Earl Shilton, the bypass um, which we designed and which has a footway cycleway on it, one side of it, uh, and we, we believe in terms of design lines and what have you, as I've just discussed, that, um, our provision is, is adequate, um, on the B4 six, six, eight itself, there is only a, an existing footway cycleway on the northern side.

00:59:29:17 - 00:59:30:17

So we connect to that.

00:59:32:09 - 00:59:33:16

Got points, I think.

00:59:33:22 - 01:00:00:01

Just one more point about the red line boundary. I mean, if you look at the red line boundary where it meets Leicester Road, Hinckley, it's so constrained in that location that we've even asked for information whether you can physically fit street lighting and signing in. And the reason there's no footway in cycleway provision is because I'm struggling to even fit basic infrastructure, um, because the boundary is so tight.

01:00:01:24 - 01:00:05:22

Thank you. Obviously nothing. You can take that away and hope for your best resolution.

01:00:06:00 - 01:00:20:10

Just just a final point. We we already have the point from LCC previously about street lighting and signage. We in the default submission and to like prior to that provided a plan showing lighting and signage and the fact that it fits.

01:00:22:08 - 01:00:53:17

Okay, fine. Okay. Right. Uh, um, right now I want to move on to, uh, bus connections. I appreciate this set up. Set out um in the in the document, but I'd be. Could you confirm how it believes their proposed bus services would be secured through the development Consent order and its associated documents, how the bus passes, etc., and why it doesn't form part of the 106.

01:00:59:09 - 01:01:32:12

In and impossible for the applicant in terms of, uh. Uh, those, those bus connections. Um, the, um, the applicant is currently working with the bus operators to, um, uh, obtain, uh, memorandums of

understanding, uh, in for, for those, um, to support the applicant in promoting, providing and promoting bus services, uh, that need to be integrated into their networks, which includes sharing of information and liaison with the local highway authorities, as we said.

01:01:32:20 - 01:02:11:23

So, as I said earlier, um, there was an acceptance that, um, we needed perhaps an earlier, uh, ramp up of bus service than was previously proposed. Um, it's not a changing strategy. It's just an acceleration of, of the original strategy. And therefore, um, the original strategy was to provide services between Coventry and Leicester because that was, um, additional services between Coventry and Leicester that was deemed to be the largest, uh, population and catchment. Uh, but um, accepting that uh Hinckley and Nuneaton as well and their railway stations uh, needed to be um, uh, um accessible from, from the outset.

01:02:12:06 - 01:02:36:12

Um, we've looked to, to incorporate that and to demand responsive, um, uh, uh, travel, which is a key component to the village, is in sort of scope and, and further afield in terms of getting, uh, staff from, from those as well as with car sharing. So in terms of how it will be secured through the um, uh, um, service.

01:02:41:12 - 01:03:13:00

Thank you, sir. Paul Melville, the applicant. I mean, the the basic approach is to secure compliance with the sustainable transport strategy through requirement nine. And the detail of what will be provided in terms of bus service commitment will be set out in the strategy itself. I think the applicant takes on board some of the comments. Um. Uh, from, from, from Hinckley, um, that the strategy could, could be clearer on exactly what it commits to.

01:03:13:02 - 01:03:22:03

And we can work on, um, putting something in the strategy, which is effectively a table of commitments to make that absolutely clear so that it is clear what the requirement is secure.

01:03:25:24 - 01:03:57:06

Anti passport on behalf of the applicant. There was a there was a comment earlier about um, the uh what happens if you're the sustainable travel uh, transport strategy does not achieve the results initially. Well that that is included within the document in terms of, uh, there is a commitment to, um, review and upgrade bus services. Uh, and until the the motor share target of 60% is, is achieved, uh, within the ten year horizon.

01:03:57:08 - 01:04:39:06

So it is very much about, um, trying to reflect the fact that, that we do have, um, uh, bus services that are serving the area at the moment. We know that the bar will rise and with the the Earl Shilton, Sue and other residential developments in and around Hinckley, that those, those requirements for bus services might change with our development as on top of that, we need to be able to reflect that moving forward. So, um, that, that review process and uh, and uh, requirement for us to, to take that information from the bus operators, uh, the travel coordinator, to review it and if necessary, put on additional services is a is a key component to the to the transport strategy.

01:04:39:09 - 01:05:11:10

Okay, fine. I appreciate that. One of the, one of the I've been conscious that, um, um, one of the reasons why Mr. Saud can't be here is he's got to go at about this point in time. So just to make make it clear he disappear, he's going to catch up on the one of the advantage of these is recordings. But if you see him suddenly disappear, it's one of the he we're we're aware he's going to have to go in shortly. Just so you're aware of that disappears. Uh, like. Yes. Pinky in Portsmouth. Yes. Thank you. Mr. Mike Parker for council.

01:05:11:26 - 01:05:34:16

Um, just picking up on Mr. Neil's comment about the schedule of certainty. That is very much welcomed. I wonder whether we might press for that to be deadline five as well, sir, because our consciousness is the second version of the sustainable transport strategy that we received. It's still lacks certainty throughout in almost transport, and we are running out of time to give us that certainty.

01:05:36:15 - 01:05:41:17

But a deadline for being able to provide that. Absolutely, sir. Yeah. Good. Thank you.

01:05:45:27 - 01:05:46:12

To.

01:05:49:00 - 01:06:10:01

Um, car sharing. Obviously, we made the comments about being one of the most anticipated, the most effective way to reduce the number of cars commuting to and from is through car sharing. Um, do. Leicester. Leicestershire. Hinckley. Bosworth. Um, maybe or, uh, for sure wish to make any comments about that.

01:06:12:23 - 01:06:26:16

This is Reconciliation County Council. We're not clear what the commitment is and how that's secured and how that then translates into a leadership target.

01:06:33:20 - 01:06:40:15

I'm doing this. Do any other go around all the other authorities first? Because just makes like sense and all the and all the other councils.

01:06:42:02 - 01:06:45:00

Yes. Yes. Looks like.

01:06:46:00 - 01:07:09:18

Thank you, sir. Joe Archer for Warwickshire County Council. It's just really a common and follows up on a deadline for submission, where we queried what provision was being made for rugby because I don't think doesn't seem to be any public transport offer for that area. And whether that's entirely the only thing that might be reasonable would be car share. And again, how that would that be secured.

01:07:11:26 - 01:07:50:26

Could I just add to that certain cluster and see what I can cancel? Rugby is one of the fastest growing towns in the Midlands, and I think the the sort of projected population increase overall between now and I think it's around about 2031 is in the order of 20,000, um, people at the moment. There's a lot of people in rugby that actually work in the distribution sector. So my sort of take on that is that the there was a prospect that quite a number of existing residents in rugby of working age might be want to go and work at HMRC, as might the new um yet to materialise working population.

01:07:51:04 - 01:08:14:25

And it does seem that the only option being talked about for rugby at the moment in the submission is culture. Um, there must be some more, um, firmer or sort of some sort of public transport option that might need to be factored into the the public transport review. If it turns out that there is in fact, a large number of people that want to get to the site from rugby.

01:08:18:17 - 01:09:00:03

And on behalf of the applicant in terms of the the public transport strategy, as I alluded to earlier on, once we start getting data from, uh, the development in terms of where people are coming from and

going to, um, we can adapt those services accordingly will be in the applicant's interest. Obviously, they've got to achieve a 60% modal, um, uh uh, share, um, a car modal share. And therefore, um, to achieve that, they will need to ensure that people can get to their site that the, the one thing about car sharing and public transport is that car sharing is most popular where there isn't public transport services, so it is an infill for the public transport network.

01:09:00:09 - 01:09:22:21

Uh, the, the, the this um sustainable transport strategy 10.21 um, it says from first occupation a car sharing platform Apple similar will be available for all staff at an RFI to share details of lift availability to and from the site. So it's it's in the in the document which is to be secured by the common line requirement.

01:09:22:23 - 01:09:48:27

Nine is your interpretation of that. That it would be. Cross site share car sharing or just operator sharing. In other words, if you had two people who happened to work on the site but were employed by different people in different parts of the site, how how they could know about it? Or is it just written with an individual occupy?

01:09:48:29 - 01:10:19:21

Yeah, the platform will be cross site in terms of, um. Uh, occupiers, there will be the option for an occupier to, um, uh, join, uh, on their own or have other limited, uh, occupiers that they will share with all the full site. This isn't an issue. Um, uh, sort of caused by the developer. It is. H.R. departments tend not to like to promote people car sharing with other organizations.

01:10:19:23 - 01:10:43:00

They feel that they're taking on a liability for it. Yeah. So the platform that we have allows that range so that we can ensure that the all companies can join it. Obviously, our preference from a transport perspective would that it would be open to everyone within the site. But we have experience elsewhere where some organizations, uh, large online retailers, for example, would would not want to do that.

01:10:45:25 - 01:11:20:24

Thank you, sir, Mr. Benson. On behalf of the National Highways, just 2.5 million. Um, we welcome the inclusion of car sharing. It is a viable tool to promote sustainable transport. Um, and there are a plethora of of mechanisms that can be used, including individuals can also look at opportunities to find people who are on their trips and link in with those. And do that just you want to draw attention just to two matters, if I may, which is appendix three within the Sustainable Transport Strategy, which relations to be include national earthquake car share analysis? It's just something that I want to perhaps need clarification or something.

01:11:20:26 - 01:11:51:06

But there's example journeys in there where the sustainable transport modes are compared against driving time. For example, Tamworth to Hinckley, uh, it's a three hour commute time, fire pit. Um, and three public transport modes are required, but it's a 45 minute driving time. I just want to make sure that car sharing isn't going to be used as a tool to mitigate car dominance and over the top of public transport modes, because public transport is about access for all. Um, and obviously you need a car to be able to car share.

01:11:51:15 - 01:12:22:20

The other aspect is just linking on that. In terms of appendix six of the proposed bus timetables, there might be a point of clarity, but I think it's service eight. It isn't entitled, but it's a lot of work to Nuneaton service that's proposed. Um the evening services um from Nuneaton to Lutterworth. The last bus that would serve the site is ten past or just before 9:10 and at night. And I just wanted to get

clarity around how the shift patterns work around those bus services as well, because that would help with the car sharing element as well.

01:12:23:07 - 01:12:23:22

Thank you sir.

01:12:25:09 - 01:12:26:26

It's the apples that want to respond.

01:12:27:10 - 01:13:00:21

And prosper on behalf of the applicant. As I said earlier, the car sharing is not a replacement for public transport. It's an infill for where public transport is not, uh, available or attractive. Um, in terms of the, the, um, the timetables, uh, the commitment in the sustainable transport strategy is that bus services, all those bus services will be available at all shift, uh, change times and office hours. Um, every day that the, the, uh, the facility is open per year.

01:13:00:23 - 01:13:20:11

So, um, we'll just need to talk to the bus operator to make sure that those indicative timetables are, are adequate. But obviously, um, uh, as we move forward, um, we would be reviewing those anyway based on the specific requirements of the site.

01:13:21:18 - 01:14:01:17

And I'm assuming in response to the question about how secured through requirement nine. Is that correct? Yes. Um, the one thing which has taught me, uh, well is relating to car, um, car parking in that there does seem to be a reliance on the maximum meaning getting to the maximum car parking. Standing by the Leicester set out as there um on the site when it surely if the sustainable transport modes and active travel mounts successful, you won't need that number of car parking spaces.

01:14:02:10 - 01:14:27:14

Um, it may be me being cynical, but surely you should be not looking for the maximum car parking, but part of a demonstration that of of of that commitment to those methods that you've been espousing is to say to indicate in the design statements and that underlying code that less than the maximum car parking would be what would be the what you would expect to be to provide, providing.

01:14:27:17 - 01:14:58:15

And possible on behalf of the the applicant, um, parking standards. Yes. They, they, they do relate to uh, that modal share, but they also relate to the operational use of the building and therefore how many staff are going to be in there? How many, um, uh, what shifts they're going to work, which is bespoke and specific to each operator. So when we, we look at, um, a new building, when you have an occupier on board, you often assess whether the parking is, is adequate for, for that.

01:14:58:17 - 01:15:21:05

Um, uh, for that operation, it may be that the majority of people do travel by sustainable modes, but they're just very densely occupied buildings. That's where we obviously need to, to, uh, the parking sensors don't take that into, into account. Um, and therefore, in terms of the consents, we want to ensure that we've got the maximum flexibility for, for each, uh, for each part.

01:15:25:23 - 01:16:01:06

I think it's now come to the end of item five, and it makes a really good time of having a break for a few minutes. Um, then we'll move on to noise. Uh, we're grateful if, um, Doctor Moore and Mr. Moore could both come and sit at one of the table's main tables because, um, a lot of what we'd be talking about is noise is what is raised. The iteration is going to be a lot easier to have you at one of

the tables here. Um, I don't know whether one of the councils or could either that table you could squeeze, you could squeeze up a bit so we can get a couple more people onto this table.

01:16:01:13 - 01:16:30:10

I think it really would, would be appreciated. Obviously we can do that. We can do them. Do the, uh, start the music, uh, as it were. Uh, when when we, when we, uh, when we break in the minutes, um, and so allow them to come to the table so we don't need to do it in this, but that would we'd appreciate that. Okay. Um, it's now, uh, 3:16. So if we adjourn now until half past, that would be great. And then we'll come back and discuss noise. Thank you.