

## **Hinckley\_ISH6\_24 Jan\_PT1**

Created on: 2024-01-24 09:19:10

Project Length: 01:28:06

File Name: Hinckley\_ISH6\_24 Jan\_PT1

File Length: 01:28:06

### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:09 - 00:00:06:16

Good morning everybody.

00:00:09:15 - 00:00:44:27

It's now 10:00, and it's time for this hearing to begin. Um, I'd like to welcome you all to this six issue specific hearing from Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Project. Um. On, particularly dealing with traffic, traffic and transport and noise. Can you just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly. Good. Thank you. Can I also confirm the live streaming recording of the event has commenced? Yep. Thank you very much. Uh, my name is Robert Jackson, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application.

00:00:45:06 - 00:01:16:19

As you will see, for those in the room, there are only two of us here today. Unfortunately, due to personal circumstances, Mr. Saud is unable to physically be with us. But it's online, as you can see. Um, so. So if you'd like to introduce yourself, please. Thank you, Mr. Jackson. My name is Graeme Sword. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to examine this application. I now turn to Mr. Herron, who is here as well. Thank you, Mr. Jackson. My name is Matthew Herron. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel to examine this application.

00:01:16:27 - 00:01:26:19

Thank you. Together, we constitute the examining authority for this application. I'm going to ask Mr. Herron to take us through the next part of this agenda item. Thank you, Mr. Jackson.

00:01:27:09 - 00:02:00:13

And I'll tell you what. A few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Can I have one, please? At all devices and phones, including smartwatches to silent. The toilets are out of this room and on your right hand side. Uh, we understand that there is a planned fire drill at midday today. This will be a short alarm only, and you are not required to evacuate the building. If not adjourned, we will pause the hearings for the duration of this alarm. However, if this alarm is extended or if another fire alarm is triggered at any point in the day, please treat this as a real emergency and follow the green emergency exit signs to the muster point at the back of the car park.

00:02:02:04 - 00:02:11:16

This meeting will follow the supplementary agenda published on the National Infrastructure Planning website on 17th January 2024. It will be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you.

00:02:13:18 - 00:02:42:21

The agenda is for guidance only, and we may add other considerations or issues as we progress. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to. But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or acquire time to get the information requested, then can you please indicate that you need time to? You need to respond in writing.

00:02:44:12 - 00:03:03:10

As you realize from our interactions. Mr.. Soared uh, today with Mr.. So sorry. Today's hearing is undertaken in a blended way, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue and someone will be joining virtually our Microsoft Teams. We will make sure that. However, however you have decided to attend today, you are given a fair opportunity to participate.

00:03:05:08 - 00:03:41:03

A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange section of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing has finished. The transcript will also be made available with use of AI technology. With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly and clearly into the microphone, stating your name and who you are representing each time before you speak. The microphone is activated by pressing the button on the base of the stand. Uh, to the right. The microphone head will light up when activated. If you are not at the table with a microphone, there are roving microphones, so please wait for one of these to be brought to you before you speak.

00:03:42:17 - 00:04:04:12

A link to the planning inspector. Privacy notice was provided in the notification for this hearing. We assume that everybody here today has familiarize themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Please speak to Sarah North, the case manager, or Steven Parker, the case officer, if you have any questions about this.

00:04:07:02 - 00:04:45:13

I'll just make a couple of comments about the hearings being held this week. Firstly, about their relationship to the examining authority's second written questions, which were issued at the end of last week. We have tried to separate them so that we don't duplicate matters. However, I believe it is inevitable that there is going to be likely to be some overlap. Can I ask people to seek not to duplicate matters? Can I also make clear that this hearing is a subject controlled hearing with the examining authority leading what we want to talk about? This may mean that either from constraint or, um, constraints of time or otherwise, we will not be talking about, uh, a part of a topic that you think we should be talking about.

00:04:45:28 - 00:04:59:00

In that respect, we have read all the representations submitted to date and we'll take them into account. It's just that we need to concentrate on those issues, which we think are most important and relevant at this time in making our recommendation to the Secretary of State.

00:05:02:06 - 00:05:29:06

So I'm not going to ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to introduce yourselves. When I state your organization's name, could you introduce yourself stating your name and who you represent and which agenda item you wish to speak on? If you are not representing an organization, please confirm your name, summarize your interest in the application and confirm the agenda item upon which you wish to speak. And please get everybody. Also state the title by which you wish to be addressed. Can we please start with the applicant and any of its advisors?

00:05:31:16 - 00:05:33:08

Thank you, sir. Uh, my name is Mr. Paul.

00:05:33:10 - 00:05:38:13

Male. Uh, I'm a solicitor and partner at Eversheds Sutherland LLP. Uh, and.

00:05:38:15 - 00:05:41:16

I'm instructed by the applicant, Triton Sanitary Hinckley Limited.

00:05:44:01 - 00:06:00:10

Mr. Mrs. Laura Atherton. I'm a solicitor and partner at Eversheds Sutherland LLP acting for the applicant. Um, if I could just let you know, sir, I am recovering from the back surgery at the moment, which means I need to move around every now and again. I hope that's okay. And I will try to keep disruption to a minimum. Of course.

00:06:02:01 - 00:06:02:21

It's certainly.

00:06:04:18 - 00:06:05:26

Andy Passmore, director at.

00:06:06:03 - 00:06:09:00

BWB consulting, representing the applicant.

00:06:10:13 - 00:06:11:05

Malcolm. Ash.

00:06:11:15 - 00:06:12:09

Mr. Malcolm. Ash.

00:06:12:13 - 00:06:16:16

Um, representing the applicant, uh, transport planner at BWB consulting.

00:06:17:22 - 00:06:25:04

Morning, sir. Mr. Sam Carter, director at BWB consulting, representing Africa on highway matters.

00:06:26:20 - 00:06:45:05

Good morning, Sir Peter Frampton, town planning consultant, Frampton Town Planning, advising the applicant on planning matters and depending on the questions you pose and the responses that may be received, I may wish to contribute throughout this session and indeed this afternoon.

00:06:49:21 - 00:06:57:10

But Shinade Turnbull tri tuck symmetry the applicant and may contribute to questions as necessary.

00:07:02:03 - 00:07:02:18

Thank you.

00:07:04:04 - 00:07:16:00

Can we move on to the organizations and individuals in the room that have given their notice of their intention to speak? Would you introduce yourselves and let us know on which agenda item you wish to speak? Hinckley and Bosworth for council.

00:07:18:04 - 00:07:27:21

Good morning, says Mr. Mike Parker. I'm a planning consultant. I'm here for Hinckley and Bosworth Product Council and may wish to comment on any of the agenda items.

00:07:31:07 - 00:07:37:26

Being from Mercury's Associates Transport Planning Consultants on behalf of Hinckley and Bosworth Council, and making sure that all the.

00:07:40:10 - 00:07:40:25

Thank you.

00:07:41:28 - 00:07:45:05

Library District Council. Good morning sir.

00:07:45:20 - 00:07:46:15

Duncan O'Connor.

00:07:47:02 - 00:07:52:03

Partner at Pitman's, who are solicitors advising Blaby District Council.

00:07:54:18 - 00:07:57:15

Mr. Ed Stacy, major schemes officer at.

00:07:57:17 - 00:07:58:17

Lakeview District Council.

00:08:00:00 - 00:08:09:29

I started to online, we have all turned to online. Thank you very much. I'm joined by my colleague Ben Barry Walsh, also from B2B Pitman's. Thank you.

00:08:14:00 - 00:08:15:01

National Highways.

00:08:16:20 - 00:08:17:21

Uh, good morning, sir.

00:08:17:23 - 00:08:18:23

Mr. Benson.

00:08:18:29 - 00:08:28:27

Spatial planning manager at National Highways, and we wish to speak on all the items identified today. And I'll just let my colleague introduce herself, who's supporting me today.

00:08:32:02 - 00:08:37:05

Good morning, sir. Mrs. Harry Wong, also representing National Highways spatial planning manager.

00:08:39:05 - 00:08:40:13

Leicestershire County Council.

00:08:43:00 - 00:08:58:00

Good morning, sir. Mr. Mark Westmoreland Smith. I'm a barrister, appearing on behalf of Leicestershire County Council, and we will be speaking primarily to agenda items three and five, and I'll let my colleagues introduce themselves.

00:09:00:20 - 00:09:07:17

Good morning, says Mrs. Rebecca Henson, Leicestershire County Council. In our capacity as local highway authority.

00:09:09:17 - 00:09:11:05

Good morning, Sir Julie Thomas, head.

00:09:11:07 - 00:09:14:03

Of planning, Historic and natural environment at the county council.

00:09:15:21 - 00:09:18:26

Thank you. Stoney Stanton parish council.

00:09:31:25 - 00:09:41:04

Morning Tim Rose from MEC representing Sony Stanton Parish Council. I will be joined later by Jonathan Weeks from Ashland, Rafferty, also representing the states and the parish council.

00:09:42:02 - 00:09:42:17

Thank you.

00:09:45:17 - 00:09:46:27

Leicestershire City Council.

00:09:52:28 - 00:09:54:10

Amsler Parish Council.

00:09:58:02 - 00:09:58:24

Morning, says.

00:09:58:28 - 00:10:04:17

Becky Roper from Alsop Parish Council. Nothing particular to speak on the agenda but available if needed. Thank you.

00:10:05:24 - 00:10:06:09

Thank you.

00:10:07:12 - 00:10:08:04

CPR.

00:10:10:17 - 00:10:21:04

Thank you to Gerald Powell, representing Leicestershire, working with parish Council as well. Um Mr. John Marriott is here as well.

00:10:21:19 - 00:10:22:04

Um.

00:10:22:15 - 00:10:23:19

Further back.

00:10:23:25 - 00:10:28:14

And Jessie Blackburn, who may wish to speak on items.

00:10:28:16 - 00:10:29:01

In.

00:10:29:03 - 00:10:41:05

Particular. I think it will be Mr. Marriott who will speak on uh three A to E if needed. Um, other matters that I may wish to speak on.

00:10:41:17 - 00:10:45:08

Thank you. Thank you. Turning to the parish council. And please.

00:10:50:00 - 00:10:56:01

Morning Jesse Blackburn from Southgate Parish Council. We may wish to speak on 3G. Thank you.

00:10:57:13 - 00:10:58:09

Narborough Parish.

00:10:58:11 - 00:10:58:28

Council.

00:11:02:04 - 00:11:09:17

Richard Chapman, chairman of Narborough Parish Council, may wish to speak on issues relating to the level crossing Narborough.

00:11:12:01 - 00:11:13:08

Friends at Marlborough Station.

00:11:22:21 - 00:11:33:12

Morning, Mr. Jackson. My name's John Harrison, representing the Friends of Narborough Station, and I would like to speak on items three and four. Thank you.

00:11:37:02 - 00:11:37:17

Thank you.

00:11:40:14 - 00:11:46:01

Okay. If I can ask if there is anybody else in the room today who wishes to speak, if they let me know now and could introduce themselves.

00:11:51:00 - 00:11:55:16

There's Catherine. Some sort of sounds together. I may wish to speak on any of the items on the agenda.

00:11:55:18 - 00:11:56:03

Thank you.

00:12:00:22 - 00:12:01:07

Okay.

00:12:03:05 - 00:12:05:17

Morning David Harrold Stoney Stanton.

00:12:05:19 - 00:12:06:13

Action Group.

00:12:06:15 - 00:12:10:29

And I might speak on item four if possible. Thank you.

00:12:14:07 - 00:12:22:15

A councillor. Terry Richardson, leader of Labour District Council, will be speaking on items three and four and may wish to comment on the item of five.

00:12:27:29 - 00:12:37:21

Um, hello, I'm doctor David Moore. Um, I'm here as a, um, interested party, and I may want to speak on any item covered in this meeting. Thank you.

00:12:39:13 - 00:12:43:11

But I'm willing to pay more. I may want to, uh, speak on noise later on.

00:12:50:21 - 00:12:51:23

Anybody else in the room?

00:12:58:03 - 00:13:12:28

Good morning, David Bill, chairman of Burbage Parish Council and a county councillor. I wish to speak on the item on the question of emergency arrangements when the motorway is closed. Thank you.

00:13:17:15 - 00:13:53:10

So as you left, seeing from the agenda, we did invite Network Rail to attend today. We appreciate the reasons why their operational leaders are unable to attend today. We have put the relevant questions we would have asked into our second written questions. I think we must express our disappointment that Network Rail was unable to provide someone who would have been able to answer our questions and be involved in discussions, which could go a little further than our written questions. Obviously, it will depend on what responses we do get from Network Rail to those second written questions, but it may be that we have to ask a third round of questions or issue what is known as a rule 17 letter to specific interested parties as a result.

00:13:53:16 - 00:13:57:03

Um. From nobody. Network rail being here today.

00:14:01:15 - 00:14:02:00

You.

00:14:07:18 - 00:14:09:20

John. Thank you. Now, if I can.

00:14:09:22 - 00:14:18:29

Move to virtual attendees, if you're with us on Microsoft Teams today, could you please raise a virtual hand? And again, if you could introduce yourself and let us know on which agenda item you wish to speak?

00:14:39:08 - 00:14:55:19

Choose. Yeah. Think if we can take them in. Notice your apologize for people, because the names that we've got on front of us are sort of, as you can see, are only half names. So we have to do our best that we're able. But number one on the list that we have in front of us is Anthea Anderson.

00:14:56:22 - 00:15:07:17

Hi there. Good morning. Yeah, it's Anthea Anderson representing Leicester City Council. Um, from Transport Strategy. Um, may wish to comment on agenda number five. Thank you.

00:15:11:18 - 00:15:14:20

The number two is I believe, is Charlie might spell.

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

Good morning.

00:15:17:18 - 00:15:25:09

Hi. I'm representing the office of Alberto Costa MP, and I may wish to speak on agenda items three and four. Thanks.

00:15:28:20 - 00:15:33:12

Uh, next one is. And I think it's Neil first night because my guest.

00:15:37:05 - 00:15:43:10

Hi there. I'm Neil Fawcett from MEC. On behalf of Blaby District Council, I may wish to speak on noise.

00:15:44:18 - 00:15:45:03

Likes.

00:15:47:01 - 00:15:52:18

Nicolas Nicolas de is the next one we've got apologies for. Don't see this, but.

00:15:53:14 - 00:16:05:10

Thank you, sir. Good morning sir. Um, Mr. Nicholas Dancy, um, Warwickshire County Council, um, primarily interested in items three for B and five. Thank you.

00:16:06:29 - 00:16:10:13

And finally, Joanne, I think it's I think it's Archer from memory.

00:16:11:21 - 00:16:26:14

Good morning, sir. Yes, Joanna. Miss Joanna Archer, from, uh, Warwickshire County Council. Um, myself and Nick Dorsey, uh, would like to comment, probably on items three and five and raise a question around four b, although I recognize that Network Rail isn't here.

00:16:28:04 - 00:16:28:21

Thank you.

00:16:29:12 - 00:16:31:23

Is there anybody else here who wishes to speak?

00:16:35:02 - 00:16:52:17

Okay. Lastly, uh, with the number of people attending virtually today, we would ask that, uh, when we are discussing a particular point that virtual attendees involved remain on screen until we have finished that point. This is the discussion and save the need to launch the video connection each time, which can involve a short delay which we can easily avoid.

00:16:53:15 - 00:16:54:00

Thank you.

00:16:54:03 - 00:16:59:01



That concludes the first item on the agenda. And I'm going to pass you back to Mr. Jackson to deal with the next items.

00:17:00:04 - 00:17:31:11

Thank thank you, Mr. Heron. Um, agenda item two, which is the purpose of this issue specific hearing. I'll briefly explain the purpose of this specific hearing. This is to allow us to consider traffic and transport elements for the proposed development, and those relating to noise. This relates to four main areas road traffic, infrastructure, rail traffic and infrastructure that the active and public travel implications and the noise implications of proposed development. Most of the matters we discussed in earlier hearings held in October and November.

00:17:31:27 - 00:18:09:14

While we have received and read more updates to deadline for on the 9th of January, we think we are beneficial to hear from you or to you to confirm where you all believe you are, and to allow us to ask questions on matters of where we have concerns. We fully appreciate that, particularly in relation to road traffic, there are implications of other areas, particularly in alphabetical order. Air quality and emissions, biodiversity, noise and vibration. Cross-cutting areas such as tranquility and enjoyment of the countryside. We may stay in strained there as areas, but hopefully following the sessions we had back in November at H3 specific hearing three we won't need to go there.

00:18:10:18 - 00:18:44:22

Um, while we've had the overall agenda, I suspect this is fairly fluid, so please bear with us if we want to go through the points. We will give an opportunity for further discussion at the end of each major topic. Um, can I also say that just because you want to think you well, you want to talk about something, that doesn't necessarily mean we will talk about it today. This is an issue specific hearing which is led by what we want to hear. Um, there has been the opportunity and there remains the opportunity to put things in writing on other areas.

00:18:44:28 - 00:19:19:16

Um, so please bear that in mind. And if we say we don't want to talk about that today, it may be because of constraint time or for other reasons that, please, we're not preventing you making your representations into the examination. It's rather there needs to be done in a way to allow us to operate the examination as a whole. Um, can I also make a ask that if everybody understands if agreement is not found between parties other than our discussion today or hereafter. But in our final report, the Secretary of State will have to make a conclusion on your disputes.

00:19:19:28 - 00:19:38:13

Therefore, if we ask you for a view without prejudice to your overall position, please bear with us to try and try to help us. Trying to defend a position which becomes untenable would be likely to harm your case in the wider area. So which deals with item to move on to item three? Road network. Highway network.

00:19:41:04 - 00:20:12:23

As you have seen from the agenda, there are a number of issues we want to discuss, and first place is furnishing just a reminder to members of the public. Furnishing is a method of apportioning moves in a junction without surveys of not all the returning moves having taken place, as we understood it. As we left in October, there were various further surveys to be undertaken. These took place in November and the results have been reported. So again, we understand it. The overwriting furnishing methodology was agreed. So we are now able to confirm.

00:20:13:07 - 00:20:45:14

So are we able now to confirm whether this element of the overall traffic generation model has been agreed? If not, can you please explain what else you need you consider needs to be outstanding. We can go through any specific queries over the individual junctions set out below agenda and as we get

them if we need be. So we don't need to constantly. This is more a general discussion about furnishing and whether all inputs are being sorted out, rather than their effect on individual junctions. So can we please start with the National Highway?

00:20:48:27 - 00:20:50:02

Thanks, sir. Thank you.

00:20:50:21 - 00:21:07:21

National highways have continued to work with the applicant and the other local authorities to resolve the outstanding matters of furnishing. However, we did put a submission in under deadline for which sets out that we have a number of areas where further clarification is sought to enable us to agree the furnishing methodology.

00:21:09:08 - 00:21:46:04

I understand from a discussion this morning that some of those have been submitted and the deadline for for, but I would need to check what the references are from the applicant side on those, but we haven't got all the information required for us to agree. Definitive methodology that includes no junction term matrices, forecast and uh, for M1 junction 20 the cheapest roundabout, nor at the A5 Redgate elongated roundabout and also just not document grade separated flows at M6 junction one and M6 nine junction two, which means that the turning matrices cannot be used to assess the future operation efficiency of the M60.

00:21:46:06 - 00:22:21:16

Nine slip road merge areas, which is a fundamental part of our assessment at those locations to ensure the safety and continued efficient operation of the SRN. And we're also just raising a point of clarification that HGV trips could be underestimated. Um, at the eh on the A5 north and the A4 303 East at the A5 crossing hand roundabout, and this is due to potential induce linkage trips to the application site at Hinkley and the existing Magna Park regional distribution site.

00:22:22:28 - 00:22:51:29

Finally, directional traffic growth biases in the target flows were noted at the A5 Hill roundabout. The operational performance of this roundabout should be assessed with alternative turning movement proportions applied to check that these biases are not material to the operational performance of the roundabout. Further detail is provided as we have appended to our submission and our report from our consultants, Aecom, and we hope to still continue to discuss that matter with the applicants to try and bring it to a conclusion.

00:22:53:06 - 00:22:56:21

You. Uh, let's just the county council.

00:22:58:23 - 00:23:34:21

It is Rebecca Henson, Leicestershire County Council. Um, we have also continued to work with the applicant team. So, um, we agreed a series of junctions that required, um, new surveys to be carried out. We agreed the dates of those surveys, and indeed we issued permits to the applicant to allow them access to the public highway to carry those out. Uh, we have we understand that the furnishing methodology spreadsheet has been updated to reflect the data from those, um, new surveys.

00:23:35:07 - 00:24:02:14

However, we need to take the opportunity now to check that that data data has been correctly translated from the survey information into the furnishing spreadsheet. And then in turn, that data is correctly transferred and updated in the local junction models. Um, so there is an exercise for us to undertake which we have um, commenced from.

00:24:03:02 - 00:24:11:24

Do you think you'll be able to achieve got your conclusions on that by the next deadline, which is on the 9th of February.

00:24:12:29 - 00:24:19:09

We are hoping to get the results of our checking of the local junction models next week. So yes, no.

00:24:19:15 - 00:24:21:14

Different from the strategic

00:24:23:02 - 00:24:30:10

national highways. Do you think you're going to position my next junction by that date? And we we.

00:24:30:12 - 00:24:40:15

We're aiming to have a third meeting with the applicants on Monday. Um, so I would hope that we would meet deadline five to be able to provide a further update, resolve the matters.

00:24:40:17 - 00:24:51:20

Not quite three weeks than that tonight. Yes. So we should be all right. Um, next on in going down the highway authorities is Warwickshire County Council, so that's there.

00:24:53:03 - 00:25:23:04

Thank you. So Mr. Nicholas Jones who works the county council, um, we're working with the applicant team and the other highway authorities in trying to progress matters on, on this topic. Um, we have a few queries on some of the individual turning movements at Gibbet Hill and the crossing hands junctions from the furnishing. Um, we would also like to see the raw survey data to make sure that the, um, the inputs have been correctly input into the finessing spreadsheet.

00:25:23:24 - 00:25:52:24

Um, there's a specific issue on the Gibbet Hill junction, where we have noticed that the Aam labelling in the finessing spreadsheet appears to be different from the labelling shown, um, on the junction diagram in table 11 of the BWB submission. And that's for Gibbet Hill. And just to make a general point we just need to make sure that the finessing outputs represent demand flows, i.e. the total demand that wants to use the junction, um, to make sure that the assessment is robust.

00:25:57:07 - 00:26:04:00

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Dorsey. Uh, the applicant, if you wish to come with us to where you believe you've got to.

00:26:04:27 - 00:26:06:15

Thank you. Sir. To the applicant.

00:26:06:17 - 00:26:07:08

Um, I'll ask.

00:26:07:10 - 00:26:12:01

Mr. Ash to comment, uh, in a moment. Uh, but before I do. So, just to make you aware, sir.

00:26:12:06 - 00:26:13:18

It appears that.

00:26:13:20 - 00:26:15:06

Some of the appendices or the.

00:26:15:08 - 00:26:16:24

Appendices that accompanied.

00:26:16:26 - 00:26:47:26

The updated transport note, which the applicant submitted a deadline for, may not have made its way to the inspector now. Um, not sure why that's happened, but we'll, um, we'll we'll rectify that as soon as we possibly can. What I can say is that those appendices were shared with the Transport Working group, um, shortly after, uh, deadline for. So the comments that you've just received obviously demonstrate that, that the relevant parties have, uh, have those appendices. And I'll now pass to Mr. Ash to comment further.

00:26:50:08 - 00:27:08:25

Thank you, sir. Um, Malcolm Ashford, the applicant. Um, in terms of the furnishing. Um, as, uh, Mr. SIM, uh, alluded to. We do have a meeting on Monday to discuss and the outstanding items. Um, we have to recognize that there's been a lot of information that was shared.

00:27:09:07 - 00:27:09:22

Um.

00:27:09:27 - 00:27:12:06

Uh, after the surveys which happened.

00:27:12:08 - 00:27:13:00

Uh, in the.

00:27:13:02 - 00:27:35:29

Final week of November as the final neutral month in 2023, um, furnishing, um, was agreed on the 13th of November, shortly before our previous, um, uh, deadline. Great. So we we discussed that in in some depth in terms of the post which junctions we need to Furness and the agreements.

00:27:36:01 - 00:27:36:21

With al-Sisi.

00:27:36:23 - 00:27:47:08

As, uh, as Missus Hanson as to as well. Um, in terms of the points, uh, Mr. SIM has raised, I think those we can address fairly.

00:27:47:10 - 00:27:47:25

Quickly and.

00:27:47:27 - 00:27:51:25

Readily. Uh, meeting on Monday. Um, they.

00:27:51:27 - 00:27:52:16

Are.

00:27:53:03 - 00:27:56:05

Uh, technical points that, um.

00:27:56:07 - 00:27:56:24

We have.

00:27:56:26 - 00:28:00:03

Incorporated into the methodology. Um, that we have.

00:28:00:05 - 00:28:00:26

Uh, we've shared.

00:28:00:28 - 00:28:06:06

A deadline for. So, um, we feel from our perspective, we've we've, um.

00:28:06:22 - 00:28:07:21

We've fulfilled the.

00:28:07:23 - 00:28:10:25

The promises that we made that the previous hearing.

00:28:12:15 - 00:28:14:25

Hmm. Okay, fine.

00:28:16:15 - 00:28:25:04

Unless there's anything they wish to say about methodology, I'd like to move on to the Patchell farm A5 junction.

00:28:26:20 - 00:28:31:15

Um. Can we have a plan of that display? Just. Some people have got it in their minds.

00:28:47:26 - 00:29:01:23

Yeah. It's that one on the, the that's one of the one of them. That's there's, there's actually one with slightly wider I think it's rep 3119. I'll be at two on one line. It's one of these.

00:29:07:21 - 00:29:11:00

Which is the one which shows the overall side.

00:29:22:02 - 00:29:24:11

Because you can't be three.

00:29:27:20 - 00:29:29:10

Yeah, right, right. 3119.

00:29:31:12 - 00:29:33:21

Right. Standing right over it.

00:29:40:18 - 00:29:50:27

While that's being displayed. Can I just confirm with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council that what? That's the planning permission were granted just before Christmas 21st of December.

00:29:52:17 - 00:30:03:22

Right. So yes, that's correct. So it was just before Christmas. And as long as you're aware, the other two local planning authorities are also granted permission. Right now I'm led to believe so. So yes. Thank you.

00:30:05:12 - 00:30:08:00

Um, wait for the plan to come back.

00:30:09:20 - 00:30:10:05

Sorry.

00:30:45:04 - 00:31:00:18

Part of the problem for this topologies was that it took us a bit of time to get the exam, with the number of submissions that deadline for when we're pulling the agenda together last week. We didn't have the examination library, so we couldn't give references for all the documents that we thought we would need. So

00:31:02:11 - 00:31:03:27

that's why, after thinking.

00:31:05:19 - 00:31:18:24

Um, now, obviously the Grants Planning Commission does have implications for the applicants, since the deadline for submissions are based on assumption that permission is yet to be granted. So the applicant wants to say, in the light of the grant of planning permission.

00:31:24:16 - 00:31:25:02

Um, yeah.

00:31:25:04 - 00:31:52:20

We noted the soy milk match for the applicant. Um, the we noted that the planning permission had had gone in, had been approved on the 21st of December. Um, we had already agreed with the the transport working group, um, that we would take the, um, the National highways visit and test the network in this location. So we have accounted for, um, in our updates, the protocol that was put forward by National Highways.

00:31:53:09 - 00:32:04:23

Okay. Thank you. Um, my understanding is the hybrid application. I think Ryan may be one is the before, and the rest is an outline. Is that correct? I think Bosworth, please.

00:32:06:24 - 00:32:29:13

Yes, that's my understanding. So now I'd like to hear whether the parties consider these societies to be quote unquote, deliverable. The reason for the question is that the definition of the national planning policy framework for deliverable only relates to housing development and the release of courses in housing development. And so we'll start with the applicant because it makes short circuit the situation. Do you consider this site to be deliverable?

00:32:34:03 - 00:32:38:18

No, I don't see any reason from our side. Why? Why it wouldn't be so. It's not. Not something we've.

00:32:38:20 - 00:32:43:03

Raised. Okay. There's any other any part, any council think

00:32:44:25 - 00:32:49:04

that national highways have any quick any view on that? It might not be.

00:32:51:25 - 00:33:07:03

Mr. Benson, National highways, it wasn't that it isn't viable. What I was going to just provide an update is that we know that they are actively talking to us through this for their section two, seven

eight submission. So in progress, we're getting technical approval from our position. It is continuing to move forward.

00:33:11:00 - 00:33:24:28

Okay. Um, now, um, like, are there any implications of the grant planning permission? Um, where we were in relation to the implications of this development? Uh, we'll start with the actual.

00:33:27:02 - 00:33:36:08

Very particular peculiar implications that you are aware of that mean that we would be of left in, in, in, in less weight, for example.

00:33:37:15 - 00:34:15:01

And Mr. Benson on behalf of National Highways. Not that I'm aware, sir, but this site is bringing forward some significant mitigation for the A5 to enable itself to come forward and mitigate its own impact. And that includes the improvements at the A5 roundabout and also the removal of the height restriction of the next lane well, which that element is quite important for this site because it does open the A5 up as a more attractive route for Jeeves to and from Hinkley Natural Interchange, and therefore put potential greater pressure on the A5, A47 junction and longship junction.

00:34:15:03 - 00:34:15:25

Welcome on today.

00:34:16:10 - 00:34:20:27

We come to those in in a minute. Does Leicestershire have any particular.

00:34:22:24 - 00:35:12:02

This is Rebecca Hanson as she came to council. Um, the same comments. Really? Uh, the, um, mitigation proposals at the A47 long chute junction associated with capsule form are there to address the impact of the partial form development, and that scheme does not provide additional capacity for other development in the area. Um, also, um the lowering of the carriageway on the A5, the you'll see from our submissions that um, the assumptions were a high sided HGV traffic simply cannot use this stretch of the A5 at the moment by lowering the carriageway is potentially to soak in another 20% of HGV traffic.

00:35:12:15 - 00:35:16:16

That can come back in a minute. Okay. Okay. Yeah.

00:35:18:29 - 00:35:28:04

Just just Warwickshire County Council wish to make any comment at this point on this on this element. But since the site of the site is in Warwickshire after all.

00:35:29:14 - 00:36:07:19

It's, um, Miss Joe Archer from Warwickshire County Council, I think the comment I'd like to make is obviously at the moment the developers are progressing with the two seven, eight works, um, which is good news. However, should something happen to prevent the design coming forward as envisaged at planning, then they'll be seeking alternative arrangements rather than it will just stop the development. So they're likely to be looking for alternative routes for those HGVs to go should, for instance, it not be possible to lower the carriageway underneath a railway bridge.

00:36:09:11 - 00:36:42:21

Again, this would have been quite useful had Network Rail been able been here. We could have asked to ask them all for that. Um. Thank you. Um, what? I'd like to have a discussion which which has been alluded to in relation to the implications of traffic model on the issue of the high sided vehicles,

um, and under the HGV route Management plan, a strategy using the along the link road because obviously along the link road would become a become a quote unquote prohibited route under the, under that um planning strategy.

00:36:43:07 - 00:37:15:02

However, this does the point of clarification relating to the drainage associated with the carriageway under the railway bridge. There was a comment I read about this needed to discharge offsite. It wasn't clear to me as to whether this meant away from the bridge and onto the farm site, or away from the bridge and site, and dealt with otherwise. Um, guessing Hinkley Bosworth might have the answer, but it might go to work to other authorities trying to. Bosworth. Do you have that information? If you haven't. Um, I'm guessing the indication that National Highways probably do.

00:37:15:24 - 00:37:21:21

Right. In which case that's a no and won't. And that's why we think they have the answer anyway.

00:37:22:19 - 00:37:53:07

Thank you sir. Mr. Benson, on behalf of National Highways. So, um, to enable the lowering of the carriageway and the Nuts Lane railway bridge, flood alleviation was required. But this need to be required. It could not be accommodated within the highway land were able to accommodate this within their land, um, as part of their search and drainage strategy and and a proposal to do so, any other party would struggle to be able to to resolve that issue without the land that your farm basically has.

00:37:53:09 - 00:37:56:09

And that's why I'm able to take forward the scheme.

00:37:57:08 - 00:38:13:09

I was wondering, looking at the drawing, whether the red line to the south of the railway line was how the drainage was anticipated being dealt with. Um, let's answer that. That was my guess. I was hoping for confirmation.

00:38:13:11 - 00:38:24:03

Missus reckons unless you're a county councillor. You are correct, sir. That's why the red line is slightly, um, odd to the to the south. It was to, um, connect to a watercourse.

00:38:24:05 - 00:38:35:04

Fine. Thank you. I surmise that might be muddy, but I wanted confirmation. Thank you. Um. Right. Pop pop pop pop pop pop. So.

00:38:37:05 - 00:39:15:00

Please correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding is that when the road has been lowered, HGV from the application site wanting to travel to the north west or western north west to travel along highway 69, junction two to junction one, then along the A5 through these junctions and the same route between reverse to get to the site. Alternatively, for high sided vehicles in the in the high sided vehicles in the interim leaving this site, they will travel along the 47 link road up the B4 668 to the A47 and then southwest long A47 to these junctions outside, as it were.

00:39:16:22 - 00:40:04:14

Yeah. Makes the point that notwithstanding the routing commitment, the A47 isn't a road and that's suitable for all traffic. Um, and at least until the bridge works are undertaken, would be an entirely legitimate route for high sided HGVs on the basis that would be less far for them to travel than taking some more other security route. What I'm insistent here is to ensure that the traffic modelling is comprehensive. That is it not the double counts nor discounts, the overnight fees. It could double



count them if they are travelling both via junction one and down the A47 and they both come hit the junction we can see in front of us here, coming as if they were coming both ways, or you will miss them entirely.

00:40:05:08 - 00:40:35:24

Um, which will obviously become important when we discuss the movements around the junction. Junction one. Um, it seems to me that there should be two different versions of the model traffic travelling each way. Given that it's 20% of the HGVs travelling to and from the site may well be the over height over the height of the bridge, and that would represent a significant number. That is, of course, unless there's a requirement preventing occupations until the road's been lowered, but the applicant is strongly resisting that. Can I have the applicants comments, please?

00:40:37:21 - 00:41:20:21

Uh, Malcolm Marshall, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think what we need to express is that there has been quite significant amount of modelling that has been done at the farm uh junction, which is, um, aligned with the information that was shared by National Highways in November. So we've taken that information and we've run that through, um, the models with our partner flows mapping on the actual farm flows. Um, and also an allowance for 20% of traffic travelling along with the A5 from our development as high sided vehicles and the 20% figure, um, we have taken on face value, we haven't had.

00:41:20:23 - 00:41:21:15

Evidence.

00:41:21:18 - 00:41:41:09

From National Highways in terms of. Of that value, but we've taken that in good faith. Um, and put that through the vision model on the A5 itself. Um, in terms of traffic on, um, the A47 and the original, uh, distribution.

00:41:41:15 - 00:41:46:01

Uh, didn't account for, um, uh, the height restriction on the A5.

00:41:46:23 - 00:41:55:08

Assigns traffic, um, to routes that that can be achieved. Um, therefore it's, um, it is.

00:41:55:10 - 00:41:56:07

Purely on the A5.

00:41:56:09 - 00:42:04:00

That we've, we've tested that 2,520% of traffic increase. Um, but we can take away the A47.

00:42:04:07 - 00:42:30:13

Um, secondary. Uh, point. Yeah. So as it stands, there isn't the model for the junction we can see in front of us. Um, the one at the top of the north form that hasn't been run with a 20% HGV is coming in. Well, the relevant proportion of 20% of the HGV, because obviously won't all be going this way. Uh, coming in through that, through coming in from the north, as it were. No, we can we can do.

00:42:30:15 - 00:42:31:16

That as a clarification.

00:42:31:18 - 00:42:33:29

Yeah. Thank you. Mr.. National highways.

00:42:35:01 - 00:43:06:07

Mr. Benson, on behalf of National Highways, I would just note, caution that the, um, the model that Mr. Ash is referring to, which is our model of the visa model, only focuses on five long junctions in isolation. It and it has an extent of the A5 to the railway bridge. It doesn't look at the overall network as a whole. And therefore with the SAC code link 47, it might need that a more high level test to take in those two scenarios, rather than just focusing on the detailed business model, which just looks at those junctions in isolation, to assume.

00:43:07:03 - 00:43:21:28

That there is the option. If the applicant said, well, we'll have a requirement saying no occupations until the bridge has been increased in height, then you don't have to run two models. You might want to take that away and think about it.

00:43:26:03 - 00:43:35:25

Impossible for the the applicant. Um, the previously we've, um, assessed, uh, the. For our junction models.

00:43:35:27 - 00:44:12:01

And the assessment has not accounted for the lowering. Uh, the increased clearance. The revised work that we've done, does it account for it? So we have both scenarios tested. The difference in in development traffic development shoves in along that route. We were talking between 2 and 8 vehicles in the peak hours that would that would potentially reroute in the interim. So we don't see that there's a a necessary relationship between the nuts Lane, um, uh, bridge and our development.

00:44:12:08 - 00:44:22:27

Yeah. It's the it's not necessarily the bridges. It's the next junction up, which is where they might be coming in from alternative either in double counting or not counting at all. And I just want to I just want confirmation.

00:44:22:29 - 00:44:32:25

Yes. And our previous modeling assumed that the traffic wasn't routing through. Our current modeling assumes that it is rerouting through the exit to the high side. But it.

00:44:32:27 - 00:45:00:26

Will. It will be routing through that junction. But in either scenario, it's whether it can be coming either coming in along the A5 or down the A47. It's it's got to it's got to come in. Otherwise you're not counting the traffic. So you need to make sure that the model and I'm sure the highway authorities will make comment on if that, should that not be dealt short, should those two scenarios not be clear? Unless of course, you have a requirement?

00:45:00:28 - 00:45:07:00

Yes, we believe that our modeling does account for that, but we can obviously discuss it on Monday with, with, uh, National Highways.

00:45:10:13 - 00:45:20:23

Thank. This is reconciliation. And so just to clarify so we don't have. We did personally and Leicestershire County Council representative meeting next week.

00:45:21:05 - 00:45:40:12

Okay. Well obviously you may or may not have a dairy dairy availability. Um, but perhaps you could discuss with that with Leicestershire to see whether or not they are able to attend. If not that meeting another one in the in the near future to deal with that particular issue. Because obviously the whole of the A47 coming down to that site is a county council road.

00:45:41:06 - 00:45:53:18

And impossible for the applicant. We can obviously, uh, um, advise Leicestershire of the outcome of the meeting and take any comments that they may have on on that and potentially meeting in the future. Thank you.

00:45:55:10 - 00:46:02:05

Um, Warwickshire, do you have any comments on, uh, on this particular issue?

00:46:10:09 - 00:46:18:05

Well, thank you sir. I don't see what kind of counsel. Um. I think we'd just like to see that. Make sure that the vision modeling is, um.

00:46:19:26 - 00:46:41:07

Is robust and it's acceptable sort of to the other authorities who would like to review it in conjunction with. Um, I don't think at the moment we've actually seen the vision model itself. Um, although we've seen a summary of the outputs, I believe. So I think it's just to make sure that the nuts and bolts are as we'd expect them to be in terms of the modelling.

00:46:41:18 - 00:46:42:15

Super.

00:46:42:17 - 00:46:57:08

Thank you very much. Um, that was my next point as to where we were on the modelling. As far as the applicant is concerned, it's been the detail. The data has been submitted to the highway authorities. It's now down to them for reviewing that.

00:46:58:14 - 00:47:02:07

That data was shared on our SharePoint site. We have with the authorities.

00:47:03:28 - 00:47:04:29

Next to the harvesters.

00:47:05:15 - 00:47:21:06

Uh, Mr. Benson, on behalf of National Highways. Yes, we've seen the output data that we had to haven't seen the model and are currently on the SharePoint site now, and I can't seem to find the actual vision model for this location. So if we could if you could provide us with the link, that would be most appreciated. So yeah.

00:47:22:12 - 00:47:38:16

Mr. and Mrs. Henson County Council. Yes. Unfortunately we haven't seen the vision model yet either. So. And um, sorry, just to come back on the point of the meeting, we very much welcome being invited to a meeting given, as you say, the A47 is a local road.

00:47:39:01 - 00:47:42:20

Thank you. Andy Passmore, on behalf. The applicant will send an invite to that meeting.

00:47:43:01 - 00:48:16:24

Obviously, it may be that they have other commitments that they can't make make Monday, but I'm sure they would prioritize this to other things. You know, at short notice. You may have to have another meeting separately. And obviously, I would strongly suggest that both National Highways and Warwickshire are involved in it as well. Um, there on the point of the the point in the within SharePoint, can we put I appreciate it's not an action point for a submission. Um, but could we put it

down as an action point for today, um, that you will provide make sure that data is provided as, as soon as possible within 24 hours.

00:48:16:26 - 00:48:17:11

Yeah.

00:48:18:15 - 00:48:20:23

I have found the link and I will share it with.

00:48:20:25 - 00:48:26:10

With the authorities. Thank you very much. Thank you. Um, does anybody. Yes.

00:48:28:15 - 00:48:35:09

Because I'm somebody we're talking about we're talking about this development and these junctions only at this point in time.

00:48:38:24 - 00:49:14:22

David. Speaking of county council, now, can I just throw into the mix the question of diverted traffic? No we're not that's not we're not on that at this point in this agenda. And it's not something I want to discuss today. Sorry. It was just it was this traffic on the A47, A5. We keep on talking about Nuts Lane bridge. Well, in fact, that is the wrong bridge. Just just just for clarification. I mean, the bridge we're talking about is the one on the drawing in front of us in the bottom, sort of on the stream right hand side.

00:49:14:24 - 00:49:49:27

But that is not the that is not the nuts lane. Um, we have an we have a bridge on the A5, which is, uh, interesting because it's hit once a fortnight, but we also have a railway bridge in that lane, and we also have a 200 year old canal bridge on Nuts Lane. And I think any modeling really has to take account of diverted traffic along Nutz Lane, which quite frankly is not suitable with, as I say, the bridge which was built in Napoleonic times.

00:49:52:00 - 00:49:58:21

I'm sure the highway authorities will have a look. Look at that. That point between themselves. Thank you.

00:50:00:22 - 00:50:04:21

Um, I'd now like to move on next time. Uh.

00:50:06:12 - 00:50:25:14

The, which is M60 junction one. Um, you just follow up the points about the quantum of traffic assessed around the junction in the pre and post uh, bridge height, just to confirm it. The modelling will take account of both scenarios. Yes, yes.

00:50:31:21 - 00:50:32:09

Um.

00:50:33:25 - 00:50:51:03

There's not anything on this particular junction. Junction one, the National highways or the two county councils wishes to say. Particularly, um, this one was fairly, uh, having read. I didn't really have any particular questions. I was just thinking about if there was anything you wish to raise at this point.

00:50:51:29 - 00:51:21:05

Yeah. Thank you, sir, Mr. Benton. Uh, the National highways. We're just in the process of trying to understand the modeling for for the junction National highways. Primary concern is during the PM peak, where queuing is often observed back onto the main line onto the M60 nine. That's due to a dominant right turn movement. Um, so we're just trying to understand the modeling. And the finessing is all part of this, to understand what the actual impact is of the network and whether substantial mitigations needed to mitigate a safety concern for ourselves. Thank you.

00:51:22:01 - 00:51:25:25

Uh, Leicestershire. Have any comments? They want to make it on this particular point at this time?

00:51:25:27 - 00:51:46:24

Yes. Mrs.. Rebecca Hanson, County Council again, we'll be reviewing the model. Um, we note the in the latest deadline for submission. The applicant has now, um, removed the previously proposed mitigation at this junction and from the submission. So we need to understand that the model reflects that assumption.

00:51:47:21 - 00:52:10:24

I'm assuming this is sort of a silly question. What I'm driving here. Yesterday I did go to that junction. I spoke with her about the process of taking place. Um, there were some LED temporary, uh, lights in the process of being strung up. Um, I just wondering whether that was that had any implications for this development. Whatever's going on at the moment.

00:52:13:05 - 00:52:21:21

It depends on behalf of the National Highways. Um, I'm not sure. Off the top of my head, sir, but it's something we can look into and come back to you with an explanation of what's happening.

00:52:21:27 - 00:52:44:04

Given the given. The notice on the sign said roadworks for the next four months that we started last week, and they did that then. It's not like it's a simple patch. Put it that way. Could I, could we put an action point that, uh, uh, given given us the roundabout itself, I assume that that's unless the county if the roundabout itself is a national highways. Roundabouts the post.

00:52:45:07 - 00:52:52:07

Mr. Benson, on behalf of the National Highways, is actually maintained by National Highways because it's the A5 and M6 joining together. Yeah. So could.

00:52:52:09 - 00:52:54:07

You I'm just thinking here the action point would.

00:52:54:22 - 00:52:55:27

Be to ourselves. Could you.

00:52:55:29 - 00:53:10:28

Could. Yeah I appreciate it. The operational side rather than the strategic side of our national highways. Thank you. Um, I'm expecting the applicant having to say. But do you have to say us on Junction Point? Um, Mark Marsh.

00:53:11:00 - 00:53:32:23

On behalf of the applicant, I think, um, we we'd be interested to know as well about the roadworks themselves. Uh, one thing to note from the busy modelling is that they take account of the 2023 furnishing. So that's why there's a change in the flows that have been put through that model, which has changed the conclusion slightly on the approach.

00:53:37:22 - 00:53:47:25

So I missed out. I apologise to the Warwickshire County Council since obviously you have read that, um, come to this. Is there anything you wish to particularly say about this? Objection.

00:53:48:13 - 00:54:00:15

Thank you sir. Mr. Nicholas Jauncey, Warwickshire County Council. Yes, we'd we'd like to interrogate the model itself because of our, um, initial concerns about the impact on, um, Hinkley Road.

00:54:02:03 - 00:54:02:18

Thank you.

00:54:06:15 - 00:54:07:00

Okay.

00:54:09:13 - 00:54:37:10

By now moving on to M6 junction two. As we left this in October, National Highways had concerns about the geometries and the layout. Slip roads were still outstanding at that point in time. Uh, this again, of course, related back to concerns about traffic generation and distribution. Talking about we'll do some more. Just wondering where National Highways and the applicant were on this and what outstanding matters there were and thus their likelihood of agreeing.

00:54:40:15 - 00:55:12:24

Uh, thank you sir. Mr. Benson, on behalf of National Highways. So National Highways have continued to proactively work with the applicants in terms of the design of M6 junction two. However, we have sought from a position of reference to progress without the modelling being confirmed, to agree the required parameters and standards and identify any further departures which are needed according to Design Manual for Road and Bridges. We have been sort of approached about looking at doing an interim road safety audit on the scheme as it stands.

00:55:12:26 - 00:55:43:07

However, National Highways will not accept this approach as it would not, um, comply with the requirements of GPS 119. Um, we've had experience from elsewhere where we've accepted that approach, and then it sort of caused issues later in the track. So our position at the moment is that we are awaiting for the modelling to be clarified, so that we can then confirm the suitability of the standards and the design progressing. However, my colleagues have been talking to the applicant's consultants doing that.

00:55:43:18 - 00:56:13:25

But, um, you know, we just don't want to create a positive work that's costly for the applicant if we have to do that. Generally national highways process as well is that it's done at the end. Once we've agreed the design for prelim, um, and the road safety audit, therefore. Three. The National Highway appoints the road safety ordinances to do that as expected. Time. And then we go through the process, as detailed in Gw1 nine, to ensure compliancy and flag up. Anything else needs to change.

00:56:14:03 - 00:56:14:18

Um, or.

00:56:15:08 - 00:56:28:08

Yeah, you know, obviously we've now at seven weeks to the end of the examination, the timeframes for getting that done, the whole process becomes tight like that. Uh, does the applicant have any comment on that?

00:56:28:25 - 00:57:03:24

Sometimes, um, have the applicant, um, generally share the views of, um, uh, what Mr. SIM is saying? Um, we've engaged with, um, the, his design colleagues and, uh, have substantially agreed that geometry through the submission, uh, directly to National highways of, uh, geometric constructors, you record and, um, a number of iterations based on comments they've come back with. I believe there are two outstanding. One is a typo and one is a bit more information on the existing, uh, slip road geometry of junction two on the north facing slopes.

00:57:03:26 - 00:57:34:15

So from my point of view, the geometry of the new south facing slips is substantially agreed. Um, with respect to modeling and what have you, the, uh, this was raised at the last hearing with respect to merge and diverge flows and how that might affect the layouts. Um, we've currently got a layout which is two lane slip roads and both of the proposed new, um, the uh, required merge flows for those with something like 1350 vehicles per hour.

00:57:34:17 - 00:58:18:04

And we are, uh, we are marginally above that in, in the peak, which means that, um, that's why we have the, the two lane slip roads. So a change upwards in that number, should that happen, would mean that we're very robust in terms of our design that we've had, uh, we've identified two departures from standard and had those both accepted in principle. Um, and so we we believe we made substantial progress on the geometric design, um, other items that we've submitted and had, uh, acceptance emails on our, uh, signage strategy, directional signage strategy, uh, and the lighting strategy from the National Highway side, at least, uh, on the M60 line and the slip roads.

00:58:18:27 - 00:58:25:14

Um, and so with respect to the road safety audit, there's an agenda item later. But can I talk on that now?

00:58:25:16 - 00:58:28:20

Uh, insofar as this junction only.

00:58:28:22 - 00:59:02:20

Okay, fine. Um, well, we've we've completed interim, um, road safety audits. Yeah. The reason for doing that is that GX 119 allows for that to happen in a, uh, in a design where the program is key to identify safety issues. So that's why we've done that. Uh gw1. Nine also, um, sets out that it's important to formalise the RSA one prior to the publication of any orders. And so we'd be very keen. And we believe that given the work we've done, we're at a position to to formalize that through the process and that we comply with the process.

00:59:02:22 - 00:59:24:18

GT one nine does allow for audits to be repeated in the event that things change substantially. But, uh, if we end up in that boat, then, um, you can we can go down that route. But as far as we're concerned now, we we should be progressing with the, the formalized road safety audits. And we have submitted the briefs to, uh, Mr. Simpson in the last week on this basis.

00:59:26:08 - 00:59:30:22

I give him the roundabout itself is Leicestershire's. Do you have any government? Seems to me.

00:59:31:08 - 01:00:08:11

Yes. Thank you sir. So there are two matches. Leicestershire County Council agrees in respect of this junction. Because you are correct, sir. The circulation is Leicestershire Road and the first related to. If you remember, sir, the modelling and the fact that the vision modelling had included for the um pedestrian crossing provision on the link road, but hadn't actually been coded incorrectly and called,

we understand that the revised model being submitted at deadline for, and we will need to check to ensure that's now correctly and correctly coded.

01:00:09:03 - 01:00:49:20

Um, the second matter related to the structural integrity of the existing structures, um, over the M 69 and their possible impact, um, by delivery of the the slip roads. And we asked for some assurances and evidence that those structures would not be, um, their structural integrity would not be impeded. We note in deadline for this, um, a couple of lines in the submission that says that's not the case, but, um, we haven't yet seen the supporting evidence that these structures won't be impacted.

01:00:50:22 - 01:00:55:24

They are national highway structures so that they do carry Leicestershire's road, which is our concern.

01:00:59:18 - 01:01:04:26

May I come down, will you? We'll be able to provide that information. Or does it need to come from the National highway?

01:01:05:13 - 01:01:29:04

Somehow the applicant on the structures, we have record drawings which we've obtained from National Highways. Uh, are you as with, we don't propose to provide any widening or additional traffic lanes or anything like that over the structures themselves. So, uh, we're happy to provide the record drawings to, uh, to Leicestershire if which would help.

01:01:29:06 - 01:01:31:29

I think the answer is yes. So we'll do that.

01:01:33:02 - 01:01:38:07

Thank you. And was there any other comments you want to make on this, on, on on this particular roundabout.

01:01:40:27 - 01:01:54:03

And the modeling has been updated in line with the 2023 observed data. Um, and uh amendments have been made to that. Um, the crossing point, the crossings are included in.

01:01:54:05 - 01:01:55:09

The, um.

01:01:55:22 - 01:02:06:13

The internal link road assessment. Um, so that has been, um, assessed through that process. Um, but we'll check the, um, input on the prism as well.

01:02:11:26 - 01:02:19:20

Okay. I think it's on that one. In which case we'll move on. We'll keep going to the next one

01:02:21:08 - 01:02:50:16

break, which is junction three. We've moved as you appreciate moving up the M6 now. Uh, so its junction with M1 junction 21. Um, a few things we'd like to discuss, given the opportunity to comment. Um, can we go to, uh, the response to deadline? Three submissions, appendix B, transport 23 update, which is read 4131. I'll give you the PDF page I need.

01:03:02:25 - 01:03:05:24

And if you go to PDF page 51, please.



01:03:42:24 - 01:03:44:28

Page next. Page 50 miles up a bit.

01:03:47:12 - 01:03:50:18

PDF page, not the page number.

01:03:56:23 - 01:04:28:28

Right. There we go. Right. And then if you could, it's the table down if we move down to the tables. Right. That'll do. Thank you. Um, if we look at these tables in the commentary thereafter, there's really discussion, little discussion about the a four, five, four, six. Oh. Ah. Um, if you look at table 57, which is what we've got in front of us, looking at the average delay for, for these, if you look on the in the Am peek, if either second row after the second heading on the A565460, which is the.

01:04:29:00 - 01:05:05:06

For those who aren't aware, that is the link coming in into the um into into the roundabout from Leicester, coming in from the west. Sorry, from the east. Um, then you will see that the average delay increases in the Ampk from 2.294 seconds to three six two seconds, which is just increase over, just over a minute, I just just less than five minutes suggest more than six minutes, which is a 23% increase. Even if we factor in the Lutterworth Urban extension committed layout, this only reduces the delay by four seconds.

01:05:05:27 - 01:05:37:01

We'll go to the next page down over the page. The increase is from 23 to the same line, same increases from 23 to 40s which is 74% increase. Well, again the urban extension is an improvement on the current situation and so would be here. It still results in detriment. Can I have comments on this, and whether it's considered that the effects of the proposed alignment should be mitigated, and if so, how that would take place. We start with the applicant.

01:05:38:04 - 01:05:42:27

Because there was so little comment about the effect on the A5 four six in this.

01:05:44:24 - 01:06:20:07

I mean, in terms of the impact on on. On that, uh, um, I just wanted to step back stage and say, uh, that the PR flows that we, we've been using have the Lutterworth East, uh, development traffic in inherently in them, uh, in both the without and with development scenarios. Um, the, the mitigation scheme for that development is therefore um or the implementation of that um under planning conditions, um is therefore considered to be our baseline scenario.

01:06:20:09 - 01:06:52:06

The what we've done with the model is we've taken, um, the, the model from that application, uh, and with the inconsistent with all the other junctions we've looked at, looked at the, the 2023 surveys. Uh, we've validated that that model, um, against degree of saturation, all those, those arms, um, and and all the particulars on um, and, um, obviously these are, these are the results in terms of our impact.

01:06:52:08 - 01:07:35:20

We we don't believe that we have a material impact, uh, that a severe impact on, on on that approach, uh, the improvements, uh, to that approach, um, in our view, would be, uh, disproportionate to the impact that we have. Um, they've they've already been significant improvements in terms of widening, um, under the, um, under the, under bridge to, to provide, uh, for narrow lanes, um, to, to to achieve any other, uh, material in physical improvements, um, would be disproportionately, um, expensive, I would say, and more than likely, uh, the implementation of those minor works.

01:07:35:25 - 01:08:07:19

Uh, if we were, if we were to do something ourselves, um, would would the delay to, to to to road users would be disproportionate to the, to the benefit you would actually receive. Um, part of the problem with that junction is actually on the approach to the junction from the M1 and from the M 69, um, not actually at the junction itself. Um, and that is why I think the p m, uh, model is is identifying diversion of traffic.

01:08:07:26 - 01:08:10:28

Um, in our, in our assessment year of 2036.

01:08:16:15 - 01:08:18:16

Even. Yes, National highways.

01:08:19:25 - 01:08:51:25

Thank you sir. Mr. Benson, on behalf of National Highways. Um, we've regularly raised the concerns about junction 21 of the M1 and 69 with the applicants and the need to assess it and the need to mitigate it. And we've sort of been stonewalled on it several times and throughout that. And I think we've mentioned that before and during the examination process, the modeling results are all based upon the modeling tool. So it's basically been done in isolation. Looking at that sets of signals junction, there is a vision model that we have discussed before for this location.

01:08:51:27 - 01:09:27:14

And it might be worthwhile that we actually have to now undertake that assessment using that tool rather than utilizing the Lindsay, because I don't think Lindsay is actually a suitable tool at this location to assess, uh, what's happening here. I have had discussions with the applicants, and I appreciate what is being said. Actually, their impact is negligible. But when you look at the modeling, traffic is rerouting, partly because the Hinckley in traffic is replacing it. So existing traffic on the network is trying to reroute around to get to the M1 and utilize alternate routes, which causes problems for my colleagues at the county council.

01:09:27:16 - 01:09:46:07

Yeah. Um, so we've got grave concerns. And I note that you experienced the traffic at that location and you asked a clarification question. Your, your and we provided a response that there were no extenuating circumstances that day. And that is the natural traffic. We just want to say whether it was.

01:09:46:27 - 01:09:49:20

What we saw was typical or atypical.

01:09:49:22 - 01:10:19:07

In that. Yeah. And and that is typical, um, um, of what the traffic is observed at, like at that location. And we are concerned that with the proposed development, we are increasing delay, we are increasing queues, and that will have significant impact on driver's behavior, to the detriment safe operation of the junction at that location. But we're still willing to work to try and find a solution, appreciate the constraints around the junction of what we can, what we can do. But this is one of the examples where the sustainable transport strategy is very important.

01:10:21:25 - 01:11:01:19

And impossible on behalf of the applicant. Um, in terms of, um, the, the, the comment that the impact is negligible due to, to to the rerouting of of existing traffic. And as I said earlier, I think the, the rerouting of existing traffic, whilst uh, that that approach is, is, is one of the reasons, uh, the main reason is to do with um, the, the slow moving queues on approach to the uh, to junction 21, first of all, from the M1 southbound, where it's actually a single lane on the main line where traffic, um, is, is required to, to, to diverge.

01:11:01:23 - 01:11:47:21

Um, once you get past that slow moving traffic, which is, is extensive, once you get past that to the junction itself, um, and, and the slip road where it flows out to 3 or 4 lanes. Um, generally the queuing at the junction itself is relatively modest. So in terms of capacity enhancements at the junction, um, we would argue not necessarily um, in terms of, um, rerouting or background traffic. It's because of that, that main line issue, we believe, um, and similarly in with respect to the M60 nine approach, um, where you have the, the motorway going from three lanes down to two lanes and then and then the diverge again, you're caught in slow moving, uh, rolling queues.

01:11:47:23 - 01:12:08:19

But once you get past that point, um, to the to the to the, to junction 21, the queues are generally, um, reasonable. I'm not saying no queue, but they're, they're not extensive. And it's that interaction on the mainline, um, that that is causing the traffic to divert in the part and model that is or interpretation of the, of the results.

01:12:10:16 - 01:12:11:14

Mr. Benson, on.

01:12:11:16 - 01:12:45:28

Behalf of National Highways, I think I think the comment that Mr. Passmore was made is a bit of a side point in relation to the constraints on the M1, um, mainline service, more focusing on how the junction is actually operating itself in terms of circulating. And we've got evidence here that it is operating over its capacity. You've got the A4 6860, which is, uh, over 100% saturation, and the M1 northbound off, which is also at 100% north of, uh, saturation in the 2036 base, without without development.

01:12:46:00 - 01:13:15:28

And that situation worsens. Um. And also, you know, the M60 line, um. Um, is congested because its signalized signal operated as well. And that timings and therefore with greater traffic and greater demand on that arm, people at the front will feel the need to take greater risks to be able to get through the flow of things. You need to focus on that. This is a junction issue and capacity within the circulatory, not something that's linked. There are elements outside that.

01:13:16:00 - 01:13:20:21

Yeah, I'm not disputing that. But actually their side issue, the actual capacity in the junction isn't there.

01:13:22:00 - 01:13:58:08

Uh, sorry. Andy, pass from the applicant. Um, I don't feel that the diversion of background traffic is a side issue. I think it's it is the issue. Um, because obviously, in terms of, uh, our assertion, it is that we are comparing the without and with developments in areas and that diversion of traffic is baked in. We are saying that that diversion is not caused by capacity issues at the junction, although we accept that there are capacity issues at the junction. We we were saying that diversion of traffic is due to wider, um, um, issues on the approaches.

01:13:58:15 - 01:14:07:21

Um, and therefore that's why as, as Mr. SIM alluded to, uh, in that scenario, our impact is negligible and that is what we've concluded.

01:14:07:24 - 01:14:08:09

Okay.

01:14:10:17 - 01:14:22:25

Leicestershire County Council. The one question I have got is whether I'm trying to move where the boundaries between the county council roads and Leicester city councils, because obviously they will be the highway authority for Leicester City.

01:14:23:16 - 01:14:39:13

Okay. So, um, Rebecca, unless you can council in terms of the boundaries. Um, Leicester City boundary is at the Braunstone Lane East junction. So it's um, quite some distance.

01:14:39:20 - 01:14:43:03

So it is therefore it is wholly Leicestershire.

01:14:43:05 - 01:15:24:18

Um, Leicestershire. Um, network. Um, I'd like to make a couple of points, if I may firstly concur with colleagues. Um, at National Highways, we have consistently advised that this is not the correct model to be modern in this junction, and it should be modelled in a visible model. Nonetheless, city pointed out the same model shows detriment to the operation of the junction. Turning to the Lutterworth East mitigation proposals, we have to remember that Lutterworth East is a predominantly residential development located significantly south of Leicestershire, off junction 20 of the M1.

01:15:25:03 - 01:15:43:21

Therefore, the mitigation improvement associated with this residential development and its distribution pattern meant that the mitigation predominantly was to widen the northbound off slip of the M6 M1 in this location.

01:15:43:24 - 01:15:47:26

The comment about to that be currently one lane. Yes.

01:15:47:28 - 01:15:59:05

Yes, sir. Um, to prevent queuing on the main line of it, just like we described earlier. And some minor adjustments to the circulatory, um, of the junction.

01:16:04:24 - 01:16:34:25

On that. Um, you you're providing the assessment that not only does the modeling take account of the Lutterworth scheme, of which there is no guarantee of delivery, um, and no timeline at the moment in terms of the scheme coming forward? Um, it also makes an assumption about the impact of the sustainable transport strategy and the reduction associated with the development traffic going through this junction.

01:16:34:27 - 01:17:07:03

And, um, I'm sure we'll come on to discuss the merits of the sustainable transport strategy. Um, later we've reviewed the Lutterworth we went, took the opportunity to review the Lutterworth East Transport assessment that were submitted in support of that application. And the conclusions of that assessment were that what the scheme was proposed did mitigate the impact of at least it didn't provide any additional capacity for any other development.

01:17:07:16 - 01:17:17:12

And indeed, the transport assessment continued to conclude that even with the mitigation, the junction would continue to operate out of its capacity.

01:17:18:15 - 01:17:30:25

Just could you provide a copy of that submitted into the examination? We certainly would E5 so much so that we've we've got it as as a piece of evidence. Thank you.

01:17:31:08 - 01:18:03:26

Andy Passmore, on behalf of the applicant at taking a couple of those points in terms of the vision model, we would we would agree that a vision model would be, um, a suitable tool for Leicestershire County Council and National Highways to use to identify what comprehensive improvements are required at that junction. However, for the for the purposes of our assessment and the fact that we have a negligible impact, we believe the tool that we've used is representative and and and um is is is a useful tool to to to predict the impact.

01:18:03:28 - 01:18:35:16

What would also say about the Lutterworth East proposals is that they were based on, um, information that was based on 2016 surveys at the junction. Um, our 2023 surveys have shown that, um, the, the the impact of those, those mitigation works, um, are better than was predicted in the original um regional transport assessment by virtue of, of of traffic flows across the board on that junction reducing.

01:18:37:15 - 01:18:48:25

That's the house and sorry. And obviously the existing problem is not for our client and the applicant to to resolve. We are to resolve the impact which again we maintain is negligible.

01:18:51:05 - 01:19:18:22

Thank you, sir. Mr. Benson of National Highways, just to pick up a comment there, where it was said that it was said that it would be a suitable tool for national highways unless your county council to look at a comprehensive improvement scheme at location, just to say that National Highways has no plans or no schemes at that, and one junction 21 and nothing proposed. We are currently waiting for the announcement on the next route investment strategy. Yeah. Uh, Mr.. Wait wait wait.

01:19:19:29 - 01:19:22:19

Wait, I thought it's an issue, but no, no.

01:19:22:21 - 01:19:31:22

No, we we were waiting. It's imminent. Let's say that, sir. Um, but M1 junction 21 will not feature in that document.

01:19:33:08 - 01:19:47:13

And on behalf of the applicant, I would also say that if a vision model were available and had already been produced, that would have been a tool that we would have willingly used and we have done in another in other situations.

01:19:51:03 - 01:19:51:18

Can I just.

01:19:54:06 - 01:20:14:25

See the comments along the lines of whether that's worth it and extension is going to take place, and comment about the highway works having been already undertaken. I got slightly confused at that point. Is is isn't anybody know what he's like with his research displayed in the ground? So it's coming. It's tough as a development.

01:20:15:04 - 01:20:24:09

And no, there isn't a spade in the ground. So I think Mr. Passmore referred to some works that had taken place at the junction. I'm not clear what they are.

01:20:25:28 - 01:20:39:12

Mr. Benson, on behalf of National Highways. Um, no. Lutterworth Urban Extension haven't implemented their works. And at that point we have no interaction with them via the Guardian section two, seven, eight or technical approval processes regarding their mitigation scheme.

01:20:40:00 - 01:21:10:16

Do you know when when the when was that planning permission granted, assuming it was if not good. If not, could you provide could you provide us with that data? Because clearly at the at the next. Because when it was grant because and and equally well the implementation issues and conditions. Because clearly you normally have a three plus two as soon as an outline. Um, is that we obviously the whether it like to be implemented yay or nay, it's a matter of up which we'll have to if we can think of that.

01:21:10:23 - 01:21:12:27

Yes, sir. We'll provide a copy of the decision that.

01:21:14:12 - 01:21:50:10

Andrew Passmore, on behalf of the applicant. Sorry if there's been some confusion. Um, I, uh, what I meant, what I thought I did say, uh, was that in our modelling, we have taken into account that mitigation, right? We're not saying that it's been implemented. We're saying that the traffic is included in the traffic flows that we've always used. If that is the case, then the mitigation that's associated with those traffic flows should also be included. So we've included that mitigation. Um, but because we have no certainty on when that mitigation will be implemented, we also did the scenario without it, which is robust because it includes the traffic but not the mitigation.

01:21:50:18 - 01:21:51:15

The first scenario.

01:21:51:17 - 01:21:58:22

We we essentially the left hand from the left, the left hand side rather than the right hand side of what we've got.

01:21:58:27 - 01:22:06:09

So we don't believe that our development is obviously linked with with those improvements. And they're not intended to mitigate our impact. Right.

01:22:07:02 - 01:22:16:04

Um, before we move on to the next step, we're going to have a little break. If it's anything else on this junctions. All I mean to talk about it was just a couple of quick points.

01:22:20:24 - 01:22:56:00

So, uh, John Marriott. Uh, I'm here, uh, I'm part of CBRE. But, um, anything I say is not relevant to what may be discussed later in reference to SAP cut, but the discussion over the last, uh, half an hour has been regarding traffic modeling and flows. And what the partners showed was that between 2014 and 2037, there would be a 70% increase in vehicle delay. This was in our evidence, and it also appears in the local plan documents.

01:22:57:03 - 01:23:30:10

And that's that's vehicle delay. And then there's also vehicle hours which is when sorry that's vehicle hours. There's also vehicle miles or kilometers, which is the extra distance that traffic does to avoid the congestion. Um, we're talking today about how traffic conditions are at the moment on the road network. And yet we have in the, in the pipeline, thousands of houses, lots of developments that were going to take us up to 20, 36. So we've already got lots of development that's going to load up the road network.

01:23:30:24 - 01:24:02:03

And yet the road network is clearly not capable of taking it. And so when the PR firm produces its figures, uh, it's the way it works is that it can only produce a figure down a road that the road is more or less capable of taking. So it doesn't matter how much traffic you pile onto the road network, the model isn't going to reflect that change. So when you when you come along and say, well, we've added all this development to it, but the flow has only gone up by 2 or 3%.

01:24:02:05 - 01:24:34:18

Therefore we don't need to model this junction. It's complete nonsense really, because the actual demand is there. And if you heard on the M6, uh, M1 and 69 slip roads that the queue is on the motorway, sorry, at the junction, but not on the motorway. Sorry. Get that round. Right. The queue is on the motorway, but the junction works well. If you take the queue out on the motorway, the junction won't work well. So you've got that problem all around. Junction 21 and M6 nine.

01:24:35:12 - 01:25:07:20

Um, and actually we saw the other day when the queue went all the way back to junction one on the, on the M60 line. I don't think that is typical actually, but it's quite frequent. And obviously if you, um, don't tackle the queue on the M6 tonight, traffic will pour off at junction two. And I don't know how much will profit junction two because it'll be constrained by the local road network. But I think the whole point is that looking at the model isn't reflecting the true position. And I have to say that I've done modelling in the past.

01:25:07:24 - 01:25:19:16

I think this whole process is is debate is completely complete. And then think about the point. Thank you very much. And and we do need to move on to other matters, Mr. Richardson. It's a very valid point.

01:25:25:06 - 01:25:56:03

She cancelled the terrorist and leader of your district council. Um, on behalf of the council, we are fully aware that junction 21 is probably the biggest pinch point in Leicestershire. We know there are delays all the time, which is why under the Luft two system, we put in a £20 million bid as a small district council to improve to improvements to two small arms of that roundabout, one of which has already been alluded to, which is the southbound off ramp on the M1. Uh, now successful.

01:25:56:05 - 01:26:27:24

Now, I'd ask you candidly, why would I, your small district council to call 14 million turnover, be prepared to front a £20 million bid if there wasn't a serious problem there. Now, I suspect, and the gentlemen of National Highways made the point. We've had complete stonewalling from the applicant that the reason we've had stonewalling is because they're aware that should they actually have to put in place the mitigation which is required at this junction, it would make the scheme unviable and therefore the Stonewall Inn. And the reason they're not prepared to model this scheme and they've not made a model.

01:26:27:26 - 01:26:46:02

Numerous junctions, the reason why information is always submitted at the 11th hour and 55th minute is because clearly they don't want to give us the information. This junction is overcapacity. It is not fit for purpose and it needs mitigation where this scheme to go ahead.

01:26:48:04 - 01:26:48:19

Okay.

01:26:49:16 - 01:27:05:09

I don't want to talk about those gentlemen of the other side, but I think it's not about the junction. It's the effect of this development on the junction. I appreciate the comment. You consider that something should be done about the junction, but that's not what we are addressing here.

01:27:08:26 - 01:27:30:27

Just a very quick point, Tim Rose. I mean, I'm half of Stanton Parish Council, obviously in terms of the M60 line. Uh, information is on the on the screen, the, um, the capacity, the junction there is, is slightly skewed by the fact that the M60 nine is a slip onto the M1 so that that traffic actually doesn't impact at the junction. So on reflection, the table shows that that arm works well.

01:27:30:29 - 01:27:31:14

But obviously in.

01:27:31:16 - 01:27:38:02

Reality, the modeling wouldn't include the left turn movement from the M16 onto the M1. So this is just that the circulatory at the giveaway line.

01:27:39:02 - 01:27:40:29

Thank you. Okay.

01:27:41:19 - 01:27:59:19

Um, we've been going all but an hour and a half, and of those who have been online have been on longer. Um, my inclination is we should have an adjournment for, say, quarter two, uh, until for 15 minutes or thereabouts if we come back at quarter two. So we adjourn now until quarter 212.