

# **Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council**

**Interested Party Reference Number: 20039546**

## **Deadline 6 Submission:**

- **REP5 – 009:ES Appendix 8.1 Transport Assessment [Part 15 of 20] Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan Document Ref 6.2.8.1C Revision 01**
- **REP5 – 013:ES Appendix 8.2 Framework Site Wide Travel Plan Report Document reference: 6.2.8.2C Revision 07**
  - **REP5 – 020 & 021:DCO Obligation S106 Agreement Document reference: 9.1B Revision: 01 & Unilateral Undertaking Document reference 9.2**
- **REP5 – 023:HGV Route Management Plan & Strategy Document reference: 17.4C Revision: 12**

- **REP5 – 041: Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [part 2 - HBBC] Document reference: 18.17 Revision: 01 (Management Plans, Transport Assessment and PRow)**
- **REP5 – 051:M1 J21 Modelling Note Document reference: 18.18 Revision: 01**

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

**(ref. TR050007)**

Document and Section Reference	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Response
<p><b>REP5 009: ES Appendix 8.1 Transport Assessment [Part 15 of 20] Sustainable Transport Strategy and Plan</b></p> <p><b>Document reference: 6.2.8.1C</b></p> <p><b>Revision: 01</b></p>	
	<p>Note that the revision number of the doc appears to be 1, although the previous version was rev 6 dated 9th January 2024?</p>
<p><b>1.6</b></p>	<p>The applicant refers to a modal shift of 75% to 60% single car occupancy. The Council believes that this '75%' is an incorrect starting point, and is based on essentially a rural area, not a new 8,000+ employee rail freight interchange in very close proximity to 50,000 residents in Hinckley. As stated, the correct baseline should be no more than 60%, which was the first year achieved at East Midlands Gateway (EMG) and the future target should be 47% as achieved at EMG on average over the first 5 years.</p>
<p><b>1.9</b></p>	<p>The applicant states that '<i>The STS satisfies National policy for sustainable travel without these additional enhancements</i>'. The applicant implies that walking and cycling are not important to the STS. The Council considers this to be unlikely given that there are 70,000 people in the borough (Hinckley, Earl Shilton and Barwell) living within a very easy cycling distance of the site and in terms of national policy it is vital to ensure there are very good walking and cycle connections to them. As noted in previous Council submissions, without enhancements the site has no safe cycling links to most of the nearby population. The NPS for National Networks paragraphs 3.15 to 3.17 set outs the importance of walking and cycling links, and</p>

	<p>the Council has noted in its submission at Deadline 5 that the ‘<i>reasonable endeavours</i>’ (para 3.17 of the NPS) must take into account the location, and scale of the proposed development. The Council contends that enhancing these links are ‘<i>fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development</i>’</p>
<p><b>Table 1 STS Commitments</b></p>	<p><b>2. Bus - Leicester to Coventry</b> – the commitment does not make the proposed bus frequency and timings clear – an ‘<i>additional 7 hours of service</i>’ still raises uncertainty as to whether these services will be adequate to meet demand and it lacks detail on where the service is intended to stop within the vicinity of the site – Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Barwell etc. The commitment should provide more detailed information on how many buses per hour in each direction will serve the site, at what times and the route of the service including stops to access the ‘coverage’ of the service. There is no commitment to subsidy for travellers, and no indication of current patronage and capacity and whether the new passengers could be accommodated on the service.</p> <p><b>3. Bus - Hinckley/Nuneaton</b> - the same comments apply here as above.</p> <p><b>4. DRT</b> – the service is not defined in terms of a Level of Service and still lacks certainty; without this the ‘commitment’ given is cannot be relied upon as the availability, wait time and journey time for users is not defined at all. At peak shift change times the service could be under pressure as multiple employees from different locations could request a trip and not be given one, or given one at an inappropriate time, there are multiple locations from which they may come served by one DRT bus - without a committed and monitored level of service the Council considers the service is highly unlikely to be effective.</p> <p><b>In the Council’s deadline 5 submission we reported on the level of bus services at East Midlands Gateway (EMG) and how the HRNFI Plans fell far short of this, and suggested how these should be enhanced. The majority of these points have not been addressed in these proposals. The applicant cannot expect to deliver an ‘EMG level of change’ without these enhancements.</b></p> <p><b>5. Free 6-month bus pass</b> – the Council considers that this should also be extended to users of the DRT services, particularly as the cost of these services is usually high. It is not clear</p>

what 'first employees' means and exactly how this eligibility criteria will be used. The Council suggests that it would be simpler and fairer if this offer were made available for example to a any employee during the first year of occupation of each unit. The measure should also be reviewed annually as part of monitoring and extended by Travel Plan Steering Group as required. It should also be clarified that where in the framework travel plan or sustainable transport strategy reference is made to employees then that reference must be construed as including all persons attending the authorised development as their usual place of work and is not to be confined solely to persons who are directly employed by an occupier of the authorised development.

6. **Car sharing** – It is unclear whether this will be an HRNFI-focused app, or just enables the ability to log into some wider county/national app. It should also be made clear that it will be free to users.

7. **Cycling facilities** – The Council suggests that it is made clear that cycle parking, ebike charging and showers/changing facilities will be provided in accordance with LCC and local planning authority standards

10. **A47 footway/cycleway** There is a reference to '*further connections will be included as Estate road*' – the Council requests that this be clarified; will this mean cyclists using the estate roads with other traffic or some form of shared/segregated safe facility?

10-13 **proposed cycle enhancements** – HBBC have already commented at Deadline 5 on the shortcomings of these proposals and recommended requirements. These facilities should be provided before first occupation as stated at Deadline 5.

#### **Missing commitments**

**There is no commitment to a shuttle bus** between the bus stops and site as indicated in previous documents; this should be added and specified in terms of frequency, route, capacity etc.

	<p>There should be a commitment to provision, monitoring and management of car parking to accord with the objectives and outcomes required from the Sustainable Travel Strategy and Framework Travel Plan.</p> <p><b>A further commitment should be provided on the Travel Plan Steering Group</b>, making it clear the composition, protocol and frequency of meetings, role and decision-making etc. – the Council has set out in the comments on the Framework Travel Plan recommendations on these issues, and the STS should be amended to refer to this.</p> <p><b>Another major point is that there is no commitment to the targets for the plans and what will be done should these targets not be achieved</b> ; the applicant referred to funding being set aside for further measures at Deadline 5, but this now no longer seems to be referred to. It is the Council’s view that (1) a commitment to targets should be included (2) these targets should be appropriate, as noted in other Council comments and (3) there should be funding set aside or able to be provided from the applicant should the plans not be achieving the targets.</p>
<p><b>5.22</b></p>	<p>The Council does not consider that it is correct to say that ‘<i>The modal shift targets for single occupancy car trips align with .... EMG</i>’; as noted at Deadline 5 by the Council, the actual achieved single car mode share at EMG was 58% in year 1 and 47% on average over the first five years – these are far lower than claimed by the applicant, and the Council has made the point above that these should be corrected.</p>
<p><b>7.13 – and Table 9</b></p>	<p>Employee bus passes – see comments in relation to item 5 of STS commitments Table1 above. Subsidy should also be given to DRT users.</p>
<p><b>8.14 and extract plan 2.32</b></p>	<p>The Council has stated before that the routes shown without enhancement do not demonstrate ‘good cycle access to the site’ and safe high-quality routes to most of Hinckley are not shown. Consequently enhancements as requested are required</p>

<p><b>REP5 – 013: ES Appendix 8.2 Framework Site Wide Travel Plan Report Document reference: 6.2.8.2C Revision:07</b></p>	
<p><b>General</b></p>	<p>The comments above in relation to the Sustainable Travel Plan all apply to the Framework Travel Plan, in particular the need for cycling enhancements, the appropriate setting of targets, the lack of clarity and insufficient nature of the bus proposals, the lack of setting out of future funding or actions should targets not be met and the consequences of this.</p>
<p><b>2.2</b></p>	<p>The FTP states that it identifies appropriate demand management measures. A reading of the document has failed to identify any such demand management measures. As noted by the ExA at the second Transport oral hearing (and in previous submissions by the Council) , the key demand management measure is parking. If parking is free and plentiful, the effectiveness of other measures to encourage sustainable modes will be very limited. Consequently it is vital that the provision and cost of parking be commensurate with the outcomes desired for the Sustainable Travel Strategy and Framework Travel Plan. This should be dealt with through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of parking in the Framework Travel Plan</li> <li>• Full justification of parking numbers in each planning application for phases in the light of the Framework Travel Plan results and outcomes – this should be achieved through an adjustment to Commitment 4 (Detailed design approval’ to require item (i) parking by adding <i>‘such parking to be justified in terms of achieving the outcomes of the Sustainable Travel Strategy and Framework Travel Plan’</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>8.1</b></p>	<p>The Council has already commented that the statement that <i>‘many options are already available to cyclists’</i> does not take into account that safe and high-quality routes are not yet available to link to most of Hinckley, for example many of the routes shown on Figure 5.4 are just limited signs on a road. Consequently, enhancements are still required.</p>
<p><b>Table 5.2 buses</b></p>	<p>The Council has commented regarding bus services and subsidised travel in relation to the STS. See Table 1 STS Commitments comments above. These comments apply to many sentences in the FTP, for example in relation to bus services and fares.</p>

<p><b>8.18</b></p>	<p>Monitoring should also include traffic and in particular HGVs on the network in and around the borough, including the A47 link road and HGV sensitive streets. Monitoring should also include parking on site.</p>
<p><b>8.2</b></p>	<p>Travel Plan Steering Group (TPSG) – there is hardly any detail provided on this group, which will be vital in the success of the sustainable transport measures.</p> <p>The Council has consistently requested that the local planning authorities also be represented on this group. In addition, the Council has noted that the operation of this group needs to be set out much more clearly, with clear actions should measures not be effective. Given that many sustainable transport measures are for the lifetime of the development, this group should similarly be for operational this time.</p> <p>Despite a number of requests the applicant has failed to address this point, and the Council therefore request that the following requirements for the membership and protocol of the Steering Group be added to the Framework Travel Plan as a new appendix with appropriate reference in the main text at 8.2 -</p> <p><b>Note that reference to this TP Steering group will also need to be included in the HGV strategy and Sustainable Transport Strategy as well.</b></p>
<p><b>New appendix to the Framework Travel Plan</b></p>	<p><b>These requirements are based around those set out in The Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Order 2019 (30th October 2019) which in Schedule 15 sets out potential requirements for these matters in relation to their Sustainable Travel group , and the Council supports similar provisions.</b></p> <p>Membership and protocol for the Travel Plan Steering Group</p> <p>1. The Travel Plan Steering Group (TPSG) will comprise representatives of—</p> <p>(a) the undertaker, who will normally take the Chair;</p> <p>(b) the local highway authorities (National Highways, Leicestershire County Council, Warwickshire County Council) ;</p>

(c) Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and Blaby District Council;

(d) interested railway or bus operators (non-voting);

(e) travel plan co-ordinators for the individual warehouses (non-voting); and

(f) such other interested parties, stakeholders and expert bodies whose attendance members of the STWG may from time to time believe to be beneficial (non-voting), except that if at the time the TPSG constituted or any time thereafter a unitary authority is established then paragraphs (b) and (c) will be replaced by both a highway representative and a planning representative of the unitary authority.

2. The role of the TPSG will be—

(a) to oversee the delivery of the framework travel plan and related detailed travel plans, the sustainable transport strategy, and the HGV route management plan and strategy all as referred to in the Development Consent Order.;

(b) to review the public transport services serving the authorised development in light of levels of usage and timing of provision with the objective of maximising usage as set out in the sustainable transport strategy;

(c) to decide upon the appropriate disbursement of monies from the funds payable pursuant to the related provisions contained in the development consent obligation.

(d) to oversee the work of the Site Wide Travel Plan Coordinator (SWTPC) appointed under the provisions of the framework travel plan, receiving the monitoring and review reports on the performance of the strategies and plans referred to in (a) above and

(e) to consider all occupier-specific travel plans submitted pursuant to requirement 8(2) (Travel Plan) and to advise the relevant planning authority on their consistency with, and support for, the agreed measures and targets in the framework travel plan and public transport strategy; and

(f) to participate in any reviews of the plans and strategies referred to in (a) above

3.—(1) The TPSG will be administered by the undertaker in accordance with the following protocol.

(2) Meetings of the TPSG will be convened, administered and serviced by the Site Wide Travel Plan Coordinator appointed under the provisions of the framework travel plan.

- (3) Meetings will take place at not more than 6 monthly intervals in a venue provided by the undertaker (or such other frequency, place and timing as the TPSG members may subsequently agree upon).
- (4) Not less than ten clear working days' notice of meetings will be given to all parties accompanied by an agenda and background papers with relevant information for the matters to be considered.
- (5) All members will have the right to propose an item to be discussed at the meeting under urgent business.
- (6) A meeting will only be quorate if a representative from both the local highway authority and the undertaker is present.
- (7) The Site Wide Travel Plan Coordinator must minute each meeting and circulate copies of the minutes as soon as practical to all invited parties. Such minutes, once confirmed at the subsequent meeting, will become a matter of public record, subject to redaction of individual items of commercial or personal confidentiality.
- (8) The TPSG will at all times be free to consult with other relevant authorities and bodies and will at the election of any member be at liberty to invite persons to attend meetings in a non-voting capacity.
4. Decisions of the TPSG are to be taken on a majority vote with each voting member of the TPSG present having a single vote. In the event of a vote causing an impasse, or if any of the voting members disagree with the decision made and wish it to be reviewed, the decision (the "disputed decision") will be reviewed using the decision review mechanism set out in paragraph 5.
- 5.—(1) In the event of any disputed decision of the TPSG being subject to review as provided by paragraph 4 the following protocol applies.
- (2) The voting members involved in the disputed decision ("the relevant members") will attempt to resolve the matter and reach agreement on the disputed decision if possible, without delay.
- (3) If the relevant members are unable to resolve the matter within three weeks of the disputed decision having been taken any relevant member may, by serving notice by email and recorded delivery post on all the other relevant members ("the notice"), with a copy to all

other members of the TPSG, within fourteen days of the expiry of the three weeks referred to above, or later by agreement between the relevant members, refer the disputed decision to an expert (“the expert”) for resolution.

(4) In order to refer the disputed decision to the expert the notice must specify— (a) the nature, basis and brief description of the disputed decision; and (b) the expert proposed.

(5) In the event that the relevant members are unable to agree whom should be appointed as the expert within 14 days after the date of the notice then any of the relevant members may request the President of the Law Society to nominate the expert at their joint expense.

(6) The expert will be appointed subject to an express requirement that the expert reaches a decision on how the disputed decision is to be resolved and communicates it to the relevant members within the minimum practicable timescale allowing for the process in sub-paragraph

(7) and the nature and complexity of the disputed decision and in any event not more than 42 days from the date of the expert’s appointment to act.

(7) Following appointment the expert will be required to give notice to each of the relevant members inviting each of them to submit to the expert within 21 days written submissions and supporting material on their position in relation to the disputed decision with copies of those submissions and material being provided at the same time to the other relevant members. The expert will afford to each of the relevant members an opportunity to make counter submissions within a further 14 days in respect of any such submission and material.

(8) The expert when making the expert’s determination shall have regard to the contents of any relevant national planning or transport policy and any relevant transportation policy adopted by the local highway authority and, where relevant, any increase or decrease in the traffic including public transport and travel by other sustainable means arising from the authorised development compared with that presented in the transport assessment or such other assessment, automatic traffic counts or monitoring data as may be supplied by the relevant members.

(9) The expert will act as an expert and not as an arbitrator and the expert’s decision will (in the absence of manifest error) be final and binding on the relevant members and at whose cost will be at the discretion of the expert or in the event that the expert makes no determination, such costs will be borne by the relevant members in equal shares.

<p><b>REP5 – 020 &amp; 021: DCO Obligation S106 Agreement</b>  <b>Document reference: 9.1B</b>  <b>Revision: 01 &amp; Unilateral Undertaking</b>  <b>Document reference 9.2</b></p>	<p>There appears to be no funding provision in either document for buses, DRT or other sustainable transport measures (apart from the TP monitoring fee). The HGV strategy (commitment 14) refers to £200k of funding for additional measures but this also appears absent from these documents</p>
<p><b>REP5 – 023: HGV Route Management Plan &amp; Strategy Document reference: 17.4C</b>  <b>Revision: 12</b></p>	<p>The Council notes the shared concerns of Blaby District Council over the HGV Route Management Plan and the Council supports their comments made in parallel with the Council’s responses set out below. Some of the wording of the commitments will also need to be adjusted in light of the more detailed comments on the text below to make these commitments robust.</p>
<p><b>1 Prohibited routes</b></p>	<p>The Council notes that the currently proposed prohibited routes does not include the A47. The Council remains concerned that this may result in unwanted HGV traffic leaving the site and travelling west along the A47 link road and then enabling unrestricted access either north (to the A47) or south (into Hinckley) along the B4668 junction and this remains a significant concern to the Council.</p> <p>The Council has provided comments at length on the need to include the A47 and the relevant section of the B4668 as a prohibited route; this could be achieved simply by making the section of the A47 link road between the railway line and the B4668 a prohibited route. This will mean that HGV’s to and from the site use the desirable routes of the M69 and A5, unless covered by local access or emergency exemption. This is simply achieved through the HGV strategy and should be implemented at first occupation and then reviewed through the Steering Group. The applicant has argued that there will be no impact on the A5 or M69 of their development, meaning that there is no reason why all HGV traffic should not use these roads instead of the B4688 A47.</p>

<b>2 Strategic Road incident Plan</b>	It is not clear what this 'live document' created jointly with National Highways is referring to. The Council would like to see it and review it to understand it.
<b>3 Vehicle Booking System</b>	It is not clear what ' <i>operators will be contracted</i> ' refers to - can the applicant be requested to advise whether this is part of the lease agreements with all occupiers.
<b>4 Driver Welfare Facilities</b>	This has no indication of the location and scale of facilities to assess whether it has been complied with.
<b>9 ANPR and Steering Group</b>	Refers to a Steering group, and the Council and Blaby DC are to be included on this group, this is welcome. In comments relating to the FTP above, the Council sets out more suggested detail of the Travel Plan Steering Group (TPSG) and believe that this group could be the Steering Group for the HGV route strategy, the Travel Plan and the Sustainable Transport Strategy, so this should be amended accordingly.
<b>10 Tenancy Agreements</b>	There should be a specific mention of the need not to use prohibited routes in the tenancies; it currently seems to refer more specifically to information advisory routes. The Council has also asked for the HGV strategy to include measures related to off-site parking and this should be included.
<b>13 HGV levels</b>	The Council has consistently requested that roads in the borough area be properly covered by the HGV strategy. These monitored roads should include the prohibited routes in the borough area including the following: the A47 link road north of the railway line, the B4668 west of the link road , The Common Barwell, Station Road east of the junction with the A47 and the B4469 towards Hinckley west of the Junction 2 of the M69; the B4109 Rugby Road north of J1 of the M69, the B4666 Coventry Road; Ashby road south of the A47.
<b>14 Funding</b>	This funding is welcome, more detail is however required of how this will be managed and it should be subject to TP Steering Group decision on spend – see role of TPSG above.
<b>15 ANPR</b>	The Council has commented that they can see no evidence that the ANPR system will cover prohibited roads in their area and this should be applied to the B4668/A47 as well. The camera locations should be detailed in this commitment.
<b>20 Steering Group</b>	Focus on this welcome, see other Council comments on the Travel Plan Steering Group which could undertake this role, and comments below.

<b>3.9</b>	It is not sufficient for use of the prohibited routes to be discouraged. The HGV strategy should contain a clear prohibition on HGVs using the prohibited routes excepts in certain circumstances (e.g. deliveries/collection or road closures).
<b>4.1</b>	Amend to: "The on-site measures described in paras 4.2 to 4.19 must be implemented by occupiers to assist in the operation of the facility."
<b>5.4</b>	Amend to: "The following measures must apply to each occupier and the Terminal operator in their tenancy and legal agreements:"
<b>5.8</b>	Amend to: "Occupiers and operators must provide evidence to the management company of vehicle routeing and a written policy, maps, driver training, briefings or pre-programmed navigation systems to ensure..." ... Occupiers and operators must provide clear evidence to the management company that any deviations from the route as notified by the occupier are addressed with the driver. The driver will be required to sign to acknowledge the infraction."
<b>5.9</b>	Amend last sentence to ' <i>Therefore, an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) and Vehicle Classification System will be implemented for the lifetime of the development</i> '
<b>5.34</b>	Amend to: <i>For efficiency and to provide clear accountability, the management of the HGV Route Management Plan will be included within the Site Wide Travel Plan process. Consequently, the Site-Wide Travel Plan Co-Ordinator will be the nominated individual working on behalf of the Site Management Company in regards the HGV Route Management Plan.</i>
<b>5.39 and 5.40</b>	The Council believes that it cannot take Enforcement Action in this manner and has to depend entirely on the effective implementation of the HGV strategy.
<b>5.47</b>	As noted in the Council submission at Deadline 5, any use of prohibited routes by vehicles associated with the site – there should not be a 'Stage 1 intervention' and action should solely be for Stage 2 and leading on from this.
<b>5.50</b>	Amend to:

	<i>Financial penalties will be imposed for each use of a prohibited route (unless any exceptions apply). In keeping with existing legal penalties for contravening a weight restriction order, the HNRFI financial penalty will be set to a maximum of £1,000 per breach and Consumer Price indexed linked.</i>
<b>5.58</b>	The Councils reasonable costs for attending Strategy Review Panel meetings should be reimbursed.
<b>5.58</b>	The Council has suggested protocols for the Travel Plan Steering group which should also oversee the HGV strategy, and this includes details of decision-making and actions should agreements not be reached. Para 5.58 should: refer to the implementation of the additional measures listed in Table 3 – funded by the £200k refer to increases of the management fines. Make it clear that the continued/further use of prohibited routes constitutes a breach of the DCO
<b>Figure 4</b>	See comments in relation to commitment 1 Prohibited Routes above for amendments
<b>5.24</b>	Relevant parishes within Hinckley and Bosworth should also be informed including, but not limited to, Burbage, Barwell and Earl Shilton.
<b>Table 4</b>	There are no HGV prohibited routes in the borough listed here which the Council considers should be (see above); no daily breaches should be permitted on these routes
<b>5.15</b>	This text refers to routes in the Eastern Villages in Blaby and makes no reference to routes within Hinckley Borough.
<b>5.17</b>	There is no overall plan showing the locations and this should be provided; just detailed plans in the appendix, and therefore there is no way of checking how the routes in figure 4 will be enforced. Despite representations the Council can see no plans to enforce HGV restrictions on roads in its borough and this remains a major concern for the Council.
<b>5.56</b>	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council should also be included in this list; it appears to be at commitment 9. Elsewhere the Council notes that the Travel Plan Steering Group may usefully perform these functions.

<p><b>REP5 – 041: Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [part 2 - HBBC]</b></p> <p><b>Document reference: 18.17Revision: 01 (Management Plans, Transport Assessment and PRoW)</b></p>	
<p><b>1 HGV off-site parking</b></p>	<p>The Council has examined the HGV strategy section 5, but there is no mention of parking as suggested, in fact Section 5 is about the Route Management Strategy. Section 4 contains some information about on-site parking and on the A47 Link Road. The applicant does not appear to have dealt with this issue sufficiently. The Council considers its proposals are practical, can use the same principles for HGV monitoring and will be a necessary addition to the management of this major new facility.</p>
<p><b>2 Enforcement , further measures</b></p>	<p>These are not regarded as adequate yet; as noted there is no proposed enforcement relating to roads in Hinckley borough, so no monitoring.</p> <p>The proposed mechanisms for review and action are regarded as acceptable subject to ongoing review through the TPSG.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the addition of a £200,000 fund for further measures and have suggested these should be under the control of the TPSG. It is not clear how this funding will be controlled through the DCO process.</p>
<p><b>3 Parish councils</b></p>	<p>The Council suggestions for the TPSG enables parish councils to be invited as observers if regarded as necessary. The Council will also forward reports to the parish councils</p>
<p><b>4 HGV's in HBBC</b></p>	<p>This response does not appear to recognise the issue being raised. Figure 4 sets out a number of prohibited routes in the borough, for example the B4668 west of the link road and the B4469 towards Hinckley west of the Junction 2 of the M69. Despite a number of representations, the applicant appears to have no intention of monitoring compliance with these, which calls into question the purpose of the strategy and its adequacy. The applicant has focused almost entirely on monitoring in the Eastern Villages in Blaby, despite the prohibited routes in the borough being closer to the site and at just as much risk. This is not acceptable to the Council and remains a key concern. The Council has commented in item 13 of the HGV strategy comments where monitoring and compliance is required.</p>

	The Council has made a separate point that the A47 link road west of the railway line should also be a prohibited route to ensure that HGV traffic from the development uses the appropriate Strategic trunk road network and not the A47.
<b>6 Construction traffic</b>	The information requested has not been provided. The document referred to (Applicant's response to ExA Written Questions [Appendix I - Construction Traffic Derivation] Document reference: 20.1.9 Revision: 01) seems to cover select link analysis of Narborough etc. and not construction traffic information.
<b>8 cycling routes</b>	The new plan provided is helpful. The Council notes that there are no improved routes shown on this plan on the B4668 west of the link road and the B4469 towards Hinckley west of the Junction 2 of the M69, which the Council believes is essential to link to Hinckley.
<b>9 FTP</b>	While some further information has been provided, the requested more detailed information on bus services has not been provided,
<b>10 J1 MOVA</b>	As far as the Council is aware, the applicant's information has not been agreed by the relevant highway authorities and therefore the Council's concern with this remains.
<b>11 Junction 14 – A5 / B4666 / A47 (Dodwells)</b>	As far as the Council is aware, the applicant's information has not been agreed by the relevant highway authorities and therefore the Council's concern with this remains.
<b>12 J21 of the M1</b>	No further information has been provided on this important aspect, and it is clear that the applicant's lack of mitigation for this junction is also not acceptable to LCC and National Highways
<b>REP5 – 051:M1 J21 Modelling Note Document reference: 18.18 Revision: 01</b>	
<b>Table 1 survey flow comparison</b>	The text does not indicate if the 2019 and 2023 surveys were undertaken at the same time of year?
<b>3.8</b>	There is no explanation why 'the average green times have been input into the base model on all approaches <u>except M1 NB off-slip PM peak hour</u> ' and what has been used instead.
<b>4.3</b>	This states ' <i>4.3 It is the existing problems at M1 J21 identified in paragraph 2.1 that have caused the diversions of background traffic and the residual impact of the flows on the M69</i>

	<p><i>and M1 north are due to this diversion</i>’. This is incorrect, the ‘so-called ‘background traffic is using the junction, and only when the HRNFI development traffic is added to the network do sit have to reroute at additional cost to these existing travellers.</p>
<b>5</b>	<p>Forecast modelling – while this presents modelling prepared by the applicant, it has not been agreed, audited and signed off by the relevant highway authorities and therefore cannot be depended on.</p>
<b>Table 9</b>	<p>Shows that with the addition of some 22-26% of all HRNFI flows to the junction (300-400 vehicles in each peak, a higher amount of pcus’), the net result is a <u>reduction</u> of 10 vehicles in the morning peak and an increase of 114 vehicles in the evening peak. This is only because the HRNFI traffic is forcing rerouting of existing strategic traffic onto lower order roads at increased cost to this diverted traffic.</p>
<b>Table 13</b>	<p>This table demonstrates that with HRNFI Traffic using the M69, the additional delays are high, and this is the reason why the development traffic is pushing other traffic onto lower order roads at increased economic cost to this traffic.</p> <p>Even with the HRNFI traffic forcing other traffic off the M69, average delay on the M69 increase by some 14 seconds per vehicle in the am peak and 30 seconds without the LUE mitigation (which LCC has pointed out is not guaranteed). The M69 (EB) is overcapacity in the base.</p>
	<p>The applicant’s case appears to be the following : (1) the junction is at capacity (2) it cannot be mitigated (although the LUE extension has developed a scheme) (3) consequently HRNFI traffic will divert existing traffic from the M69 onto local roads (4) no mitigation is required of J21 by the scheme, as flows will e reduced on the morning peak and only slightly increased in the pm peak .</p> <p>These conclusions are put forward (1) without modelling recommended by the highway authorities and (2) are based on other modelling that has not yet been accepted and reviewed by the highway authorities and (3) without an investigation of possible mitigation options at the junction. All this has been left until Deadline 5 of a long process where are the applicant has refused to study the junction as per the recommendations of the highway authorities. This is one of the most critical junctions on the local strategic network, is at capacity and not a single pound is proposed for future mitigation by a nationally significant infrastructure scheme</p>

	<p>situated one junction to the south; instead the 'solution' is to divert existing traffic from the motorway network.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that this approach cannot be considered to be that the '<i>applicant has taken reasonable steps to mitigate these impacts</i>' as per paragraph 5.2.13. of the NPS for National Networks. Indeed, the applicant has failed to meet the national and local; highway authorities' requirements to even understand these impacts fully and understand potential mitigation options. The development has worsened accessibility (para 5.216 of the NPS) by forcing existing traffic from the motorway network and has not '<i>mitigated (impacts) so far as reasonably possible</i>'. Given the national importance of the facility, its scale and the impact it has on J21 of the M1, further mitigation is required to be assessed and funded. It is the Council's view that the applicant has not complied with paragraph 5.214 of the NPS in that they have not been '<i>willing to commit to transport planning obligations and, to mitigate transport impacts</i>'.</p>