Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

The Hinckley National Rail Freight InterchangeDevelopment Consent Order

Project reference TR050007

Applicant's response to Deadline 5 Submissions [part 5 - Statutory Bodies]

Document reference: 18.19

Revision: 01

20 February 2024

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009Regulation 5(2)(q)

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
Active & Sustainable Transport Strategy				
1	National Highways has significant concerns that the proposals for active and sustainable travel have not been fully considered, and what is provided is exceptionally limited. We have therefore concluded it doesn't meet the requirements of the Circular and there is no clear vision or transport strategy for the development proposals. Our concern is that trips to and from the site by employees will be car dominated, having significant impacts upon the operation of the SRN.	National Highways has been working with the applicants on the development of an active & sustainable transport strategy. Further discussion was held during the meeting on 2 Feb 2024. The Applicant has provided clarification of their proposed strategy which includes introduction of majority of measures from Day 1. National Highways have queried the frequency of review (currently every two years) in the early years of the development where there is likely to be a greater rate of change and opportunity to influence travel patterns.	Ongoing	Following NH comments, Annual reviews have been proposed within the latest version of the Sustainable Transport Strategy submitted at Deadline 5.Deadline 5 STS (document reference: 6.2.8.1C, REP5-009)- Table 1
Furnessing Methodology				
2	Whilst the general approach to applying the Furness process is acceptable, two areas of concern were identified: Where an observed (2018/19) turning movement is zero, or close to zero, the Furness process will not reflect a reassignment of traffic into the corridor where this is indicated as an effect of the scheme by the forecasting scenario outputs from the PRTM v2.2 traffic forecast model. There is a risk of underestimating the demand for a turning movement at an assessed junction.	A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1.	Ongoing	See detailed Furnessing response.
3	Where a large observed (2018/19) turning movement has had negative growth applied, due to reassignment effects in the PRTM v2.2 forecast outputs, then this could result in the suppression of a flow demand. This might be important to the junction's operational assessment if the suppressed flow demand is (say) a right turn. These two concerns may be addressed by undertaking a sense check using the PRTM reassignment impacts and turn movements; paying particular attention to the magnitude			See detailed Furnessing response.

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
	of flows that turn right at an assessed junction. Alternatively, the operational assessments of the junctions could include sensitivity testing of the derived turning proportions.			
4	3. For those junctions along the Development's spine road, the report contains no description of how design reference flows were derived from PRTMv2.2 forecast outputs (which model loads all development trips at a single zone) combined with a 'first principals' method of distributing trips generated by the development. It is noted that the design of the spine road is not a specific concern for the SRN, such as the M69, A5, M1 corridors.	National Highways has raised this matter with BWB, on behalf of the applicant during the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023. Matters relating to traffic flows on the spine road are also covered in the furness review which require further information to be clarified.	Ongoing	Noted that the spine road is not a specific concern for the SRN. See above response to the Furnessing review
5	4. There is no traffic forecasting set for the scenario 'With development generated trips' demand assigned to a 'Without HNFI infrastructure network'. This forecasting set would identify if all the link and junction improvements are necessary. This forecasting set would also assist in determining construction phase timing and sequencing of improvements.	It is understood that all mitigation will be required up front to support the development and the rerouting of traffic across the SRN and LRN. Therefore, no such scenario would be required.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
Strategic modelling methodology and outputs				

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
6	National Highways are not able to fully consider the suitability of the strategic modelling undertaken at present. The justification being that not all parameters which have been used within the PRTM modelling methodology have been agreed with us including the furnessing methodology. This has prevented us being able to fully review and consider the outputs which have been provided to ourselves until our concerns regarding the methodology have been addressed. Furthermore, we have not been able to undertake a full review of all the transport supporting information as a Transport Addendum is awaited which will provide further modelling methodology and outputs based on modelling through Rugby Rural Area Wide Model (RRAM) which is managed and maintained by Warwickshire County Council. This information is crucial for us to fully understand the impacts the development proposals will have on the SRN.	National Highways confirms that the PRTM and RRAM model are the correct tools to be utilised to understand and identify the impact that the development proposals will have upon the operation of the Strategic Road Network. National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnessing data in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023. We understand that these have been submitted; however given the volume information available we had requested for the precise locations of within SharePoint to be provided. This requires clarification.	Ongoing	It is noted that all RRAM items have been accepted. Outputs from the strategic modelling have been shared throughout the pre and post submission process. Inputs were agreed by NH and LCC and are recorded in Highways Position Statement (document reference: 18.2.1, REP1-033) Table 1 A sharepoint link to the 2023 amended furnessing was sent on 18.12.23 this contained one spreadsheet. (link sent Updated VISSIM and Standalone models were sent on the 12.01.24, shortly after the Deadline 4 submission. The files on the TWG sharepoint are arranged in a logical order, with namings amended following comments from NH on 02 February. We would welcome a discussion to run through and address any outstanding queries.
PRTM Review				
7	AECOM on behalf of National Highways undertook a review of PRTM v2.2 Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Application: Forecasting Modelling version 3 dated the 3rd May 2022 and supporting additional data and plots provided in September 2022. This review was completed on the 29th September 2022, and the technical note is provided in Appendix C National Highways has requested a further review be undertaken by AECOM of the supporting PRTM modelling reports. This review has highlighted that no further assessments or refinement have been undertaken by BWB. Based on this the following matters need to be addressed.	National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnessing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023. We understand that these have been submitted; however given the volume information available we had requested for the precise locations of within SharePoint to be provided. This requires clarification.	Ongoing	As stated a review of the PRTM outputs was provided by NH on 29 September 2022- this did not identify fundamental issues with the PRTM outputs. . National Highways Review of PRTM v2.2 Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Application: Forecast Modelling. A sharepoint link to the 2023 amended furnessing was sent on 18.12.23 this contained one spreadsheet. Updated VISSIM and Standalone models were sent on the 12.01.24, shortly after the Deadline 4 submission. The files on the TWG sharepoint are arranged in a logical order, with namings amended following comments from NH on 02 February. We would welcome a discussion to run through and address any outstanding queries.

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
8	1. Whilst the modelled trip distributions appear logical, some of the routeing patterns to and from the development do not use highest standard routes to the destination. If traffic can be persuaded to use the most appropriate roads, this would result in an increase in traffic on some parts of the SRN.	National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnessing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023. We understand that these have been submitted; however given the volume information available we had requested for the precise locations of within SharePoint to be provided. This requires clarification.	Ongoing	A sharepoint link to the 2023 amended furnessing was sent on 18.12.23 this contained one spreadsheet. The PRTM outputs are a function of the agreed inputs which were signed off by the TWG. Highways Position Statement provides a summary of the sign-off dates in Table 1. The model outputs are reported by LCC's NDI unit, which has been through an extensive validation process. Updated VISSIM and Standalone models were sent on the 12.01.24, shortly after the Deadline 4 submission. The files on the TWG sharepoint are arranged in a logical order, with namings amended following comments from NH on 02 February. We would welcome a discussion to run through and address any outstanding queries.
9	2. On some roads, particularly the M69 to the north of Hinckley NRFI going up to M1 Junction 21, the increase in traffic flow on the road is less than the assigned traffic from the development. This is a demonstration that development traffic is causing existing traffic to divert away from the preferred route. The roads being used are of a lower standard.	National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnessing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023. We understand that these have been submitted; however given the volume information available we had requested for the precise locations of within SharePoint to be provided. This requires clarification.	Ongoing	A sharepoint link to the 2023 amended furnessing was sent on 18.12.23 this contained one spreadsheet. Further detail on the J21 diversion is included within the Transport 2023 Update (document reference: 18.13.2, REP4-131).. and the latest REP5 submission (document reference: 18.18, REP5-051) Updated VISSIM and Standalone models were sent on the 12.01.24, shortly after the Deadline 4 submission. The files on the TWG sharepoint are arranged in a logical order, with namings amended following comments from NH on 02 February. We would welcome a discussion to run through and address any outstanding queries.
10	3. Assuming that all traffic uses the most appropriate roads may mean that more mitigation would be required to avoid adding to congestion at the most congested junctions.	National Highways has been directed to the BWB Sharepoint site to review the furnessing data and additional PRTM information in light of discussions at the workshop which took place on the 13th November 2023. We understand that these have been submitted; however given the volume information available we	Ongoing	A sharepoint link to the 2023 amended furnessing was sent on 18.12.23 this contained one spreadsheet. Updated VISSIM and Standalone models were sent on the 12.01.24, shortly after the Deadline 4 submission. The files on the TWG sharepoint are arranged in a logical order, with namings amended following

No	Matter Outstanding	Updated Position	Status & Next Steps	Applicant's Response
		had requested for the precise locations of within SharePoint to be provided. This requires clarification.		comments from NH on 02 February. We would welcome a discussion to run through and address any outstanding queries.
Rugby RAM Modelling				
11	Based on our consideration of the RRAM modelling outputs provided, National Highways is unable to agree to the modelling at this moment in time until the following matters are resolved.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
12	1. The claimed reduction of 22 seconds 'mean delay' benefit obtained from across the RRAM network is substantially less than the range of accuracy that can be obtained from an application of the RRAM traffic model. There is a low level of assurance in stating this conclusion.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
13	2. Journey time Route "R1" along the M69 did not validate against observed journey times in the base Year. Without knowing the narrative behind why the RRAM is simulating vehicles as travelling too slowly along the M69, it is difficult to attribute a level of confidence to the tabulated results.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
14	3. Similarly, the difference in journey times along the A5 strategic route ("R7") could be due to a number of modelling parameters and might not be attributable to using an alternative forecasting scenario alone.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
15	4. The locations where journey times increase are described in bullet points at paragraph 3.5. However, the wording in brackets is confusing. The journey times presented in Table 1 are total journey times for the full route lengths.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
16	5. Care needs to be taken when examining journey times along route segments. The average journey speeds were not validated in the Base Year for links with	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
	short lengths.	matter is now resolved.		
17	6. RRAM was built by Vectos using S-Paramics microsimulation software. BWB is using VISSIM microsimulation software. The claimed betterment appears to have been achieved by changing software packages.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
18	7. Paragraph 3.8 and Table 2 present journey time changes for the PM one-hour peak. The same comments apply as for paragraph 3.4 and Table 1 above.	National Highways have engaged with the applicants consultants, BWB and Warwickshire County Council. We have also undertaken a further review and this matter is now resolved.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
Development impact upon the SRN				
19	***J4 – A5 The Longshoot Junction:*** The assessment of the A5 Longshoot junction is not correct. This is because operationally the A5 Longshoot Junction and A5 Dodwells Junction work as one. Therefore, they must be assessed together. In addition, all three Highway Authorities have agreed a modelling protocol for this junction, which we expect applicants to accord with. A copy of this protocol was provided in the National Highways Deadline 3 Position Statement In addition, the following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted LINSIG model. – Signal Controller not provided so the modelled setup cannot be compared to the on-street setup. – CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the model cannot be checked. – The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked. – The Saturation Flow has been calculated using LinSig's built in RR67 calculation, however, turn radii have not been entered.	At the workshop on the 13th November 2023, it was agreed that the A5 the Longshoot and Dodwells Junctions will be assessed in accordance with the modelling protocol provided in Appendix E of National Highways Deadline 3 Position Statement. The modelling protocol requires the joint use of the LCC PRTM and the NH VISSIM to assess this impact. National Highways have supplied the Applicant team with the most up to date VISSIM model, which includes all agreed assumptions associated with the Padge Hall Farm development. In light of this, the LinSig model will not be accepted. At ISH6 National Highways highlighted operational issues at the Longshoot Junction (along with the Dodwells Junction). Traffic surveys, including video surveys, were undertaken in November 2023. A summary of the findings which demonstrate the above operation can be found in Annexes A-D of this submission. Details on the Furnessing issues are provided in our response to ExQ2.11.1	Ongoing	As agreed in a meeting on 13 November 2023 new surveys were commissioned and outputs used within the revised furnessing for HNRFI, this included the Dodswell/Longshoot VISSIM area. The NH VISSIM model has been used as requested and reported within the Transport 2023 Updated submitted at Deadline 4 (document reference: 18.13.2, REP4-131). The modelling accounted for the future year impacts with the furnessed flows and the access infrastructure in place. This substantially changes the flow patterns in and around the A5 to 2036 and has been modelled with the Padge Hall farm traffic and mitigation. The model outputs were shared with the TWG through the Sharepoint site on 12 January 2024. The conclusions of the revised modelling were that the HNRFI impacts at Padge Hall Farm were minor and would not trigger works to the A5.

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
20	***J13 - M69 Junction 1*** ***The following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted VISSIM model.*** – ***Signal Controller not provided so the modelled setup cannot be compared to the on-street setup.*** – ***CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the model cannot be checked.*** – ***The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked.*** – ***No model has been provided so cannot be checked.***	The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnessing methodology. A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1. In addition, notwithstanding the requirement to agree traffic flows, National Highways have undertaken a review of the highways network coding in the VISSIM supplied by the Applicant team. A number of corrections are required, which are detailed in the Technical Note in Annex E.	Ongoing	See detailed Furnessing Response VISSIM models have been shared on the TWG Sharepoint and clearly signposted.
21	***J14 - A5 Dodwells Junction*** ***The assessment of the A5 Dodwells junction is not correct. This is because operationally the A5 Longshoot Junction and A5 Dodwells Junction work as one. Therefore, they must be assessed together. In addition, all three Highway Authorities have agreed a modelling protocol for this junction, which***	At the workshop on the 13th November 2023, it was agreed that the A5 the Longshoot and Dodwells Junctions will be assessed in accordance with the modelling protocol provided in Appendix E of National Highways Deadline 3 Position Statement. The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National	Ongoing	As agreed in a meeting on 13 November 2023 new surveys were commissioned and outputs used within the revised furnessing for HNRFI, this included the Dodswell/Longshoot VISSIM area. The VISSIM has been used and reported within the Transport 2023 Updated submitted at Deadline 4 (document reference: 18.13.2, REP4-131)).

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
	we expect applicants to accord with. A copy of this protocol is provided in Appendix E of the National Highways Deadline 3 Position Statement. In addition, the following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted LINSIG model. – Signal Controller not provided so the modelled setup cannot be compared to the on-street setup. – CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the model cannot be checked. – The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked. – The Saturation Flow has been calculated using LinSig's built in RR67 calculation, however, some turn radii have not been entered. For example, Lane 10/1. – Some of the Saturation Flows are also quite high (in excess of 2000 PCU/Hr). These may be too high to accurately model behaviour on a roundabout.	Highways is satisfied with the furnessing methodology. A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1. The modelling protocol requires the joint use of the LCC PRTM and the NH VISSIM to assess this impact. National Highways have supplied the Applicant team with the most up to date VISSIM model, which includes all agreed assumptions associated with the Padge Hall Farm development. In light of this, the LinSig model will not be accepted. At ISH6 National Highways highlighted operational issues at the Dodwells Junction (along with the Longshoot Junction). Traffic surveys, including video surveys, were undertaken in November 2023. A summary of the findings which demonstrate the above operation can be found in Annexes A-D of this submission.		The modelling accounted for the future year impacts with the furnessed flows and the access infrastructure in place. This substantially changes the flow patterns in and around the A5 to 2036 and has been modelled with the Padge Hall farm traffic and mitigation. The model outputs were shared with the TWG through the Sharepoint site on 12 January 2024. The conclusions of the revised modelling were that the HNRFI impacts at Padge Hall Farm were minor and would not trigger works to the A5.
22	***Junction 26 – A5 / A426 Gibbet Hill (Existing Layout)*** It has not been possible to verify the roundabout geometry values input into the Existing Layout model without a scaled plan of the junction. This should be provided. Please also supply any traffic flow spreadsheets developed to demonstrate how the traffic flows used in the submitted models have been determined.	A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1. During the meeting on 2 February, National Highways reiterated our position regarding the assessment requirements in VISSIM as expressed during ISH6. Following the meeting National Highways has confirmed the correct VISSIM model to be utilised.	Ongoing	See detailed Furnessing response, The standalone VISSIM for Gibbet Hill as mentioned during the ISH6 does not exist. A much larger corridor model had been shared by NH in 2021. As has been the case from the start, the impacts of the HNRFI site in the future forecast year are low and there is a very small impact on the A426- therefore the need to model the entire corridor network was deemed disproportionate. Despite a review of other planning applications where financial contributions have been requested to this junction, there is little evidence in the public domain that the use of the wider VISSIM model has been followed, and it would be helpful if NH could please provide details of schemes that have adopted this approach. It appears that other developments have not used the

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
				A426 Corridor VISSIM in any detail aside from the Magna Park Extension site which sits close to the junction. The Applicant has used the PRTM forecast flows and standalone modelling to determine capacity constraints and a scheme to mitigate the development impact. Sensitivity test for the furnessing have been shared with NH, which have been agreed (see detailed Furnessing
23	***J26 - A5 Gibbet Hill (Proposed Layout)*** The following information is required to enable us to complete our assessment of the submitted LINSIG model. – CAD drawings have not been provided so the measurements in the models cannot be checked. – The demand spreadsheets have not been provided so the demands in the model cannot be checked. – The Saturation Flows have been entered manually rather than using LinSig's RR67 calculation. The calculations that resulted in these Saturation Flows have not been provided so cannot be checked. Custom lane lengths have not been entered. This isn't necessary incorrect, however, it would depend on the junction's measurement which have not been provided.	At ISH6 it was clarified that National Highways proposals at the Gibbet Hill roundabout are still in development stages. The process advised by LCC, to which WCC and NH have previously agreed on other developments, is for a mitigation scheme to be proposed by the Applicant team to be used as the basis for a contribution in lieu. During the meeting on 2 February, National Highways reiterated our position regarding the assessment requirements in VISSIM as expressed during ISH6. Following the meeting National Highways has confirmed the correct VISSIM model to be utilised. Also at the same meeting, a process was detailed to the Applicant team which would require agreement of the traffic flows (through the ongoing PRTM and furness reviews), the VISSIM model and the proposed mitigation scheme in lieu. It is National Highways understanding that the Applicant team will also provide a breakdown of the cost estimate used to derive the proposed contribution value.	Ongoing	Proportionate mitigation has been developed on the basis of the PRTM inputs and the standalone modelling. A contribution has been developed by the Applicant which is reasonable and based on the proportionate impact of vehicles routing in this direction. See response to the Existing Layout in the previous point.

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
24	***Junction 27 – A5 / A4303 / B4027 Coal Pit Lane Roundabout*** Although the proposed layout drawing has been provided within the Transport Assessment, it has not been possible to fully verify the roundabout geometry values input into the Existing and Proposed models due to the extent of the junction shown on the plan. Please can further information be provided to demonstrate how the roundabout geometry has been calculated. National Highways requests the provision of any traffic flow spreadsheets developed to demonstrate how the traffic flows used in the submitted models have been determined.	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023. The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnessing methodology. A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1.	Ongoing	See detailed Furnessing response. Further detail on the Coal Pit modelling can be found within the BWB Sharepoint site as shared with NH.
25	***Junction 30 – A5 / Higham Lane Roundabout*** Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment does not summarise the capacity results of this junction. Please clarify its absence from the report and update as necessary. It has not been possible to verify the roundabout geometry values input into the Existing Layout model.	The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnessing methodology. A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.
26	without a scaled plan of the junction. This should be provided. National Highways requests the provision of any traffic flow spreadsheets developed to demonstrate how the traffic flows used in the submitted models have been determined.			

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
27	***M69 Junction 1 and M69 Junction 2*** Traffic modelling work was previously submitted for review, with comments provided by National Highways within the formal S42 Consultation Response dated 8 April 2022. This response stated that although VISSIM base model validation for M69 Junction 1 and M69 Junction 2 had been agreed, models assessing the with development scenarios were not provided for review. Although we note that the TA summarises results of these assessment scenarios, will require the accompanying model files to be submitted before impacts at these junctions can be agreed.	The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnessing methodology. A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1. In addition, notwithstanding the requirement to agree traffic flows, National Highways have undertaken a review of the highways network coding in the VISSIM supplied by the Applicant team. A number of corrections are required, which are detailed in the Technical Note in Annex E.	Ongoing	See detailed response on Furnessing. Much of the VISSIM comments appear to be clarification points and NH state that *'no immediate issues have been identified during the network review'.* *Model files have been shared on the BWB Sharepoint site.*
28	***M1 Junction 21*** From review of the PRTM forecast flows at the junction, TA Table 8-6 shows that the most significant impacts shall be in the PM peak, with an overall increase of 114 vehicles across the junction as a result of the development. 107 of these vehicles however are on the A5460 local road link, with minimal change in demands on the M1 or M69 approaches in either peak period.	The traffic flow information which will be utilised is still not agreed until National Highways is satisfied with the furnessing methodology. A detailed update regarding the review of the Furness process has been provided through the National Highways response to ExQ2.11.1. National Highways continues to note a considerable concern about the impact at this junction and the lack of mitigation being identified by the applicants at present. At ISH6 it was clarified that the required level of assessment at the M1J21 is a VISSIM model. This is due to the interactions between the circulatory carriageway and the merge/diverge sections on both motorways needing to be accounted for to understand the operation of this junction. During the meeting on 2 February, it was clarified that a VISSIM model is not currently available from National Highways. However, LCC offered advice to the Applicant team regarding their model in Paramics, which National Highways would consider as a suitable alternative provided that the junction in its entirety (circulatory and merge/diverge)	Ongoing	At ISH2, it was agreed that modelling would be produced for M1J21. LCC had previously requested a VISSIM model of the junction. It is accepted that a VISSIM model would be beneficial in enabling LCC/NH to identify a comprehensive improvement scheme and if such a model were already available. However, this is not the case and consequently, the LINSIG modelling for the Lutterworth Urban Extension was used. This was a scheme that was brought forward by LCC and did not require the use of a micro-simulation model. A PARAMICS model had been built in 2016 for the J21 network by LCC, but this had not been validated and had been raised only once in April 2021 during discussions between the Applicant and the Transport Working Group. The LUE mitigation works themselves were primarily provided to avoid queues on the M1J21 northbound approach and have been secured via planning condition. The traffic for LUE is already included in the PRTM 2.2 WoD and WD models. Consequently, the baseline for HNRFI modelling should also include the associated mitigation works. However, a scenario based on the existing arrangement has also been assessed. (Albeit this still includes the LUE traffic) As agreed with the TWG, traffic surveys were undertaken at M1J21 on 29th November 2023 and the same agreed furnessing methodology was used to

No	Matter Outstanding	Updated Position	Status & Next Steps	Applicant's Response
		are contained for assessment.		produce 2036 WoD and WD turning flows. (Peak hour flows have reduced by 11% and 13% during peak periods compared with the 2019 survey/base model.) At the request of LCC, a theoretical assessment has also been undertaken where no background traffic diverts. This does not follow the agreed methodology used for all other junctions within the Transport Assessment. Therefore, it is provided as a sensitivity test only (document reference: 18.13.2, REP4-131) and DL5 J21 Modelling Note (document reference: 18.18, REP5-052) The modelling demonstrates the magnitude of impact is negligible in both scenarios and whilst the junction operation is worse without the committed LUE improvements, the impact on queues and delay remains marginal. Hence, the impact is not considered to be a 'severe' and it is maintained that highway mitigation is not justified. Further work has been carried out using video data at M69 J1 submitted at Deadline 5 (document reference: 18.18, REP5-051) DL5 J21 Modelling NoteThis has sought to detail the interactions of queuing with the M1 mainline flows and where they affect capacity on the circulatory carriageway. The evidence suggests that queuing due to well documented mainline flow capacities causes peak hour blocking of the M69 (eastbound) stopline. Merge/Diverge assessments were undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment. (document reference: 6.2.8.1A, REP3-157) Table 8-9
	A merge-diverge assessment has been carried out, which based on these flows demonstrates that the development impacts shall not trigger the requirement for upgrade to the junction's merges or diverges.			
Development Mitigation Strategy for the SRN				

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
29	The Applicant and their consultants have not discussed the mitigation strategy with National Highways at this present time. It should also be noted that some locations have mitigation identified whilst others, the documents note, mitigation is required but a scheme has not been identified. At present we are unable to agree the development mitigations strategy. This is because we have been awaiting the completion and sign off the strategic modelling with the Applicant's consultants and other stakeholders to understand the traffic flows at the junction in the base and future year assessments. This data is key to setting the design parameters and design standards and understanding whether any departures from standard are required in accordance with DMRB.	National Highways has actively engaged with applicants to identify the range of mitigation being identified to resolve the development impact. There is agreement that this consists of a variety of tools including sustainable and active travel interventions as well as physical mitigation schemes where required. Inclusion of these will be required through the requirements.	Ongoing	The most recent STS contains further information on the active travel and public transport provision for the site. A clear table of commitments is included which will help resolve the understanding of the requirements. Deadline 5 STS (document reference: 6.2.8.1C, REP5-059)
Deliverability of the Railhead and capacity on the Nuneaton & Leicester Railway Line				
30	National Highways is concerned whether the railhead on the Nuneaton & Leicester Railway Line is deliverable as we have not seen the assessments nor agreement from Network Rail. We also have concerns that the acceptance of the scheme would limit future capacity on the line to the detriment of passenger services which are crucial as a viable alternative to car based strategic trips between Birmingham, Nuneaton, Hinckley and Leicester.		Resolved 31.01.2024	Noted as resolved.
M69 Junction 2 – Slips				
31	National Highways has no objection to the principle of the slip roads and their implementation however there are still the following aspects which need to be confirmed, some of which are also linked to environmental matters as well:	The suitability of proposals will be assessed once the traffic flows (through the PRTM and furness process) and subsequent capacity modelling are agreed.	Ongoing	See detailed Furnessing Note.

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
32	Agreement of the strategic modelling to agree and identify traffic flow to enable the agreement of the design parameters and required standards or where departures are required in accordance with DMRB	The suitability of proposals will be assessed once the traffic flows (through the PRTM and furness process) and subsequent capacity modelling are agreed	Ongoing	See detailed Furnessing note
33	Departure from Standard submitted for approval in principle in regard to the removal of the hard shoulder	Approval in Principle has been given by SES at National Highways for this departure.	Matter resolved 09.11.2023	Noted as resolved.
34	through M69 J2 to create all lane running for the inclusion and provision of the new slips.			
35	Understanding of the suitability of the bridge structures to accommodate the additional traffic and the introduction of the slips, access arrangements and improvements to the circulatory.	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.
36	Agreement of the WCHAR and RSA Stage 1 Briefs and CVs when National Highways is satisfied with the design of the slips and access arrangements for M69 Junction 2	Agreement of traffic flows and operation (through PRTM, furness and VISSIM) are required to progress this to WCHAR and RSA1.	Ongoing	Interim RSAs have been carried out to avoid delays and following recommendation by the ExA at ISH2. Further design discussions have proceeded between the applicant and NH.
37	***Landscaping:*** National Highways notes that the introduction of the northbound on-slip and southbound off-slip will impact the landscape in the vicinity of M69 Junction 2. This is mainly due to the removal of substantial and well-established vegetation on the embankments adjacent to the M69. Landscaping has an important role of limiting the impact on the landscape of the visibility of the SRN whilst also having a role in mitigating noise impact of the network.	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.
38	***Lighting / Lighting Impact:*** the landscape impact assessments need to consider the potential visual impact that the lighting of M69 Junction 2 will have on the landscape. Whilst the existing circulatory of the junction is lit, the need to accord with the requirements of standards set out in DRMB, may require the new proposed slips, and existing slips to be lit and for this to extend onto the M69 mainline in the interests of	Discussions have taken place between the applicants' consultants and the asset management for lighting and an agreement in principle has been reached regarding to the requirement and extents of lighting.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
	highway safety. It should be noted that the existing M69 mainline and existing slips are not lit.			
39	***Biodiversity:*** Based on our assessment we would also note that the proposed works at M69 Junction 2, also need to be considered through relevant biodiversity assessments. National Highways also requires details of biodiversity off-setting for the loss of habitats which potentially exist on the verges of the M69 at junction 2.	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.
40	***Drainage:*** National Highways needs to fully consider the full drainage strategy for the development proposals and how it relates to the SRN. However we are unable to fully consider the drainage implications of the proposals related to the SRN until further clarity is provided in the feasibility and development of the highway schemes notable for M69 Junction 2.	A further workshop meeting between the applicant's consultants, BWB, and National Highways will be taking place on the 16th November 2023.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.
HGV Routing Strategy & Enforcement				
41	National Highways requires further clarity on the proposed HGV routing strategy and notably around its enforcement. At present National Highways cannot agree to this as who is responsible for the strategy and enforcement is not clear. We also require additional information for the potential location of any associated infrastructure and who would be responsible for its maintenance.	National Highways has been working with the applicant's consultants, BWB, to identify the HGV Routing Strategy and suitable routes. National Highways also accepts that none of the infrastructure will be on its network.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.
Construction Management Plan				
42	National Highways requires further clarity on the construction management plan due to how it will function with the implementation of the development proposals and the associated infrastructure.	National Highways has been working with the applicant's consultants, BWB, to identify the HGV Routing Strategy and suitable routes.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.

National Highways - Table D5.1: Summary of outstanding matters and progress responses

No	*Matter Outstanding*	*Updated Position*	*Status & Next Steps*	*Applicant's Response*
	In addition, the routing of construction traffic also needs to be fully considered during the phasing of the development and implementation of the associated infrastructure. As works to M69 Junction 2 may warrant for this junction to be closed for significant periods to traffic movements whilst works should the development be approved are implemented.	We are also awaiting the publication of the GANNT Chart which has been requested for Deadline 3.		
Emergency Response Plan				
43	It was noted that during the examination by the ExA about providing details and modelling on what would happen should the M69 be closed.	National Highways and the applicants have discussed the matter. An emergency plan with routes identified is being prepared by the applicants. National Highways has submitted a note which sets out our current operational plans for the M69.	Resolved Dec 23	Noted as resolved.

Question No.	Questions	National Highways Response	Applicant's Response
2.3 Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations			
2.3.1	**Plots 65 and 90** In its D3 submission [REP3-137], NH indicates that it objects to the CA of these plots but indicates that it would be willing to enter into suitable agreements with the Applicant to allow the proposed works to be undertaken. In addition, in relation to Plot 65, F & J Gent [REP3- 115] indicates that the land to the east of M69 drains through this culvert, adding to NH's concern. c) Could NH confirm whether these "suitable agreements" would be protective provisions secured under the DCO or would another method be required? If not, what would this be and what other changes would be required to the dDCO and associated documents? d) Could the Applicant please set out, without prejudice to its case that the use of the plots is required, alternative drafting for the dDCO (and associated documents) in the event that the SoS were to conclude that the CA of these plots was not justified.	c) National Highways' (NH) D3 submission [REP3-137] references plots 65 and 69. Reference here to plot 90 is taken to be an error. NH's position is that compulsory acquisition of these two plots is unnecessary. Instead, NH is willing to enter into a suitably worded licence and/or easement over the plots as necessary. Paragraph 7(2) of NH's Protective Provisions that were included as part of the Deadline 1 submission, and are currently being negotiated with the Applicant, do not authorise the exercise of compulsory acquisition pursuant to Article 25 of the DCO over any part of the strategic road network or land in which NH has an interest without the consent of NH. This provision allows a licence and/or easement to be secured under the DCO as part of the consenting process. NH would like this time to reiterate the position set out in its Deadline 1 and Deadline 2 submission. It is NH's position that its draft Protective Provisions be included in their entirety on the DCO, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH. NH considers that without such NH Protective Provisions, there is a considerable risk of serious detriment to the SRN and its licence obligations. Should NH's previously submitted Protective Provisions not be agreed by the Applicant and accepted in their entirety, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH, then the current articles of the revised DCO submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3 are not capable of being accepted as drafted. NH's Deadline 3 submission sets out NH's objections to the various articles.	The Applicant's position in respect of all these plots is clear from its responses to this series of ExQ2.3 questions (document reference: 18.16, REP5-036) submitted at Deadline 5. The Applicant considers NH's 'blanket' stance in respect of compulsory acquisition in land in which NH has an interest fundamentally unreasonable. Compulsory acquisition may not be required had NH engaged meaningfully with the Applicant and most importantly, none of the plots affected by the proposed powers form part of the SRN as has repeatedly been confirmed by the Applicant. The Applicant is disappointed to note that at this stage in the Examination and following numerous attempts by the Applicant to engage with NH and agree protective provisions, NH is still reiterating its position from early deadlines in the Examination. The Applicant's position on the protective provisions was outlined by the Applicant in its Protective Provisions Table submitted at Deadline 5 in response to ExQ2.5.8 (document reference: 18.16.2, REP5-038). Not only has the Applicant accepted many of NH's requirements in respect of the protective provisions, despite having negotiated the previous drafting over a number of years, the Applicant's "site specific" requests are clear and reasonable. Furthermore, it is not accepted that the Applicant's requests pose any risk whatsoever to the SRN or NH's licence obligations, since the Applicant's original drafting, and the Applicant's very few remaining "site specific" requests, reflect provisions that have been authorised by the Secretary of State for Transport in other made DCO, specifically the West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order 2020 and the Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Order 2019, upon which the Applicant's drafting has been based since the outset, and upon which the Applicant's few remaining requirements are based.
2.3.2	**Plots 66 and 98** In its D3 submission [REP3-137], NH indicates that it objects to the CA of these plots but indicates that it	a) NH's D3 submission [REP3-137] references plots 66 and 98. Reference to plot 98 in NH's D3 submission is an error and, in fact, should refer	See above in response to 2.3.1.

Question No.	Questions	National Highways Response	Applicant's Response
	would be willing to enter into suitable agreements with the Applicant to allow the proposed works to be undertaken. a) Could NH confirm whether these "suitable agreements" would be protective provisions secured under the DCO or would another method be required? If not, what would this be and what other changes would be required to the dDCO and associated documents? b) Could the Applicant please set out, without prejudice to its case that the use of the plots is required, alternative drafting for the dDCO (and associated documents) in the event that the SoS were to conclude that the CA of these plots was not justified.	to plot 68 instead. NH apologises for any confusion this may have caused. As with the above response to plots 65 and 69, NH's position is that compulsory acquisition of these two plots is unnecessary. Instead, NH is willing to enter into a suitably worded licence and/or easement over the plots as necessary. The points made above equally apply here, in that paragraph 7(2) of NH's Protective Provisions that were included as part of the Deadline 1 submission, and are currently being negotiated with the Applicant, do not authorise the exercise of compulsory acquisition pursuant to Article 25 of the DCO over any part of the strategic road network or land in which NH has an interest without the consent of NH. This provision allows a licence and/or easement to be secured under the DCO as part of the consenting process. As already mentioned, it is NH's position that its draft Protective Provisions be included in their entirety on the DCO, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH. NH considers that without such NH Protective Provisions, there is a considerable risk of serious detriment to the SRN and its licence obligations. Should NH's previously submitted Protective Provisions not be agreed by the Applicant and accepted in their entirety, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH, then the current articles of the revised DCO submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3 are not capable of being accepted as drafted. NH's Deadline 3 submission sets out NH's objections to the various articles.	
2.3.3	**Plot 61** In its D3 submission [REP3-137], NH indicates that it objects to the TP of this plot but indicates that it would be willing to enter into suitable agreements with the	a) NH's position is that temporary possession of this plot is not required. It is understood that the plot is sought for access purposes to carry out the closure of the level crossing and the diversion works. NH is therefore willing to enter into a suitably worded licence over the plot	The plot is a private track, and in the absence of any engagement from NH on the necessary licence arrangements, it is clearly necessary for the Applicant to seek temporary possession powers in order to access the track for the undertaking of the level crossing closure and diversion of the right of way.

Question No.	Questions	National Highways Response	Applicant's Response
	Applicant to allow the proposed works to be undertaken. a) Could NH confirm whether these "suitable agreements" would be protective provisions secured under the DCO or would another method be required? If not, what would this be and what other changes would be required to the dDCO and associated documents? b) Could the Applicant please set out, without prejudice to its case that the use of the plot is required, alternative drafting for the dDCO (and associated documents) in the event that the SoS were to conclude that the TP of this plot was not justified.	allowing the Applicant the ability to pass and repass. Paragraph 7(2) of NH's Protective Provisions, as already mentioned and are currently being negotiated with the Applicant, do not authorise the exercise of temporary possession pursuant to Article 34 of the DCO over any part of the strategic road network or land in which NH has an interest without the consent of NH. This provision allows a licence to be secured under the DCO as part of the consenting process. Again, it is NH's position that its draft Protective Provisions be included in their entirety on the DCO, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH. NH considers that without such NH Protective Provisions, there is a considerable risk of serious detriment to the SRN and its licence obligations Should NH's previously submitted Protective Provisions not be agreed by the Applicant and accepted in their entirety, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH, then the current articles of the revised DCO submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3 are not capable of being accepted as drafted. NH's Deadline 3 submission sets out NH's objections to the various articles.	Please see above in response to 2.3.1 in respect of the remaining repeated points.
2.3.4	**Plots 39, 54, 67, 71, 84, 101, 101a, 102, 103 and 104** In its D3 submission [REP3-137], NH indicates that it objects to the interference, suspension, or extinguishment of rights upon CA where NH benefits from rights of access and maintenance rights. a) Could NH indicate the rights it holds in relation to each plot individually and set out how the CA of each plot would affect its undertaking. b) Could NH confirm whether, with appropriate protective provisions secured under the DCO, this would protect its interests in relation to these plots.	a) NH holds the following rights in relation to each plot identified: Plot 39 - Right of entry for excavation and right to maintain boundary fences, hedges and walls as contained in a Conveyance dated 25 October 1979 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT339299) Plot 54 - Rights relating to a boundary ditch and headwall as contained in a Transfer dated 6 January 1999 for the benefit of adjoining land (Title Number LT333110) Plot 67 - Right of entry for maintenance of boundary fences, hedges and walls as contained	See above in response to 2.3.1. NH's own acceptance that they do not know how (and the Applicant would assert, <u>if at all</u>), these interests relate to the SRN clearly demonstrates NH's failure to engage in meaningful discussions in relation to these interests. To be clear, the proposed powers relate to compulsory acquisition or extinguishment of the *rights* and not the *plots* as noted by NH in its response.

Question No.	Questions	National Highways Response	Applicant's Response
	c) Could the Applicant confirm whether it believes the Proposed Development could be delivered by the CA being amended so as to exclude the CA of these rights, while compulsorily acquiring all other rights. This may need to be set out by individual plot. d) Could the Applicant please set out, without prejudice to its case that the use of the plot is required, alternative drafting for the dDCO (and associated documents) in the event that the SoS were to conclude that the CA of: (i) these rights; and/ or (ii) each plot was not justified.	in a Transfer dated 28 April 1982 for the benefit of adjoining land (Title No. LT126994) Plot 71 - Right of entry for excavation and maintenance of boundary fences, hedges and walls as contained in a Conveyance dated 13 January 1982 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT278346) Plot 84 - Right of entry for excavation, cleansing widening and deepening of ditch, and right to maintain boundary fences, hedges and walls as contained in Conveyance dated 24 March 1981 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT424040) Plots 101 - Right of entry for maintenance of boundary fences, hedges and walls, right of erection or planting of hedge/fence and excavation right of ditch as contained in Conveyance dated 24 March 1981 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT372804) Plots 101a - Right of entry for maintenance of boundary fences, hedges and walls, right of erection or planting of hedge / fence and excavation right of ditch as contained in Conveyance dated 24 March 1981 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT372804) Plot 102 - Right of entry for maintenance of boundary fences, hedges and walls, and right of erection or planting of hedge / fence as contained in a Conveyance dated 24 March 1981 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT458616) Plot 103 - Right of entry for maintenance of boundary fences, hedges and walls, right of erection or planting of hedge / fence and excavation right of ditch as contained in Conveyance dated 24 March 1981 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT372804) Plot 104 - Right of entry for maintenance relating to boundary hedges, fences and walls, right of erection or planting of hedge / fence and excavation right of ditch as contained in a	

Question No.	Questions	National Highways Response	Applicant's Response
		Conveyance dated 24 March 1981 for the benefit of the M69 (Title No. LT331148) NH is currently unable to provide details of how the compulsory acquisition of these plots will affect its undertaking. Enquiries have been made for this information and NH will endeavour to provide this detail by Deadline 6. b) Paragraph 7(2) of NH's Protective Provisions, as already mentioned and are currently being negotiated with the Applicant, do not authorise the extinguishment of private rights pursuant to Article 30 of the DCO over any part of the strategic road network or land in which NH has an interest without the consent of NH. This provision seeks to protect NH's private rights in relation to these plots. Again, the same points are repeated here for consistency in that it is NH's position that its draft Protective Provisions be included in their entirety on the DCO, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH. Should NH's previously submitted Protective Provisions not be agreed by the Applicant and accepted in their entirety, subject to any site specific amendments sought by the Applicant and considered acceptable to NH, then the current articles of the revised DCO submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3 are not capable of being accepted as drafted. NH's Deadline 3 submission sets out NH's objections to the various articles.	
2.11 – Traffic and Transport			
2.11.1	**Furnessing** The Applicant states that additional surveys have been undertaken at the relevant junctions to allow for confirmation of traffic flows utilising the agreed furnessing methodology.	b) Further information has been submitted to NH to address outstanding matters related to Furnessing. This has all been reviewed, and a number of matters now resolved. However, some matters remain outstanding, with comments provided by NH to advise and request the necessary additional information	Further discussions and technical feedback have been provided to the NH team ahead of Deadline 6. This is with the view to finalise the last furnessing points raised. Broadly the issues are based on clarifications rather than fundamental changes to methodology, which is noted as being reasonable by NH and LCC in their representations.

Question No.	Questions	National Highways Response	Applicant's Response
	a) Can the Applicant set out those junctions where surveys have taken place and when the surveys will report. b) Can the Applicant, NH and LCC please set out their respective positions on this matter including what the implications are for the overall modelling and when final positions are likely to be identified?.	Please refer to Annex A for full details of the Furnessing matters to be addressed.	
2.11.2	**PRTM Reviews** The Applicant indicates that "Sharepoint and full models previously shared with schedule of inputs and dates. A full schedule was shared with the TWG on the 23.11.23". Could the parties provide their understandings of the latest positions as to whether the model is agreed, and if not, when final positions are likely to be identified?	In NH Deadline 3 response of 14 November 2023 (REP3-139), a number of outstanding matters were raised related to the PRTM. The applicant's response within the document states that NH has been directed to the BWB sharepoint where these matters have all been addressed, however this has not been discussed, nor can this be found on the sharepoint. Given the volume of work being submitted, all parties agreed that the applicant shall notify NH of updates made to the sharepoint, and also clarify where specifically outstanding matters have been addressed. This remains outstanding.	Sharepoint links have been shared with the TWG and further clarifications provided since meeting NH in early February. The Sharepoint site has been accessible throughout the pre-application and post-submission process. Changes in personnel at NH and their technical advisers have meant continuity has been disrupted occasionally, though all new reviewers have full access to the site.

No	National Highways	BWB response- dated 29 Jan 2024	National Highways further comment and response. 9th February 2024.	BWB Response 13/02/24
1	The Applicant has not responded to National Highway's comments as set out in the DCO document **REP1-182**.	Six comments were provided by NH in summary of the comments within **REP1-182**, these have been addressed below: 1. NH considers furnessing approach sound as outlined with the **REP1-182**. No further comment required from BWB. 2. NH agrees with methodology undertaken for site access junctions. No further comment required from BWB. 3. BWB have undertaken checks on the furnessed matrices, and the two areas of concern highlighted are not applicable to the furnessed traffic matrices. 4. As stated in Point 3, sense checks have been undertaken for the furnessed matrices. The furnessing methodology is double constrained, therefore if there is an increase in flows forecast for a particular movement, this will be reflected in the furnessed flows. 5. Internal Road Capacity Review-(REP2-073 18.4.2) provides detail on internal access junction assessments. 6. The proposed development will come forward with the proposed infrastructure including the south facing slips at M69 J2 and A47 link road. Therefore, an assessment scenario of 'with development without infrastructure' is not required.	The DCO Document **REP1-182** contained Appendix B "AECOM Furness Methodology Review". The "Summary of National Highway's Comments" is on PDF page 126 (of 183). The BWB response relates only to those specific six points. 1. Resolved. 2. Resolved. 3. This response is not appropriate to address this matter as we note that BWB has undertaken checks where: a. Observed turn matrix cell entries contain low flows. b. The PRTM has forecast a rerouting of trips away from the junction(s) of interest. 4. Sensitivity turn matrices were produced for the A5 'Gibbet' roundabout. A BWB spreadsheet dated 7th Feb 2024 refers. These adjusted turn matrices at the A5 'Gibbet' roundabout should be used for future operational assessments (using Junctions10 and VISSIM software). Resolved for the A5 'Gibbet' roundabout. 5. Reference to the DCO submitted document is noted. The information provided does not include assessment at the first (eastern-most) internal roundabout – which provides a direction change in the horizontal alignment – and therefore does not demonstrate whether it will produce queues blocking back to M69 junction 2. 6. As noted in the DCO submission document **REP3-139**, at Outstanding Matter point 4, this matter is resolved.	At the meeting of 2nd February it was understood that the only outstanding points in respect of furnessing/modelling were the six specific points identified in the "Summary of National Highway's Comments" on PDF page 126 (of 183) of REP1-182 and as set out in National Highways Update – Furnessing Methodology (document reference: REP4-189) on the 9th of January. 1. Noted as resolved 2. Noted as resolved 3. This response is not appropriate to address this matter as we note that BWB has undertaken checks. BWB have undertaken a sense check of the observed turning movements vs PRTM2.2. This included a sense check on turning movements at a few local junctions where changes to the junction and or surrounding network meant PRTM turning movements differed from the observed position in the 2018/2019 surveys with Leicestershire County Council prior to the revision shared in June 2023 of the furnessing sheet. sheet. The sense check was also carried out and through to the new observed flow (2023) furnessing sheet shared in December 2023. Point a) The only locations that include zero's are that of the new arm on the M69 J2 and the new access roundabout on the B4668. As set out in the Furness methodology note (AS-017), both of these junctions have been treated differently as agreed by all parties. Point b) BWB have reviewed junctions where the PRTM forecast significant rerouting would occur, i.e. site access junction, a different methodology was set out and agreed as above and documented in (document reference: 6.2.8.1, AS-017). More recently as per point 4, BWB have also undertaken sensitivity tests based on the updated furnessing spreadsheet that took account of the 2023 observed surveys shared in December 2023 for National Highways on Gibbett Roundabout and at Cross in Hand roundabout for

No	National Highways	BWB response- dated 29 Jan 2024	National Highways further comment and response. 9th February 2024.	BWB Response 13/02/24
				Warwickshire County Council both now on the TWG sharepoint page. Both the sense checks and the sensitivity tests were recommended in point 4 of REP1-182 and reiterated in REP4-189 in Figure 2. The Applicant would seek to understand if NH has any other issues in particular with this approach and or they are referring to a particular junction. 4. Noted as resolved. 5. As previously stated the Internal Road Capacity Review- (document reference: 18.4.2, REP2-073) provides detail on internal access junction assessments and the impact of the two controlled crossings on the A47 Link Road. The change of direction is unopposed at first internal roundabout, it therefore will not create capacity issues at this location. The Pegasus crossing was modelled as this will create delay which will lead to some queuing, though, as concluded, traffic will not block back to M69 J2. However, a review of the first roundabout capacity has been requested by LCC to understand what would happen should a third arm be proposed in the future to accommodate an internal access road. The roundabout model will be shared and the results submitted as part of DL6. 6. Noted as resolved. Regarding responses not been provided to NH's requests for more information, concerns, and significant concerns documented in the other Appendices attached to REP1-182. The subsequent position Statement from National Highways REP3-139 provided an update to the submission by National Highways at deadline 1 for Traffic and Transport Matters following that original submission by National Highways. "*This note and associated table provide an update on National Highways position in relation to matters around Traffic & Transport which were set out in our written submissions provided at deadline one.*
			Satisfactory responses have not been provided to NH's requests for more information, concerns, and significant concerns documented in the other Appendices attached to **REP1-182**.	

<table>
<tr><th>No</th><th>National Highways</th><th>BWB response- dated 29 Jan 2024</th><th>National Highways further comment and response. 9th February 2024.</th><th>BWB Response 13/02/24</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>
Figure 1
<table>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th></th><th>Planning Inspectorate Project Reference: TR050007
Environmental Statement Volume 2: Appendices
Appendix 8.1: Transport Assessment (part 9 of 29) "Furness Methodology"
Document Reference: 6.2.8.1. Revision: 07. Dated: September 2023
BWB document number: HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0022-S4-P03_Furnessing Methodology
BWB Reference: NTT2814. Revision 4. Status S4. Issue date: 04/09/2023</th><th>Applicant's Response/Action</th></tr>
<tr><td>3.3</td><td>(C)</td><td>The objective of the Furness process is to provide forecast turning flows at each junction of interest without and with the proposed Hinckley NRFI highway improvements in place. For the forecasts with the trips generated by the Hinckley NRFI development, these were only assigned to the highway networks with the proposed Hinckley NRFI highway improvements.
i.e.
Traffic forecast scenario (2026 & 2036)
Assigned to highway network: | Without (WO) Dev trips | With Hinckley NRFI trips
Future (committed schemes) | A: Without (WO) Dev
Future + NRFI improvements | D: WO Dev + Infrastructure | C: With Dev + Infrastructure
These three forecast flows sets (A, C, D) may be used to understand the environmental impacts of the Hinckley NRFI infrastructure improvements and may be used for operational junction modelling with Hinckley NRFI trips included in the forecasts.
These three forecasts flow sets will not identify if a junction or link to be improved is unnecessary. This might be a concern if:
a) Environmental impacts are unnecessarily incurred.
b) Carbon budget expended on unnecessary construction.
c) Traffic management during construction delays existing users.
d) There are no traffic forecasts to inform the construction phasing programme.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>4.5</td><td>(C)</td><td>For the junctions along the development's Spine Road, it is noted that forecast traffic flow matrices will be derived from the reassigned traffic attracted to the Spine Road – as forecasts by PRTMv2.2 – and combined with a 'first principals' method to distribute the trips generated by the proposed development. This method is considered to be a reasonable approach.
This paragraph does not explain how the double counting of trips generated by the proposed development (i.e. generated in the PRTMv2.2 forecasts, which loads the trips at a single development zone, and trips added by the 'first principals' method) was addressed.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>
Since our submission, National Highways has been actively engaged with the applicants on several matters to identify a way forward to address the outstanding matters."

The outstanding matters were then set out in a Table in Appendix A. We have been working through these outstanding matters since that time with National Highways and Aecom. We were not aware that any information or clarifications identified in the REP1-182 were still required following AECOMs review.

However as outlined in REP4-189 National Highways update on Furnessing identifies the two items of concern related to Furnessing in Appendix B and in Figure 1 and these were Points 3.3 and 4.5 from REP1-182

Point 3.3

The furnessed turning flows were originally undertaken for <u>all</u> the junctions identified in the AOI as set out in the Transport Assessment were included in the Furnessing spreadsheet and it was only the most recent furnessing sheet with the new 2023 observed surveys that were carried out on the proposed mitigation junctions only. sheet with the new 2023 observed surveys that were carried out on the proposed mitigation junctions only.

Junctions and Links being improved have been identified from the outcomes of the suite of assessments undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement. Forecast construction traffic is within the Construction Management Plan REP3-040 and phasing detailed in the Gantt chart provided REP3-048.

However, if clarification or information is still required on Furnessing please let us know.

Point 4.5

The PRTM WD flows were reviewed at the entry points to the A47 Link Road or development zone 1 (M69 J2 and the B4668) to understand directional distribution of all flows. The development vehicle trips taken from the TA REP3-157 are set out in Tables 1 and 2 of the REP2-073 Link Road Capacity Assessment were then extracted and manually assigned using the first principle method set out. The Rail Port trips and B8 trips were assigned to their development zones as set out and then an assumption made that
</td></tr>
</table>

No	National Highways	BWB response- dated 29 Jan 2024	National Highways further comment and response. 9th February 2024.	BWB Response 13/02/24
				some of the B8 trips would diverted via the lorry park. The resultant traffic assignment is set out in the traffic figures within the REP2-073. There is no double counting of trips generated.
2	No junction turn matrices forecasts were produced in the "Furnessing Spreadsheet" at the M1 junction 20 two-bridge roundabout nor at the A5 'Redgate' elongated roundabout.	M1 junction 20 and Redgate roundabout were not identified as junctions impacted by the proposed development through the consultation and filtering process, so these were not included.	National Highways letter dated 8 April 2022 – refer DCO document **REP1- 182**, Appendix A, which included a section on 'Highway Impact' (PDF page 82 of 183). Thie potential corridors to be considered included M69 entire length (i.e. M1 to M6), M1 between Lutterworth (j20) and Leicester (j21) and A5 between Gibbet Hill (A426) and Tamworth (M42).	The Transport Assessment (REP3-157) covered the wider network reviewed as part of the PRTM this is illustrated in Figure 7-2. A set out in paragraphs 7.29 to 7.32 a total of 55 Junctions within the AOI were assessed for impact of the HNRFI development. Redgate Roundabout and M1 Junction 20 are both included in that review as J32 and J25 respectively. Table 7-2, 7.-3 and 7-4 within the above document then quantifies the impacts at these junctions as being well below the agreed threshold for a detailed modelling review. The sifting criteria were agreed with the TWG in the Forecast Modelling Brief (APP-145) Paragraph 6.1 prior to the release of the PRTM 2.2 data. In the Transport Assessment has set out that a more onerous criteria has been used to that originally set out and agreed in the Forecast Brief to assess the network and the impacts in the forecast future years. This included everything above 85% VoC, Change in VoC of 1% and Flow Change of 3%. This is compared with above 85% VoC, a change in VoC of 5% and more than 30 vehicles, which was featured in the brief. This criteria picked up limited junctions and did not pick up the junctions LCC expected for detailed assessment.
3	The "Furness spreadsheet" does not document the grade separated flows at M69 junction 1 and at M69 junction 2. This means that the turning movement matrices cannot be used to assess the future	The Furness spreadsheet only includes flows arriving and departing at identified junctions, therefore any grade separated flows (M69 mainline) have been excluded from the Furness process to ensure these do not skew the results. However, M69 mainline flows have been Furnessed separately and included within the respective VISSIM models.	A spreadsheet was supplied to the Traffic working group, on 5 February 2024, documenting a method of forecasting the M69 mainline (grade separated) flows. The method used outputs from the PRTM forecast scenrios to assess the incremental chenge due to the Development (i.e. WD-WoD). The following points are noted: 1. The peak hour flows on the M69 differ between the 2023 Observed and the Forecast 2019 PRTM outputs: In 2023 the Observed AM flows southbound were 1,999 PCU/hour, compared to 2019 PRTM outputs on the same southbound M69 link of 2,416PCU/hour (21% higher); In 2023 the Observed PM flows northbound were 1,868 PCU/hour, compared to 2019 PRTM	An updated spreadsheet was produced following the observed traffic surveys being updated for the proposed mitigation junctions and access junctions at the request REP3-046 of the Transport Working Group and agreed with the Applicant during a meeting on the 13 November 2023. This was shared in December 2023 following the surveys being undertaken and the furnessing being updated. 1. The Applicant maintains that the flows used in the original furnessing spreadsheet (2019) were sufficiently robust to provide a worst-case impact for review through the modelling process. Across the surveys undertaken during November 2023, the majority demonstrated a significant reduction in flows from the 2019 flows. Therefore, it is not unexpected that there are differences noted by NH in this assessment. The assessment has been carried out on the original higher

No	National Highways	BWB response- dated 29 Jan 2024	National Highways further comment and response. 9th February 2024.	BWB Response 13/02/24
	operation efficiency of the M69 slip road merge areas.		outputs on the same northbound M69 link of 2,517PCU/hour (35% higher). Why are the 2023 Observed flows less than than the 2019 PRTM link flows? Note: The method used carries forward these lower 2023 Observed flows for use in the subsequent assessments. 2. A "Heavy Goods Vehicle" (HGV) has been classified as all vehicles of length 6.6m or longer. The resulting 2023 "Observed" HGV flows on the M69 are about 10% to 20% less than in the PRTM Base year model. Given this lesser proportion of HGVs, please evidence why 6.6m was selected to understand whether "Observed" HGV should include a proportion of shorter vehicles. 3. The PRTM forecasts imply that the development will reduce flows on the M69 and these trips are (possibly) rerouting through Sapcote. If measures are implemented to discourage the routing of trips through Sapcotem then the WD forecast flows on M69 junction 2 grade separated movement would be higher. The M69 mainline (grade separated) PCU flow under junction 2, for the with development (WD) case, may be underestimated for the reasons provided above.	2019 flows and impacts assessed on this basis. 2. LGV are classified as vehicles that had a gross weight of under 3.5T and HGVs are classified as anything with over 3.5T gross vehicle weight. For example a Mercedes-Benz sprinter Van (LGV) overall length varies between 5.93m-7.36m. Therefore, it is considered reasonable to assume vehicles of length of less than 6.6m are light good vehicles. 3. The reductions northbound on the M69 have been noted from the original run of the PRTM. Speed/flow changes were made at the pre-forecast stages of the PRTM modelling to reduce the attractiveness of Sapcote and Stoney Lane as per the existing on street parking and nature of the routes through each village in agreement with LCC so through traffic should be as expected. Modelling submitted REP4-131 and J21 Models for M1 J21 provides further detail around the issue of diverting traffic. It should be noted that all development traffic allocated to the M69 does not divert. A worst case has been modelled for Sapcote, based on the evidence provided through the PRTM. Representations at Deadline 3 provide further details. REP3-051 Grade separated flows are based on the inputs to the PRTM which had been fully agreed with the TWG. Prior to April 2022 when the model was processed.
4	The Furnessing process could underestimate the magnitude of the HGV turn movements between A5 North and A4303 East at the A5 'Cross In Hand' roundabout if new HGV trips are induced	As agreed on 13th November 2023, new surveys were commissioned at all junctions for which a mitigation measure was identified. This included 'Cross in Hand' roundabout and 'Gibbet' roundabout. The traffic flow turning matrices were Furnessed again based on the 2023 surveys. This along with the PRTM distributed development traffic flows would adequately forecast HGV trips induced between the sites mentioned. The traffic modelling has been updated and submitted as part of Deadline 4 Transport 2023 Update (document reference: 18.13.2, **REP4-131**).	The collection of new 2023 surveys and a fresh application of a Furness process is welcomed. At the A5 'Cross In Hand' roundabout, the PRTM may be forecasting extra HGV trips generated by the devlopment between arm A (A5 N) and arm B (A4303). PRTM is also forecasting extra HGV trips between arm A and arm C (A5 S). The subsequent application of the Furness process (doubly constrained) will then incorrecty increase HGV trips between arm B and arm C. An alternative method of forecasting HGV turn movements at the A5 'Cross In Hand' roundabout should be considered.	It should be noted that a sensitivity test has been undertaken on the request of Warwickshire County Council at Cross in Hand Roundabout, who had concerns regarding the turning proportions and resulting flows on Coalpit Lane and Lutterworth Road based on the PRTM target flows. The sensitivity test and adjusted flows are provided in WCC Sensitivity Test. However, the junction modelling has been based in PCUs and on the best available evidence to forecast flows at the junction in 2036. The A4303 will be utilised as a link to the M1 by HGVs, so the PRTM assumptions may be reasonable.

No	National Highways	BWB response- dated 29 Jan 2024	National Highways further comment and response. 9th February 2024.	BWB Response 13/02/24
	between the Applicant's Hinkley NRFI site and the existing Magna Park regional distribution centre.			
5	Directional traffic growth biases in the target flows were noted at the A5 'Gibbet' 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.	As above response to Point 4. Updated turning count flows have been used to reassess the junction. The results are set out in Deadline 4 Transport 2023 Update (document reference: 18.13.2, **REP4-131**).	The collection of new 2023 traffic surveys and a fresh application of the Furness process is welcomed. AECOM received a spreadsheet on 7 February 2024, which contained adjusted turn movements applied to those vehciels forecast to enter the A5 'Gibbet' roundabout from arm D (A5 South). Following a review of this spreadsheet, NH is content that these adjusted turn movements may be applied to the assessments of the A5 'Gibbet' roundabout. This matter is therefore resolved.	Noted as resolved.

National Highways Request for an Extension to answer identified written questions from the Examining Authority (ExQ2)

No.	Matter	Applicant's Response
	National Highways has been considering the information which has been submitted formally to support the application of the Development Consent Order (DCO) for consideration by the Examining Authority and determination by the Secretary of State for Transport. National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. National Highways proactively pulling together our responses to provide informative advice and guidance in response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ2). However, we seek to obtain an extension and will endeavour to respond at Deadline 6 to enable us to provide full responses to the following part question, as identified below. ExQ2.3.4: Plots 39, 54, 67, 71, 84, 101, 101a, 102, 103 and 104 In its D3 submission [REP3-137], NH indicates that it objects to the interference, suspension or extinguishment of rights upon CA where NH benefits from rights of access and maintenance rights.	
1	a) Could NH indicate the rights it holds in relation to each plot individually and set out how the CA of each plot would affect its undertaking. National Highways is seeking clarification from across the Company to ascertain how our ability to operate and maintain the SRN may be affected should these parcels be compulsorily acquired, and National Highways private rights extinguished. As a nationally critical infrastructure asset, the ability to operate and maintain are of the utmost importance. However, we also note that should these private rights not be necessary for us to undertake our duties as a Highway Authority then we would not wish to resist their extinguishment. The extension will enable us to undertake a full and thorough review of the land and access requirements for our activities to inform our position on how	This is noted. The Applicant's position was submitted at Deadline 5 and the Applicant also refers to its responses to NH's Response to ExQ in this regard (document reference: 18.17, REP5-045) . The Applicant would welcome NH's urgent engagement should it be possible to reflect some form of agreed position in the protective provisions in the final dDCO at Deadline 7.

National Highways Request for an Extension to answer identified written questions from the Examining Authority (ExQ2)

No.	Matter	Applicant's Response
	the Compulsory Acquisition and extinguishment of each of National Highways' private rights would affect our undertaking.	
2	As part of our Deadline 5 response, we have set out the private rights we currently enjoy over plots 39, 54, 67, 71, 84, 101, 101a, 102, 103 and 104 as requested.	As above.
3	Our response to part b of this questions is also provided in our Deadline 5 response to ExQ2.	As above.
4	In addition, a further extension is requested until Deadline 6 for Ex Q1.11.8(b) and 1.11.10(b). The requested information has been obtained; however, owing to the volume of information available, the extension will enable us to provide an informative response for the examining authority.	The Applicant requires any comments on the dDCO urgently in order that it has sufficient time to consider and draft any agreed items into the SI template before validation and final submission. The Applicant cannot guarantee it will be able to do so should comments be provided after Deadline 6.