

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited  
**HINCKLEY NATIONAL  
RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE**

---

**The Hinckley National Rail Freight  
Interchange Development Consent Order**  
Project reference TR050007

**Applicant's response to Deadline 6 Submissions [part 4 -  
WCC]**

Document reference: 18.20

Revision: 01

**27 February 2024**

---

Planning Act 2008

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

**WCC Comments Deadline 6**

| No | WCC Comments   | Applicant's Response  |
|----|--|---|
| 1  | <p><b>Furnessing, traffic flows and mitigation scheme at Cross-in-Hands junction</b><br/> Further discussion has taken place with The Applicant and BWB over the revised turning flows following the initial furnessed flows that were provided. WCC raised concerns over particular movements, our main concern at the Cross-in-Hands junction was that there seemed to be a concentration of background growth between the B4027 Lutterworth Rd and A4303 whilst the A5 South appeared to have proportionally less growth as set out in our Deadline 5 response.</p> <p>BWB have carried out a sensitivity assessment and utilised the 2023 observed entry proportions to derive adjusted flows for the 2036 scenarios. WCC has reviewed the flows and consider that they represent a more likely pattern of flows at the junction for those arms.</p> <p>The revised set of ARCADY models based on these revised flows, and the assessment work carried out using with the Rugby Rural Area Model, demonstrates that there is no longer a requirement to provide mitigation for the HNRFI development traffic on either the B4027 Lutterworth Rd approach arm or the Coal Pit Lane approach arm.</p> <p>WCC have advised The Applicant that they should provide this information to National Highways, Leicestershire County Council and submit to the ExA for consideration.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this sensitivity assessment work. Additional information has been submitted by BWB in respect of the swept paths at the junction and the preliminary design of the mitigation scheme to address the problems identified within the Interim Road Safety Audit. WCC are satisfied that this additional information demonstrates the scheme would be acceptable in principle. WCC anticipate that The Applicant will be submitting this revised information to the ExA at Deadline 6.</p> | <p>Noted- BWB has provided sensitivity tests and further liaison with WCC as outlined. This is submitted as a technical note at Deadline 7 (document reference: 22.2)</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted- the mitigation will remain in the DCO with amendments to requirement 5 to allow the parties to agree that the works are not required to be undertaken.</p> <p>Noted. A clarification note summarising the inputs to WCC is provided at Deadline 7 (document reference: 22.2)</p> |
| 2  | <p><b>Furnessing, traffic flows and mitigation scheme at Gibbet Hill junction</b><br/> Further discussion has taken place with The Applicant and BWB over the revised turning flows following the initial furnessed flows that were provided. WCC raised concerns over the level of flows forecast from Gibbet Lane in comparison to the proportion observed in the 2023 surveys. Although WCC noted that the A5 south to A426 south movement had increased, it was considered that this could be due to other committed development traffic growth, however it is understood that National Highways also raised concerns. This was set out in our Deadline 5 response.</p> <p>BWB have carried out a sensitivity assessment and utilised the 2023 observed entry proportions to derive adjusted flows for the 2036 scenarios. WCC has reviewed the flows and consider that they represent a more likely pattern of flows at the junction.</p> <p>Whilst the adjusted flows have been used to carry out sensitivity tests for the capacity performance at the junction using ARCADY. WCC do not consider that the 2023 scenarios adequately reflect the current junction performance in the peak hours and</p>   | <p>There has been ongoing liaison with the Highway Authorities. A sensitivity test on the flows at Gibbet has been supplied as recommended by National Highways and a further version based on comments from WCC. This has been formalised in a Technical Note submitted by the Applicant for Deadline 7 (document reference 22.2).</p> <p>Noted</p>  |

| No | WCC Comments  | Applicant's Response  |
|----|---|---|
|    | <p>therefore cannot be relied upon to identify the degree of impact that the development traffic is likely to have in a 2036 scenario.</p> <p>WCC still consider that the use of the VISSIM model is the best available tool to use to identify the impacts of the forecast development traffic on what is an already congested part of the network, as set out in our earlier responses.</p>   | <p>The Applicant has checked the validity of the modelling. The sensitivity schemes have been produced on the existing layout in the future year 2036 to establish costs for contribution to the NH scheme, which the Applicant has not had sight of.</p> <p>As per previous comments to WCC responses at Deadline 5: A VISSIM model of the baseline position within an extensive corridor network was shared by NH in early 2021. The Applicant's team reviewed and informed the TWG that for the HNRFI forecast impacts, to update the full corridor model was disproportionate, as most of the network was unaffected by HNRFI forecast traffic. This was further supported with outputs from the Rugby Rural Area Model. Hence the submitted standalone capacity-based modelling included within the Transport Assessment. Without a model of the re-designed Gibbet Hill, the requirement from NH was to develop a theoretical scheme to mitigate the HNRFI impacts alone. The Applicant has done this, only within the standalone capacity model rather than the Corridor Study VISSIM A note is submitted at Deadline 7 clarifying the model process (document reference: 22.2).</p> |
| 3  | <p><b>Furnessing, traffic flows and mitigation schemes at M69 Junction 1, A5 Longshoot &amp; Dodwells</b></p> <p>Please be advised that WCC has arranged to meet with National Highways on 5<sup>th</sup> March to review the additional VISSIM modelling that was submitted at Deadline 5. Whilst there is only one Warwickshire highway connection at each of these junctions (Hinckley Road and The Longshoot respectively) we need the opportunity to understand the modelled impacts on those arms, and this date is the earliest available to us. We will update on any issues by Deadline 8.</p>   | <p>Noted- though the Applicant will have no opportunity to provide a response on any comments submitted at this Deadline, however, the Applicant will make themselves available for any clarifications that may be required.</p>  |
| 4  | <p><b>HGV Route Management Strategy (Document Ref 17.4 C Rev 12)</b></p> <p>WCC has had ongoing discussions with The Applicant and BWB in order to address issues raised in our earlier responses. WCC's main concerns are that sufficient ANPR cameras are installed to facilitate monitoring and enforcement for any HNRFI development HGVs found to be using the 'HNRFI Prohibited Routes', and the triggers used to identify when enforcement is required in respect of a breach occurring.</p> <p>A total number of 5 ANPR cameras are included within the WCC area in the Appendices of Document Ref 17.4C rev 12. Following discussions it has been agreed that one of these cameras should be relocated from the unclassified road to the north of Monks Kirby and be located on the B4027 to the north of Stretton-under-Fosse, and an additional camera should be located on the B4065 at Ansty (6 in total). All of the locations identified are acceptable in principle, however detailed checks need to be carried out to ensure they are 1) sited within the adopted highway, 2) no objections from either the Streetlighting Team and the Parish Councils over the locations. WCC would request that a plan be included in the document that shows the 'HNRFI Prohibited Routes' within the Warwickshire network, and a plan to show the general location of the cameras as well as the detailed plans in the appendices.</p> <p>As set out within the document, the Daily Breach Thresholds (page 41) and Private Daily Breach Thresholds (page 44) together with the reference to daily traffic flows and average day flows and average day breaches are unclear as to their relevance and are</p> | <p>The HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (document reference: 17.4E) has been updated taking into consideration the changes submitted by WCC and other authorities. Whilst not all changes have been included directly, the context behind the majority have been included. Where changes have not been included, the Applicant considers that other paragraphs within the strategy provide the required content. This applies to the remainder of this section.</p> <p>This has been updated in Deadline 7 Submission the HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (document reference: 17.4E)</p> <p>See opening point in reference to the changes within the document</p> <p>See opening point in reference to the changes within the document</p>  |

| No | WCC Comments  | Applicant's Response   |
|----|---|--|
|    | <p>considered to over complicate matters. In short, any breach on the identified 'HNRFI Prohibited Routes' should be investigated.</p> <p>Apportioning a number of breaches across the tenants on the site is in our view unnecessary, every tenant should be treated on the same basis – zero tolerance ideally, but allowing for human (or satnav) error and that sometimes there are circumstances beyond our control, the Stage 1 measures proposed would cater for such occurrences. However WCC would suggest that if more than 2 breaches occur with any tenant on any of the routes cumulatively, then the breaches should escalate to Stage 2 on the 3rd breach with fines imposed (need not necessarily stop at 6 as the document suggests). Also overlapping numbers eg. 1-3 and 3-6 needs to be altered so no overlap for clarity of which Stage a tenant has reached.</p> <p>Other elements that either need to be included or clarified include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• timing for 'reset' on the breaches ie. weekly or fortnightly</li> <li>• measures to deal with a tenant that is repeatedly at Stage 1</li> <li>• Table 1 and paragraph 5.26 refer to a fund of £200,000 being held by The Applicant to be used to pay for additional measures to discourage HGVs travelling through Sapcote. Provision should be made for other villages that may experience adverse HGV impacts, and therefore £200,000 (with hopefully what should be minimal fine penalties) may not be sufficient. It certainly would not provide for a traffic calming, or strategic signage scheme it that was called for.</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.24 refers to advertising of reporting mechanisms at the County Councils for specific concerns to be investigated. WCC does not have a dedicated resource for dealing with HGV complaints, we tend to be alerted via the various Councillors or MPs. Reference to the County Council reporting mechanisms should be removed from the document.</li> <li>• The responsibilities for the Site Wide Travel Co-Ordinator set out at paragraph 5.33 needs to also include for monitoring and review as well as implement, manage and operate.</li> <li>• the roles and responsibilities of the Travel Plan Co-Ordinator and the Tenants in some of the bullet lists appear to have been mixed up and should be edited to address this.</li> <li>• The document suggests that the Panel should agree the future service charge costs – WCC consider that this is a commercial matter and should be for the Management Company.</li> <li>• As there will need to be a Data Processing Agreement and a Data Processing Impact Assessment – if these documents be made available on the management company website or a copy obtained via application to the management company can this also be stated within the document, it may allay any concerns residents may have over the cameras.</li> </ul> | <p>See opening point in reference to the changes within the document</p> <p>This was removed in HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (document reference: 17.4E).</p> <p>This to be shared with LHAs or LPAs on request to the data controller (The Applicant).</p> <p>T</p> |

| No | WCC Comments  | Applicant's Response   |
|----|---|--|
| 5  | <p><b>Sustainable Transport Strategy (Document Ref 6.2.8.1 C Rev 7)</b><br/>The document has helpfully been updated with a table summarising the measures/commitments.</p> <p>As previously responded, the extension of the #8 service to Nuneaton is a welcome commitment, however further work will need to be carried out with the operator in order to ensure that the timing of the service dovetails with the shift times at the development site (as stated at paragraph 7.19), otherwise the patronage and mode shift will not be realised.</p> <p>It is noted that a free 6 month bus pass is to be offered to the first employees (paragraph 7.13). WCC recommend that this is more precisely defined ie. Number of employees, or for a period of time after a tenant takes up occupation on the site.</p> <p>In discussions with The Applicant we have noted the contribution that Rugby may make to the employment workforce at the site. However at this time The Applicant does not consider it necessary to provide public transport or DRT connectivity, though it is understood that this will be reviewed on an annual basis.</p> | <p>Noted, the STS (document reference 6.2.8.1E) sets out the provision at first occupation and the commitments made to ensure that the timetable aligns with the shift patterns, patronage and modal shift will be monitored annually by the Travel Plan Coordinator and this is secured through commitments with the document.</p> <p>The commitment within the STS (document reference 6.2.8.1E) highlights that the free bus pass offer will be publicised by the Travel Plan Coordinator and will be available to all employees on first occupancy of a building and for six months. This is for all first building occupations rather than a defined number of employees. This allows greater flexibility.</p> <p>Noted- the annual reviews that are committed to through the STS (document reference 6.2.8.1E) will record employee origins and measures will be taken upon review to ensure that services align with public transport services as required.</p> |
| 6  | <p><b>dDCO</b><br/>Discussions are continuing between all parties, working towards a submission for Deadline 7.</p> <p>The Applicants response to WCC's ExA1 questions at Deadline 4 submission refers (qu1.2.2) to there being no impacts on trees and so no requirement for commuted sums. The response is acceptable based on the preliminary layout for the Cross-in-Hands junction mitigation scheme, however this statement also needs to hold true for the location of any ANPR cameras and will have to ensure that no trees are adversely impacted on, otherwise the provision for securing commuted sums should be included within the dDCO.</p>  | <p>The Applicant's proposed locations for ANPR cameras are shown within the HGV Routing Strategy Plans, these plans have been further updated in line with the comments received from the ExA in their Rule 17 letter (document reference: 17.4E).</p> <p>Detailed drawings show indicatively where each camera might go but the locations are deliberately sufficiently flexible so that the exact location can be agreed between the Applicant and the highway authorities and can avoid adverse impacts on trees. The location drawings are based on OS mapping at present and will be subject to detailed surveys before a final location is decided upon and agreed with WCC. The Applicant therefore does not consider that any commuted sum is necessary since the location of the cameras will be agreed between the parties so as to avoid the stated impact.</p>   |