

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

February 2024

Planning Act 2008

TRITAX SYMMETRY (HINCKLEY) LIMITED

PROPOSED HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE
OFF M69 JUNCTION 2, LEICESTERSHIRE

DOC REF TBC

Statement of Common Ground between
Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited and National

Highways

Matters Agreed

Matters Not Agreed

Traffic and Transport

Version Control

Version	Date	Issued by
01	09.10.2023	TSL
02	09.01.2024	TSL
03	26.02.2024	TSL

CONTENTS

- 1. MATTERS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT 1
- 1.1 Traffic and Transport..... 1
- 2. AGREEMENT ON THIS SOCG24

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

GLOSSARY

Term	Definition
ANPR	Automatic Number Plate Recognition
ES	Environmental Statement
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
LCC	Leicestershire County Council
NH	National Highways
NPSNN	National Policy Statement for National Networks
PRTM	Pan Regional Transport Model
SoCG	Statement of Common ground
STS	Sustainable Transport Strategy
TSL	Tritax Symmetry Limited
WCC	Warwickshire County Council

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND◆ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

1. MATTERS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT

Traffic and Transport Matters agreed

Ref.	Matter agreed	Record of agreement
1.	The Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 8 (document reference: 6.1.8, APP-117) have been prepared in accordance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).	Agreed through this SoCG
2.	Development Trip distribution as produced by AECOM (TN1) APP	Agreement from National Highways Limited (“NH”) original AECOM distribution received 12.03.21
3.	Development Traffic generation (Including Rail Freight to HGV Movements)	Agreement from NH received 27.10.21
4.	PRTM 2.2 Uncertainty Log V8, dated 02/02/2022	Agreement from NH received 05.05.22
5.	PRTM 2.2 Forecast Modelling Brief- inclusive of assessment years and scenarios	Agreement from NH received 03.12.21
6.	PRTM 2.2 Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Transport Modelling: Base year Model Review and Refinements	Agreement from NH received 01.12.21
7.	Barrier downtime impacts at Narborough	Through base model sign-off as above.
8.	Rugby Rural Area Model	Resolved, TR050007 14/11/2023
9.	Landscape Impact Landscape agreed subject to Requirement 19- Landscape Ecological Management Plan. 19.—(1) No phase is to commence until a detailed landscape and ecological	

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

	<p>management plan for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority. The detailed landscape and ecological management plan must be in accordance with the principles set out in the outline landscape and ecological management plan. (2) The content of any detailed landscape and ecological management plan will—</p> <p>(a) identify features of ecological importance;</p> <p>(b) provide a management framework for the conservation and enhancement of habitats and other features of ecological interest; and</p> <p>(c) provide a work schedule (including an annual work plan).</p> <p>(3) Any detailed landscape and ecological management plan must be implemented as approved as part of the relevant phase of the authorised development and must be reviewed on the 5 the anniversary of commencement of the relevant phase of the authorised development and at five yearly intervals thereafter for the lifetime of the relevant phase of the authorised development. Any review of a detailed landscape and ecological management plan is to be approved in writing by the relevant planning authority.</p>	
10.	<p>Biodiversity Impacts</p> <p>Biodiversity agreed subject to Requirement 20 Ecological mitigation management plan.</p> <p>20.—(1) Subject to paragraph (3) no phase is to commence until a detailed ecological mitigation and management plan for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the</p>	

	<p>relevant planning authority. The detailed ecological mitigation and management plan must be in accordance with the principles set out in the ecological mitigation and management plan and must—</p> <p>(a) apply a precautionary approach to working methodologies and habitat creation for reptiles and amphibians;</p> <p>(b) ensure that mitigation and compensation measures have demonstrable and measurable outcomes, which are monitored and reported on; and</p> <p>(c) create alternative habitats to an agreed form to compensate for the loss of irreplaceable habitats.</p> <p>(2) Any detailed ecological mitigation and management plan approved under sub-paragraph (1) must include an implementation timetable and must be carried out as approved in writing by the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>(3) If a phase does not include ecological mitigation or management then a statement from the undertaker must be provided to the relevant planning authority prior to the relevant phase being commenced, confirming that the phase includes no ecological mitigation or management and therefore no ecological mitigation and management plan is required for that phase pursuant</p>	
--	--	--

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND ♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

	<p>to paragraph (1). A phase for which a notification has been given in accordance with this sub-paragraph must not commence until the relevant planning authority has confirmed in writing that no ecological mitigation and management plan is required for that phase.</p> <p>(4) Where specified as required in the framework ecological mitigation and management plan, works must be supervised by a suitably qualified person or body</p>	
<p>11.</p>	<p>Lighting agreed subject to Requirement 30: Lighting.</p> <p>30.—(1) No phase of the authorised development is to be commenced until a report detailing the lighting scheme for all permanent external lighting to be installed in that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. The reports and schemes submitted and approved must be in accordance with the lighting strategy and include the following—</p> <p>(a) a layout plan with beam orientation;</p> <p>(b) an Isolux contour map showing light spillage to 1 lux both vertically and horizontally and areas identified in the detailed ecological mitigation and management plan approved pursuant to requirement 20 as being of ecological importance;</p> <p>(c) a quantitative light intrusion and luminous intensity assessment in accordance with ILP Guidance Note 01/21; and</p> <p>(d) measures to avoid glare on</p>	

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND◆ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

	<p>surrounding railway and highways.</p> <p>(2) The lighting scheme for each phase must be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved strategy for that phase and may be reviewed by the undertaker as necessary with the approval of the relevant planning authority. No external lighting other than that approved under this requirement may be installed.</p>	
12	Furness Methodology	
13	Base VISSIM modelling M69 J1 and J2	
14	RRAM Modelling	

Matters not agreed.

Ref.	Matter not agreed	Rating	Actions
1.	Off-Site Mitigation strategy and package		<p>Strategic Road Network Mitigation and modelling has been updated following discussions with National Highways and LCC/WCC including the recent observed surveys carried out and furnished matrix updates within the 2023 Transport Update (document reference: 18.13.2, REP4-131).</p> <p>STS (document reference: 6.2.8.1D, at Deadline 6)</p>
2.	Output from PRTM 2.2 Model		<p>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 Table 1</p> <p>A sharepoint link to the 2023 amended furnessing was sent on 18.12.23 this contained one spreadsheet. HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XX-CA-TR-0008-S3-P1_2023_Furnessing.xlsx</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

		<p>Updated VISSIM and Standalone models were sent on the 12.01.24, shortly after the Deadline 4 submission. December 2023 Modelling and Surveys. The files on the TWG sharepoint are arranged in a logical order, with namings amended following comments from NH on 02 February.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Preliminary design of access infrastructure (M69 J2 and slips)</p>	<p>Various workshops have been held with NH on the preliminary design of the access infrastructure and the following documents have been agreed in principle with NH: HRF-BWB-GEN-XX-SK-CH-SK043 – M69 J2 Directional Signage Strategy – S2-P01 HRF-BWB-HLG-M69-RP-CH-1300 – M69 Junction 2 Lighting – S2-P01 Departures from Standards Ref 102866 and 104401 relating to discontinuous hard shoulder on the M69 south of J2 In addition, all comments provided have been addressed by the Applicant on the following document which has been submitted to the ExA at Deadline 7 along with the comment log: HRF-BWB-HML-M69-RP-CH-00101_M69 Slip Roads Geometric Design Strategy Record - S2-P02 The following document has been submitted but no comments have been received by the Applicant: HRF-BWB-GEN-XX-SK-CH-SK079_Merge Retaining Wall - Sheet Piles - S2-P03 NH have stated that any agreement given is subject to acceptance of traffic modelling. Given the position set out above it is the Applicant’s view that traffic</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			modelling notwithstanding, the preliminary design of the access infrastructure is agreed.
5.	Site Wide Framework Travel Plan		<p>The Site Wide Framework Travel Plan was updated at deadline 3 and subsequently at deadline 4 (document reference 6.2.8.2B, REP4-055) including commitments to measures in line with modeshift STARS and commitments consistent with the updated STS submitted at deadline 4 (doc ref 6.2.8.1B, REP4-055)</p> <p>See point 7 below</p>
6.	HNRFI HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy		<p>Comment has been made received at Deadline 6 in regards to the HGV Route Management Plan & Strategy</p> <p>The plan does not detail how the height restriction will be managed for the low railway bridge.</p> <p>Response: The Applicant’s HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (current DL 7 document reference: 17.4E) has always included within the list of advisory routes to the northwest,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A47 south, A5 west (alternative route to avoid low bridge).</i> <p>Under the section named Low Bridge Risk, as identified in point 8, the first paragraph states the following:</p> <p><i>As described above, there is a low bridge on the A5 approximately 2 miles to the west of M69 J1. Occupiers of the development using vehicles above 4.6m in height will be advised to avoid the bridge and use an alternative route (which would be a choice of the A47 or the M69, M6 and M42)</i></p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<p><i>by the TPC (Travel Plan Coordinator) .</i></p> <p>This is being amended as part of DL7 submission to read the following.</p> <p>Occupiers of the development using vehicles above 4.6m in height will be advised to avoid the low bridge and use an alternative advisory route (which would be a choice of the A47 or the M69, M6 and M42) by the TPC. The mechanism for occupiers is covered by the requirement to agree and implement the HNRFI HGV Route Management Plan & Strategy (document reference: 17.4E) as part of their occupational agreements (Commitment 9 in Table 1) and reminders will be sent out periodically to occupiers of the the prohibited routes, the advisory routes including the alternative route for high sided vehicles wishing to go/come from and to the northwest via the A5 avoiding the low bridge. Until such time the works have been completed at the bridge</p>
7.	Sustainable Transport Strategy		<p>As discussed on the 13/11/23 further assessment and designs of the Active Travel routes have been carried out. This has led to further updates of the STS. More detail on how a minimum level of service bus provision will be secured through private agreements and Memorandum of understanding has been provided in the submitted STS for Deadline 4 (document reference: 6.2.8.1B, REP4-052).</p> <p>NH Deadline 5 Response</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Applicants response: Following NH comments, Annual reviews have been proposed from the Deadline 5 submission.</p> <p>NH comments DL6</p> <p>The Travel Plan sets out a number of initiatives, including some aspirational ones. Furthermore, there is reference to the Travel Plan Coordinator’s responsibilities to include monitoring, but it is unclear how any unmet targets would be addressed. The Travel Plan Coordinator’s responsibilities also include for feasibility reviews of various initiatives, but it is unclear how any such initiatives, in particular the aspirational ones (for example bike hire schemes) would be triggered and brought into use, particularly if mode shift targets are not met.</p> <p>It is noted that walking and cycling are considered collectively in ‘Active Travel’ and it is implied</p>
--	--	--

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<p>that this generally relates to cycling, with the Travel Plan suggesting low opportunities to capture walking trips. However, walking trips should not be discounted entirely and splitting these out discretely may enable monitoring more transparent to enable any remedial measures to be implemented.</p> <p>It is also noted that membership to the Travel Plan Steering Group is not identified and therefore it is unclear what responsibilities and authority the Steering Group would have. Para 8.2 of the Framework Travel Plan (Doc Ref: 6.2.8.2C) makes reference to membership of the 'Working Group' but it is unclear if this is the same as the Steering Group.</p> <p>Clarification and sign posting in response to these points are being prepared for DL7.</p>
8	Construction Traffic Management Plan		<p>Latest document and gantt chart phasing of works submitted and derivation submitted and a minor update for the DCO following Royal Mail comments will be submitted at DL7.</p>
9	Road Safety Audit Stage 1		<p>The Interim Audit and designers response has been provided in DL4 (document reference: 21.1, REP4-151)</p> <p>A brief was issued for the formalised Stage 1 RSA on 23rd January 2024 but NH stated in their response that due to not having agreed the traffic modelling or outputs, they were unable to sign the brief at this stage. The Applicant remains committed to formalising the interim RSA reports as soon as practicable and is confident that</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			having submitted the proposals to an interim audit which followed the process set out in GG119, the scheme has been subject to a rigorous safety audit process that would have identified any fundamental safety concerns (if any) and enabled the Applicant to rectify these. .
11	Base VISSIM modelling Audit Response J1 and J2 M69		NH Audit and responses in 2021 undertaken and information provided as requested on LMVRs.
12 Furnessing Matrices spreadsheets.			
1	Response to outstanding information at Deadline 5		<p>The Methodology remains unchanged and agreed. However the applicant has updated the observed data with additional Traffic Surveys carried out in November 2023 for the existing junctions with highway works mitigation (as per the TA and submission) as requested and agreed by the Highway Authorities on the 13th November 2023. The updated Furnessing spreadsheet has been shared with the highway authorities on the 18th of December 2023 following the meeting held on that day.</p> <p>Outstanding points from NH at deadline 5</p> <p>1) The Applicant has not responded to National Highway’s comments as set out in the DCO document REP1-182. NH further response 9th February for DL6 Summary of National Highways Comments Matters 1,2,4 and 6 are resolved.</p> <p><u>Summary Point 3 response,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BWB have undertaken a sense check of the

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<p>observed turning movements vs PRTM2.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XX-CA-TR-0002-S3-P5_Furnessing.xlsx revision shared in June 2023 of the furnessing sheet.• The sense check was also carried out and through to the new observed flow (2023) furnessing sheet HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XX-CA-TR-0008-S3-P1_2023_Furnessing.xlsx 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
--	--	--	--

			<p>different methodology was set out and agreed as above and documented in (AS-017).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More recently as per point 4, BWB have also undertaken sensitivity tests of the Background flows as requested by National Highways and Warwickshire County Council at Gibbet and Cross in Hands roundabouts. <p>The sensitivity tests are part of ongoing discussions by the Highway Authorities and the applicant and a note has been prepared for the authorities at Deadline 7.</p> <p>Summary Point 5 response,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As previously stated the Internal Road Capacity Review-(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 the 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.
--	--	--	---

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND ♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 has been shared and the results submitted as part of DL6 (document ref 22.1 A47 Link Road Roundabout North of M69 J2 Capacity Assessment) and shared on the 22nd of February. <p>In addition to the above REP4-189 National Highways update on Furnessing identifies the two items of outstanding concern related to Furnessing in Appendix B and in Figure 1 and these were Points 3.3 and 4.5 from REP1-182</p> <p>Point 3.3 Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The furnessed turning flows were originally undertaken for all the junctions identified in the AOI as set out in the Transport Assessment were included in the HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XX-CA-TR-0002-S3-P5_Furnessing.xlsx 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.• Junctions and Links being improved have been identified from the outcomes of the suite of
--	--	--	---

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<p>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.</p> <p>Point 4.5 Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 some of the B8 trips would divert 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.
			<p>No junction matrix forecasts at the M1 J20 and the A5 Redgate roundabouts As per the Applicants Deadline 6 Response.</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<p>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. Email acceptance on the 03.12.2021.</p> <p>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%.</p> <p>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.</p>
			<p>Grade separated flows at M69 junction 1 and at M69 junction 2.</p>

			<p>As per the Applicants Deadline 6 Response.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant maintains that the flows used in the original furnishing 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 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. This is set out in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges CD 224 Traffic Assessment. 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
--	--	--	--

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p>
	<p>Cross in Hand PRTM flows and furnishing</p>		<p>Sensitivity tests undertaken on behalf of WCC. WCC confirmed happy with the test and requested the mitigation works be removed. Ongoing discussions with Highway authorities regarding this position. Therefore the Applicant has included a new paragraph (3) in requirement 5 to address the ongoing discussions and to enable the parties to agree that alternatives may be provided, subject to such alternatives being appropriate mitigation for the HNRFI impact(s). This is</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			explained in the Explanatory Memorandum submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 3.2C).
Forecast VISSIM Models			
13	A5 Longshoot and Dodwells VISSIM Modelling methodology and outputs		<p>VISSIM Modelling undertaken and included with the 2023 Transport Update (document reference: 18.13.2) utilising the model provided by NH in November 2023.</p> <p>Padge Hall Farm traffic and mitigation has been included in the 2023 Transport Update submitted at Deadline 4 (document reference: 18.13.2, REP4-131) at the request of the highway authorities. The VISSIM model was shared on the 12th of January 2024.</p> <p>The conclusions of the revised modelling were that the HNRFI impacts on Padge Hall Farm were minor and would not trigger works to the A5.</p> <p>NH consultants are reviewing the model, applicant awaiting a response.</p>
	A5 / A426 Gibbet Hill (Existing Layout)		<p>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 at this junction 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 for this junction, there is little evidence in the</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

		<p>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.</p> <p>It appears that other developments have not used the 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.</p> <p>Proportionate mitigation has been developed on the basis of the PRTM inputs and the standalone modelling. A contribution has been put forward that has been derived from costs associated with the implementation of the proposed mitigation for HNRFI.</p>
	<p>M69 J1 and M69 J2 (Development access)</p>	<p>No comments have been provided on the Forecast VISSIM summary with the Transport Assessment and/or the models from NH.</p> <p>Further to submitted TA, 2023 surveys requested by LCC have been included in the furnished matrices and the VISSIM modelling has been updated and forms part of the 2023 Transport Update (document reference: 18.13.2, REP4-131). Model files have been shared and NH have undertaken a review of the highways network coding in the VISSIM and state a number of corrections are required. Much of the VISSIM comments appear to be clarification points with NH stating that no immediate issues</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			<p>have been identified during the network review. Applicant waiting on any other comments from NH</p>
	<p>M1 J21/M69 J3</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>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)</p> <p>As agreed with the TWG, traffic surveys were undertaken at M1J21 on 29th November 2023</p>

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND♦ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

		<p>and the same agreed furnessing methodology was used to 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.) HNRFI-BWB-GEN-XX-CA-TR-0008-S3-P1_2023_Furnessing.xlsx</p> <p>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. REP4-131 and DL5 J21 Modelling Note DL5 J21 Modelling Note</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Further work has been carried out using video data at M69 J1 submitted at Deadline 5 (document reference DL5 J21 Modelling Note. This 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</p>
--	--	---

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND◆ HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

			blocking of the M69 (eastbound) stopline. Merge/Diverge assessments were undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment.REP3-157 Table 8-9
17	Drainage impacts		The drainage strategy for the slip roads is included in the environmental statement (document reference: 6.3.14.7, APP-342) Environmental Statement - Figure 14.7 - M69 Junction 2 Concept Drainage Strategy). This has been signposted in the D4 responses.
19	Landownership matters & compulsory acquisitions		These have been subject to discussion by the legal teams.
20	The draft Development Consent Order, including requirements and protective provisions		These have been subject to discussion by the legal teams..

2. AGREEMENT ON THIS SOCG

This Statement of Common Ground has been jointly prepared and agreed by:

Name:

Signature:

Position:

On behalf
of:

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

Date:

Name:

Signature:

Position:

On behalf
of:

National Highways Limited

Date: