



## Meeting note

<b>Project name</b>	Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange
<b>File reference</b>	TR050007
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate)
<b>Date</b>	11 November 2020
<b>Meeting with</b>	Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (the Applicant)
<b>Venue</b>	Telecon
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project Update Meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

### Introductions

The Inspectorate and Applicant team members introduced themselves and their roles. The Applicant explained that whilst the proposed Development Consent Order (DCO) application remains named as 'Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange', due to a recent change in ownership, the Applicant has changed its name from 'DB symmetry ltd' to 'Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited'. Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd is a subsidiary of Tritax Symmetry.

### Project Update

The Applicant acknowledged that there has been a delay progressing its Development Consent Order (DCO) application due to the impacts of the Coronavirus pandemic however it now anticipates submission of the DCO application will be Q4 2021.

The Applicant provided an update to the Inspectorate on the background of its informal consultation that was carried out in late 2018 and summer 2019 which included sending notifications to 28,000 addresses and undertaking a series of local meetings for a period of six weeks.

Work had been taking place on transport modelling to identify traffic and transport impacts and inform the mitigation strategy. The Applicant highlighted the primary issue

arising from these exercises were transport impacts, especially in relation to the proposed opening of new southbound entry and northbound exit slip-roads for junction 2 of the M69 and reassignment of traffic using the highway network. The Applicant said it had committed to providing a highway link road between junction 2 of the M69 and the B4668, known as the A47 link. Work was also ongoing on whether to provide a relief road to the east of the M69, known as the eastern villages' road, or whether to provide off-site highways improvements, including at junction 21 of the M1.

During engagement with potential clients of the proposed development, feedback suggested that logistics buildings should be higher than proposed to deliver volumetric efficiency for racking systems. As a result, the Applicant intends to seek the views of all stakeholders during its statutory consultation for a proposed maximum height of 36 metres for these buildings. The Statutory Consultation phase is planned to begin in March 2021

### **Amended scheme content and draft Order Limits**

The Applicant gave an account of the historical Order Limits, which originally were only for the proposed rail freight interchange site. The proposed addition of works at M69 Junction 2 and M1 Junction 21 subsequently increased these limits. As highways modelling work progressed it became evident that off-site highways works would be required. Non statutory consultation received on the proposals helped inform highways works. The two significant outcomes were (1) A western bypass to the A47, north-west of the site and (2) Options for a bypass around the villages of Stoney Stanton and Sapcote, to the east of the site.

In addition, on a precautionary basis, a need was identified for improvements to circa 30 junctions in the wider area. The Order Limits have been altered to reflect the increased scope of these proposals.

### **Scoping**

The Inspectorate confirmed that it had received the Scoping Report from the Applicant that morning and had carried out high level checks to ensure that it met the regulations, legal requirements and accessibility tests required, for it to be sent out for consultation.

The Inspectorate noted that a number of figures given in the Scoping Report didn't match those of the latest Order Limits given in the GIS shapefile and it wasn't satisfactory for use in consultation in its current version.

The Applicant stated that it would reassess the information in relation to the figures and resubmit as soon as possible.

### **Consultation**

The Inspectorate referred the Applicant to the [Written Ministerial Statement \(WMS\) issued by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government](#).

The Applicant stated that they were aware of the WMS although noted it was temporary, and due to expire on 31 December 2020 and asked whether the Inspectorate knew if it would be extended into 2021. The Inspectorate stated it was unable to advise on this point although assured the Applicant that the impact of Covid-19 is under constant review and the Inspectorate would provide advice and guidance on this where possible

as things develop. The Applicant was reminded of its duty to ensure adequate consultation and to explore ways of how they can carry this out within the current restrictions of Covid-19.

### **Statement of Community Consultation**

The Applicant advised that its Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), agreed prior to the 2018 informal consultation was considered by it to now be obsolete and rather than update the old version, the Applicant considers a new version of the SoCC is required especially to address the issues surrounding Covid-19 restrictions, such as restrictions on accessing hardcopy documents and face-to-face meetings/ exhibitions.

The Applicant advised that a draft version of the SoCC was ready for consultation which assumes that restrictions on movement would still be in force in 2021 but included alternatives if restrictions were relaxed. Special consideration had been given to hard-to-reach groups, such as the Gypsy and traveller community, where internet connectivity may not be guaranteed. One potential solution being explored was to offer outside meetings to engage with these groups. The Inspectorate encouraged the Applicant to continue its discussions with the Local Authorities in building the SoCC and advised them to take a flexible approach, which would allow for any potential changes with the Covid-19 restrictions.

### **Draft documents**

The Applicant said it intends to submit a draft DCO and draft Explanatory Memorandum for review; the Inspectorate suggested also submitting draft versions of the Consultation Report, Land and Works plans, and the indicative master plan. The Inspectorate also offered to review a copy of the draft SoCC which the Applicant welcomed.

### **Next Steps / Actions**

- Applicant to resend Scoping report in correct format
- Next project update meeting to be arranged
- Applicant to send draft SoCC to the Inspectorate