



Event Transcript

Project:	East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
Event:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) – Part 2
Date:	11 March 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the event.

Issue Specific Hearing 1 - 11_3_26 - Session 2

Wed, Mar 11, 2026 11:19AM 1:25:01

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

DCO, MCO, Freeport, highway works, rail freight interchange, carbon neutral campus, market demand, strategic context, advanced manufacturing, logistics, planning permission, economic growth, infrastructure, site location, development consent, transport assessment.

SPEAKERS

Speaker 8, Speaker 2, Speaker 6, Speaker 1, Speaker 12, Speaker 7, Speaker 5, Speaker 4, Speaker 3, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Speaker 11

 01:24

Having problems with the technology anyway, it'll sort itself out. I'm sure. This here, the hearing is resumed. We've got moved up. Can I just confirm the recording has restarted? Thank you. We'll now move on to Item five, the relationship between the DCO and that for the MCO and the two ratios. Can I? Can I have the following documents ready? Which is the EMG one, MCO application, location plan, which is either a double P 05, 7m or a double P 060 M, take your choice And the components plan, which is as double Oh, eight.

 02:20

I'm not sure.

 02:32

Thank you. Right.

 02:35

What we're particularly concerned about is those parts of the land where there is overlap, particularly because they relate to the same plots of land, or whether the grant of one could lead to an incompatibility with the other. In the latter, that could also have a provision in the EMG two DCO, which could lead to an incompatibility with the original DCO. We'll start with the general idea and move to the specific

 03:05

so Alexander Booth for the applicant, just before we commence work on Item five, and I appreciate that there's a lot to get through, which is why panel may sort of jump and pass over individual items we were discussing in the context of item four, I thought the second, well, the first and second bullet points, and we were coming to the third bullet point, namely the implications of the planning permission in terms of hillside. I mean, I'm obviously content. If you're content,

 03:36

it's going to become more on it'll be, we can cover it perfectly well in i in the in

 03:44

so long as the panel was yeah, that those two items, third and fourth, could be dealt with

 03:47

in there. It's more to do whether or not there would be incompatibility, and thus whether or not

 03:55

incompatibility as between the two DCOs, yes, a DC on the MCO,

 03:59

a DC on the MCO. And also the, if you end up, yeah, applying permission in which was incompatible with the EMG one,

 04:09

the SEO, yes,

 04:13

there is all. They'll be on the same, same essence in the way around. And then, as I said earlier, this is early doors. So there may well be opportunities to make sure that the problems which we are going to discuss here, well, the issues discussed here could be able to be resolved in the next few months. Anyway, if we look at the EMG, at the out, the location plan, which you just, was just looking at a minute, there are substantial areas within the EMG DCO application which are also in the EMG one DCO. What I'm interested is whether in any incompatibilities, and if to any event where it's possible to change the EMG one DCO implicitly, or whether there should be improvements in the D in the DCO to allow that to happen in the EMG to this may be a bit more complicated than you may have, than it may needed to have been, the fact that the applicants are two legally distinct companies, rather than a single one and EMG one site has, I believe, at least nine separate companies within the SEGRO, group within it, let alone others with an interest in the land. As to the amount of duplicate, a significant amount of the duplicated land is highways. After that the comments of the applicant. I have then asked the app, the two highway authorities for their views. I'd also like the past consider whether the hillside decision has any implications for this, in the sense that, if you have an incompatibility between the EMG two DCO proposals and the EMG one consent, and given that they involve substantial areas of land that are the same, would it leave the original EMG one consent no longer capable of implementation, for example, by implementing any EMG two highway works which are incompatible with the EMG one highway works that would have the effect of the proposition continues that a change through the original DCO, through the MCO could no longer be implemented. Because, essentially, the MG, the EMG one DCO would have no longer further. Further been implemented. Implemented any further.

 06:29

So Alexander booth, on behalf of the applicant, in a moment, I'm going to turn to Mr. Simon hilditch, who is sat three to my right. Simon hilditch of BWB consultants, and he is going to assist the panel with the extent to which there is, or rather is not, physical incompatibility as between various consents, notwithstanding there is overlap in terms of Red Line areas, just pausing first before I turn to Mr. Hilditch in terms of the wider hillside issue, which you flagged at the tail of your introduction. I mean, I suppose the point I would make is this, firstly, we say there is no physical incompatibility. And of course, physical incompatibility is at the heart of the hillside decision.

 07:22

But secondly,

 07:25

we would respectfully also direct the panel's attention to paragraph 69 of hillside, which I know you will already be familiar with, which is where the decision addresses material materiality. Because, of course, it is only where a departure or there is a physical incompatibility which amounts to a material departure from the original position, permission that the principal is engaged, and it is a material departure as viewed in the context of that original permission slash consent as a whole. So we would say that there is no physical incompatibility, and to the extent there were perceived to be one, it would not amount to a material departure from the development consented originally,

 08:16

and therefore wouldn't engage hillside.

 08:20

But sir, before we go any further, I'm going to turn to Mr. Hilditch, and he's going to speak to the particular areas of concern, as you've identified in the agenda, in particular the area of the entrance to the EMG one site and the area of the north end of the rail terminal. Mr.

 08:37

Hilditch, thank you. Simon hilditch, for the applicant. So in relation to the area of the entrance, the EMG one site, which is the specific second bullet point on the list, then the EMG two highway works do not physically overlap in terms of alterations to curb lines, carriageways, footways, etc, with the proposed highway works under the MCO the area of the red line or the order limits does overlap to allow in the EMG to highway works for general improvements to road signs and traffic signals around the wider junction.

 09:16

Just go a little more slowly. Mr. Hilditch to allow to bring up a plan,

 09:28

zoom in, yes, or the whichever you there are the relevant highway works plans which could be found

 09:38

if you zoom in, right, yeah. The

 09:41

component plan, I think, might be simpler to

 09:52

Yes. So you can speak to the entrance to EMG one, first of all, by reference to

 10:06

it. Okay, yeah. So the under the EMG one MCO highway works. We have work number eight, a it's a bit boom me this micro microphone. So apologies. And then we have the Asics capable bypass a 453, junction improvements under these, under the DCO, which is the injury to DCO, which is works number 13. And if you, if you zoom right into where the label is for the injury one pedestrian crossing, you'll see the the main bulk of the physical works associated with those. It's shown by those lines. The gold line and the red line do not overlap, but the order limits for the EMG to DCO allow for general changes to signage and signals around the wider junction. Hence the overlap on of the two order limits on the plan this

 11:00

one, it's the air. It's the area that is enclosed by both the red line and the green green hack, the green

 11:05

line and green hatching. Yes, that's correct,

 11:11

if I may. Then turn to the second question about the northern end of the rail terminal. If you're able to move to the move north again, you'll see the green hatching overlaps with the red line of the order limits. And in this situation, the order limits is set purely to allow for temporary access for construction purposes of the works under the DCO scheme, which is work number nine, which is the new m1 to a 50 Westman link following completion of that so those the bit within the green hatch and therefore wouldn't be become part of the permanent highway, therefore not creating an incompatibility with the usage of the green hatched area for cranes.

 11:58

This is a bit of a detailed question, but given the need to get access to those temporary access through that, is that going to cause a problem with the operation of the existing rail freight interchange?

 12:15

There are set times. There's been work and activity has been done over the many years that has been in that land, and there are set times available with relationship with the rail operator to allow access.

 12:31

Thank you. Third one we did was down the substation site, because obviously one of the things we're interested is one of the questions we're going to ask next week is, what was the area of the essentially the green hatched area, the work summer, three, three, a, four, five, a and six, a and work say and work duration. What was that used for in em, in the original scheme? That's coming question next week again, just making sure that we haven't got any incompatibilities over what's been proposed in relation to

 13:09

that bit. Alexander booth, for the applicant, in terms of the substation, which is, I think your original query. I mean, what's proposed, what's required over the substation, is rights, and we require those rights because the substation needs to be extended. It needs to be extended because currently it serves EMG one, and it's going to have to serve EMG two also, hence its inclusion within the DCO. There are advanced discussions with UK Power Distribution, who have the lease of the substation, and as I say, as I said yesterday, there's no relevant rep from them. There's no anticipation of any difficulty. We will reach agreement, and we don't actually anticipate exercising the powers, because it will be undertaken by agreement, by reference to protective provisions that will benefit ukpd.

 14:02

The can the couple of things I would say is get one is a question, what you're going to get next week in relation to the consenting powers to allow the power substation work, that the reinforcement works, to the Totten works, and then from it, that substation down to the MG, to site, under what consenting regime you're going to be that's going to be done. That's for next week. More. The one thing which I was going to suggest is you might want to have a look at the Millbrook gas fired Generating Station order 2019 which included provisions providing modifications and amendments to the rookery South resource recovery facility to order 2021 2011 sorry that involved cross order protection revisions, which essentially found a way to avoid any any issues with Cross implementation of layering and layering of consents. Because clearly, one of the things you've got here is, although we've done the three detailed ones, there are going to be significant works further up, if you came OUT out slightly on this, on this drawing, on areas that were, E, M, G, Grant its consent for the highway works in EMG, one that will be could no longer be, there could be no more works done to them and it which. And therefore you could argue that the if you've undertaken an incompatible event in creating the highway works for EMG two, EMG one, the consent would have essentially expired for more to a better term, and then, which means you couldn't then have implement the EM that material change order because the EMG one had ceased, is it? Yeah, practical terms, that's the that's we might want to have a look at Millbrook power, because there was

 16:08

grateful for that. We'll obviously take that away and have a look at it.

 16:14

Thank you. Did I was gonna say I was gonna want the highway authorities may bring have their views. I'll start with national highways first, do you have any any comments you wish to make in relation to this?

 16:30

Rahul hack on behalf of National Highways, so we don't have any comments on this. And Leicestershire county council, Mrs.

 16:39

Rebecca and st Leicestershire county council, yes, sir, we do have a comment to make. Mr. Philpott made a valid point earlier this morning that the MCO could be implemented. In the absence of the DCO being implemented, we have requested that the applicant assesses, stand alone, the impact of the MCO on the highway network and identifies any necessary mitigation. Now we understand this work is underway, but we are yet to see it and for it and for ourselves to come to a conclusion. So as a consequence, what's not clear to us at this moment in time is whether the works associated with the MCO will include the works proposed to the existing EMG one access arrangements, as we've just seen on the plan earlier. I

 17:43

Mr. Booth. So I'm not entirely sure I understood what Miss Henson was saying, but what I can undertake to do now is take instruction on the point as regards when that work is going to be provided to ms Henson to the extent it has not been already. So if you just give me a moment. In fact, actually, again, Alexander booth, for the applicant, is probably best if Mr. Paul Wilson of BWB, who sits, I think, four to my right, pick that point up.

 18:16

Good morning, sir. Yeah. Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, national highways indeed asked for that assessment. Fairly recently, we've agreed to the scope of what's required. We've undertaken a lindsig model of the EMG one site access. That work is very close to be concluded. We don't envisage there being any issues whatsoever with that exercise. So that information will follow as part of deadline, one submission, and should hopefully resolve the point that Leicestershire have kind of just made. Thank you. Mrs.

 18:48

Henson. Mrs. Rick Henson, Asher county council, apologies if I wasn't clear our request. Our request is the assessment stand alone of the additional 30,000 square metres of floor space on the MCO, and the impact of that on the highway works, highway network and any necessary mitigation. And the second point was whether the impact of that stand alone would necessitate the works to the existing EMG one site access.

 19:32

Paul Wilson, again, on behalf of the applicant, as I say, that assessment will be undertaken and will be shared with the authorities. So we're assessing just the MCO traffic, which I think is 53 two way movements in the morning peak, 67 two way movements in the evening. So it's a low number, but we're assessing it nonetheless, and then we can see if there's any further impact in the likes required off the back of that, which, based on the current work that we're undertaking, suggests not.

 20:00

Well, obviously, we'll wait to see that. See those results in due course. I've noticed there's a hand up. Ms Ahmed in the online.

 20:11

Thank you. Fiona Ahmed, representing national highways, just to confirm that national highways have also been in discussions with the applicant about this matter, and we've agreed the methodology for the assessment of the impacts, specifically of the MCO.

 20:31

Do you have an anticipated time when that's going to be complete? And that's when it could be submitted into the examination? Obviously, from our point of view, we'd like it in at deadline one Paul

 20:41

Wilson, and for the applicant, that will be absolutely fine. We'll be submitting it as part of deadline one. It's close to being completed.

 20:49

Does anybody else have any other points on this? Yes, Mr.

 20:53

Philpott herwood, Phil Park Casey, on behalf of the Prologis companies. So just just, I want to just revisit the answer. Then that was given to my question because I asked the question whether there was a separate assessment that would allow for the MCO to come forward without the DCO. The answer, I was told, was yes. It appears that the answer is no, not yet, but there will be one, and just to make sure I understand what's being done, there will be an assessment of the MCO, plus an assessment of what highway works would need to come forward if the MCO alone was generating the traffic that will involve, then a separate consideration of what would be associated development and justified if it's just the MCO traffic and not the DCO traffic. That's what I understand. We're being told is being done, but hasn't yet been put in.

 21:56

Alexander booth for the applicant, the position is, as I previously indicated, that is in the ES, what we have is a structure which provides for analysis of DCO impacts, the MCO impacts and the aggregate impacts. And that's across all the various all the various issues, cultural heritage and so on and so forth. As regards highways, the position is that the impact, and I think this is set out in the transport assessment, the impact associated with the MCO are we say so low, they haven't been the subject of assessment that work has been requested, and it's now being undertaken, and it's going to be provided by deadline one. So it's, it's, it's not right with respect for, well, my learns understanding is not right insofar as he thinks the position is no that information is not before the examination. It is, we say, for all practical intents and purposes, albeit there is this lacuna in relation to the impacts associated with the MCO. We say those are so small that they're unnecessary.

 23:02

But the words been used minimal, but I was going to come to we were going to come to that later on, when we come to the traffic, but we

 23:08

get the position is that LCC are very fairly and I should just say LCC and national highways and LTC in particular, I know, have been working with us for many years, and we're extremely grateful for their engagement. Been walking the line with us. Since 2022 they've requested this information, and we're definitely going to provide it to them, and they're going to have it next week, I think before

 23:29

deadline one may I just clarify, clarify. So just to sorry. Paul Wilson, on behalf the applicant, just building on what Alex said, the ES certainly has the MCO assessed separately, so it's covered in the ES the transport assessment refers, as Alex, quite rightly said, to the low level of trip. So it was considered in the transport assessment. It was only when national highways provided their written representations recently, where a specific separate assessment has been requested, which is why it's now been undertaken now it will be completed, as we said earlier,

 24:05

not in any way prejudging anything, obviously, clearly. But if the just looking at the drawing in front of us, if the transport analysis of the MCA works, or on their own, actually said, What you also you need to do work the DCA works 13, then that could, could easily appear in both both orders with relevant cross provisions. So that, actually, that might be an empty if that were the solution, which was, if, if, if the highway solution was, you did need to do more work to that roundabout. They work 13 on as looking on here. I'm not saying that is the answer. It's just it's a possibility which could easily appear in both orders, unless achieved in that that sense, if necessary. What did you want to continue

 24:50

her with Philpot KC, on behalf of Prologis, what I'll say so we'll watch this space and see what comes out, and we'll respond to it when we have it in writing. I

 25:05

uh, could the applicants just clarify whether there's anywhere else in the ES where the MCO and DCO assessment hasn't been separated out, because I seem to recall that perhaps the air quality obviously relies on the highways and transport evidence so that would follow the same path be useful, if you could clarify that and also just double check that yes as a whole, to ensure that There is sufficient distinction between the two moving forward.

 25:42

Yeah, so Alexander booth for the applicant, yes, we'll certainly do that. I mean, I think we'll do that for deadline one, if that's acceptable.

 25:51

Thank you very much. Cheers. Paul

 25:53

Wilson and behalf the applicant for the absolute pointed out the transport chapter does separate the MCO out there is a separate section in the transport chapter, at least. Thank you.

 26:05

Just whether there any other section, sections particularly, you'll get some questions. But the lighting one certainly got it, got itself, got itself into a tangle. Okay.

 26:15

Well, so Alexander booth, yes, the reason I can't answer now is because I'm not across that, but we'll cut back line one.

 26:21

Thank you. Does anybody else have to wish? Yes, District Council just

 26:26

call in North West Leicestershire District Council just to just to ensure it's covered off. Because, as we discussed at the start of this item, there was hillside mentioned in relation to the previous item, and I just firstly support what my learned friend said in terms of the relevant parts of the hillside judgement that he explained and referred to reiterate the indication that was given yesterday that so far as there have been subsequent grants of planning permission, and the panel will need to consider the extent to which those grants of planning permission, separate to whether they're valid, etc, but the actual grants plan permission that have been made, and then the implications that there may or may not be for the the MCO. That's something that we'll look to address in the statement of common ground with the applicant, between the council and the applicant.

 27:17

Thank you. Anybody else, in which case we will move on to item six, need alternatives, which Mr. Page is leading on?

 27:29

Thank you. Mr. Jackson, Okay, moving on to item six regarding need and alternatives. So as set out in the detailed agenda, I will structure this item under a number of issues, broadly following, broadly following the main component parts of the proposed development, including the free board. The EMG two works. The highway works. The EMG one works. And finally, the alternatives. So naturally, there has been and will be a degree of overlap between some of the discussion around need and alternatives and other items covered during these hearings, such as compulsory acquisition yesterday and traffic and transport later today. If you feel the thrust of the question or discussion has already been covered and you have little else to add, by all means, point this out, and we can move on in the interests of efficiency and avoiding duplication. So to keep things streamlined, I will provide an opportunity for interested parties to comment at the end of each issue, rather than after each question, to the applicants. So for instance, in relation to the Freeport issue, the applicants will provide an overview of the need to locate the proposed development in the Freeport I will ask questions and the applicants will answer. Then at the end of the issue, after all of the questions and answers, I'll provide some time to hear comments from other interested parties. Are there any questions about the intended approach to this item. Don't see any hands, so I'll move on, okay, beginning with the free port. Then I'd like to ask the applicants to provide a short overview of the need to locate the proposed development in the free port and the contended benefits of doing so over to the applicants, please.

 29:22

Thank you very much, Sir Alexander booth, on behalf of the applicant. So just stepping back a moment and putting the free port into context. Of course, post Brexit in 2016 we've seen governments, indeed successive governments, seeking to ensure investment and economic growth in the UK, one such vehicle for promoting that growth and investment is the free port, or rather the free ports. It's therefore very much government policy, and has been for many years that they are seeking to promote investment in these areas, the East Midlands Freeport is, of course, the only inland Freeport, and what we have now is a window. I'll come on to timelines later on, but essentially, what we have is a window for investment in order to promote growth prior to the end of September 20 because that's essentially when the benefits will cease to apply in one form or another.

 30:31

Sorry, Mr. Booth. Can I just cut in there for a brief moment in terms of the free port itself? Are you able to provide more information about how that designation arose, we're wondering if there's any support in documentation about the free port designation process and the need arguments in making the designation from the Government, etc.

 30:59

So this area, being the East Midlands Airport, and also the cluster of logistics development within what is commonly referred to as the Golden Triangle has been a focus for economic growth, particularly as regards logistics and freight handling, for a considerable time. I can't point you to a particular document, but we can do that in writing, following this issue specific, hearing, what I can point you to, sir, in this context, are effectively the spread of benefits which have been deposited in order to promote investment, which will trigger growth, which will lead to reinvestment and further growth in the virtuous circle that the Freeport anticipates. So essentially, the headlines are that in circumstances where commercial premises are constructed and occupied prior to the end

 32:00

of September 2031,

 32:03

then there is a window of five years 100% business rates relief. Those rates effectively being covered by central government, fed back into the free port in order to deliver further growth within the region. There is also a spread of other benefits, and I can run through those very briefly, the enhanced structures and building allowance, which is a 10% per annum allowance as against the standard 3% allowance for qualifying non residential building expenditure that is available until the end of 2013 there's an enhanced capital allowances position, so 100% first year allowance for qualifying expenditure on plant and machinery, primarily used within the free port, and also relief from SDLT, stamp duty, land tax on qualifying acquisitions of land and property. In addition, there is relief in terms of national insurance contributions in circumstances where new employees are taken on prior to the September 31 deadline, there's 36 months relief in terms of

 33:20

national insurance contributions.

 33:26

So those are the spread of benefits. But what I would propose we do is provide you an explanation as to the detail of how the free port was designated in answer either to a written question, or we can provide a free standing note, whichever you wish. But those are essentially, that is essentially why there is a need to develop out the Freeport, because it is an engine for growth and investment, and if we don't take advantage of it. And of course, we say that the you'll be aware that the East Midland Freeport comprises of three elements, the E magic cluster, of which the DCO scheme would deliver the remaining lion share that I think the only sites that have been built out within the Freeport designation as yet are those within EMG. One what we're doing is building out the lion share of the remainder of the Imagic cluster. Then there's the Radcliffe on soil power station and the intermodal part. But we are this development would ensure the build out, we say, of it would provide the best possible position in terms of realising the build out of the lion share of the E magic cluster prior to the expiry of the deadline in September 31 so that's essentially Sir the need case in terms of why, within the free port.

 34:49

Thank you for that introduction. You've answered one of my questions about whether the benefits kick in on consent, or whether it's deconstructed and occupied. So thank you for anticipating that.

 35:05

Just looking at my notes.

 35:10

So we're wondering whether there's any other criteria for leveraging the Free Port benefits. For instance, does the proposed development need to serve a particular sector, attract certain employers or employees, or have a particular funding model in order to leverage those benefits.

 35:29

Alexander booth, for the applicant, so I've touched on one or two of the criteria already in answering your first question. I mean, you will not be surprised to note that there are a number of criteria. I'm going to give you a flavour of them because I'm not. I don't have the full detail list, but certainly, sir, headlines are as follows. Firstly, the premises must be wholly located within the free port in order to attract the relief. Secondly, sir, in terms of sector coming to your specific point, the occupier, in order to benefit from the relief, must operate a qualifying logistics, advanced manufacturing or other approved commercial activity which align with the free port strategic objectives. Third point, and again, I think I touched on this one for the NIC relief, it's not employees, it's newly hired employees, and they have to be hired prior to the end of September 31 and I think they have also to spend at least 60% of their working time within the free port in order for the NIC relief to engage. In terms of that business rates relief, I've said there has to be occupation and active occupation in order to qualify for that rates relief. And I think the capital allowance and the structures and building allowance, I think those only engage in relation to expenditure incurred prior to the end of the window. Those are my short headlines, sir. I mean, to the extent that the panel would wish to have further detail, of course, you can put a written question to us, and we can either provide more detail in writing or direct you to relevant locations where that information may be found in detail.

 37:29

Thanks for that. So I think two action points to come out of the discussion so far is more information about how the designation came about and what the underpinning evidence was, and then subsequent to that, the criteria for leveraging the benefits, and critically, how the proposed development is going to comply with that criteria. For example, is there anywhere in the DCO or the MCO that secures compliance with the free port criteria? Would it be open? How can we be certain that the Free Port benefits will arise as a result of the proposed development without the necessarily necessary controls in the DCO or the MCO, I guess, is my question.

 38:30

So the position would be that the

 38:33

we may need to come back in a note once I review the requirements with that question in mind. But the position is that what we are seeking consent for is logistics and advanced manufacturing, accommodation. That's what we're seeking consent for in those circumstances,

 38:53

the occupiers who are going to come forward

 38:58

are going to be operating within those sectors which, which will show that the benefits of Freeport designation are engaged. So, so we have that. We will have that in any event, I'm reminded that in the context of the MG, one part of which was within the Freeport designation, that those occupiers, that character of occupation came forward without the need for any requirement. And the reason being, of course, that when one looks at EMG one and what will become EMG two, I mean, it's hard to see what use any other operator operating in another sector would have, I mean that we are a logistics park. That is what EMG one is. That's what EMG two will be, albeit with an advanced manufacturing option as well. In those circumstances, the size, scale, nature of the accommodation is suited specifically to logistics operators. So we are going to have, with or without the requirement, we're going to have occupation which secures delivery of the Freeport benefits.

 40:09

So just coming in there, I can appreciate the likelihood of the logistics floor space coming forward in the current market conditions, but I think more clarity on the Advanced Manufacturing would be helpful. What if you know market forces change? What if the you know is a different commercial decision about what floor space gets delivered within the terms of the my understanding, you might have consent for it, but it doesn't compel you to deliver advanced manufacturing floor space is my understanding.

 40:42

Obviously. I mean, what we can't do as we sit here today is guarantee what the market will look like two years from now, and what the appetite will be for one form of provision or the other. And of course, it's right for the panel to know that this is going to be a market led development, there has been very significant update EMG one, and it's on that basis because EMG one has been such a successful and indeed exemplar form of development that the applicant is seeking to deliver a second phase. But we can't guarantee, as we sit here today what the market will look like in two years time. But what we can reasonably anticipate, and indeed what the savills report that others will speak to Mr. Harley, who is going to address needs subsequently will speak to, is that there is every reason why the panel should anticipate that logistics and potentially also advanced manufacturing, will see demand that will ensure build out of EMG to certainly in large part, if not entirely, by the expiry of the Freeport window.

 41:53

So you just mentioned that we can't really predict what the market will look like.

 42:00

So I didn't say so with respect to I didn't say predict, what I said was rent P I think, or certainly, that's what I meant to say. Because, of course, what we have is the expert analysis of property consultants, which does assess the position now and what the anticipated future demand will be. And of course, what we also have now, sir, is interest from both logistics and advanced manufacturing uses. Now the panel will be aware of the Maersk proposal. What Maersk is seeking to do is on EMG to its national headquarters there. So we have interest from logistics operators. We have also interest from advanced manufacturers now and others can speak to that point, or we can put it down in writing if you'd like to have that. But we have that interest now. The market analysis suggests that that will be there going forward. But can I promise you and guarantee what the position will be in in 2829 No, of course, I can't. And of course the panel knows that.

 43:01

Thank you for that. Okay, I will leave that there, and if we need to, we can follow up in writing.

 43:09

So moving on.

 43:16

So I think going back to the Free Port deadlines. Like to hear more about the construction programme and whether that is realistic

 43:33

to leverage those benefits.

 43:36

Thank you, Sir Alexander booth, for the applicant,

 43:41

obviously what we don't have is a guarantee as to the timeline of Well, what we can say is that we would expect that the DCO be made at the end of first quarter 2027 what we say is on that basis, enabling works would commence within six to seven months, say, By October, 2027 and what we would see is construction of the first building

 44:16

in, say, second quarter, 2028,

 44:22

and assuming a 12 month average build out, which we say is reasonable that would allow for first occupation the following year in Second quarter or third quarter, 29 now, of course, construction. Will be demand led. It's going to be occupy specific, as is always the way, but we anticipate significant demand. That was certainly the position as regards the AMG one. It's why we are promoting this second phase of the East Midlands gateway. To note, when I say first building commencing construction in second quarter, 28 it's important that the panel understands that this is not a sequential with one building being delivered at a time. And at EMG one, we had, say, four buildings. I think it is being constructed concurrently. We have a situation where it is a very realistic prospect to anticipate construction of the entirety of the consented accommodation prior to September 31 so that there can be occupation prior to September 31 what I cannot do again is guarantee that that will happen. Of course, when we get to 29 the market will be what it is at that point in time. But on the basis of the evidence that we currently have, and harking back to our experience at EMG one, there is every reason to be very optimistic. Optimistic is the wrong word, because it's realistic to be positive about the delivery, construction and occupation of the accommodation prior to the end of the Free Port window in September 31 Thank you, Tim,

 46:08

thank you for that on the EMG one builder. We're wondering whether there's anything you can provide us by way of a proxy. So look at what the EMG one construction programme was proposed to be, and what the actual build out was. And then that might give us a flavour of might give us a flavour of the realism for the build out rates, yes.

 46:44

Well, we, we can certainly do that by deadline. One, I don't have the information to hand, but Mr. Hilditch, perhaps can give you a flavour now of what the position is. Sat three to my right. BWB, you've already heard from him

 47:02

just just before you pass over. I think if you could build in to the answer information about works, build out rates as well, that would be helpful, because obviously that's going to be mitigation.

 47:20

Yes, sir, that's absolutely right. So, so you're asking for, sorry, not, not Mr. Hilditch is answer in relation to EMG one the request is in relation to build out of the highway works. When are those anticipated to commence, and so on and so forth, correct? Yes, what I'd like to do, because I don't hat immediately. Can we put that in writing? Yes, Mr. Hilditch, in relation to the EMG one and experience and what it can tell the panel?

 47:55

Yes, absolutely. So Simon hilditch, for the applicant. So, as I'm sure you're aware, the EMG one DCO was made in January 2016 and over the course of the next well of 2016 2017 and 2018 was when all the the maker and the highway works was constructed. The last significant part of highway of the highway works. So the highway works, for that conclude, included the significant alterations in Junction 24 and 24 A of the of the m1 and it then also included the keg with bypass. The Keg with bypass had a slightly later occupation trigger, and that was completed in November 2018 so less than three years following the DCO consent. And that was the last significant part of the Hyo works, if that gives some confidence as build out rate of a very substantive piece of infrastructure associated with with EMG one, the build out of the development itself, then carried on for further as a few number of years. I don't have all the timeline for all the individual units, but I'm sure we can pull something together for as in answer to a question, or for deadline one,

 49:01

yeah, if we can, sorry, if we can mark that as an action point to provide a full level of detail, and then we can work with that then and ask any further questions if we need to.

 49:12

Thank you. So Alexander booth, for the applicant, yes, I think it's probably helpful. In addition to the overview that you've had in terms of delivery of infrastructure that we set out in writing, what the position is, both in terms of infrastructure and in terms of accommodation, the build out. The point that I suppose I would make is that, of course, these are two different developments, and the extent of infrastructure being provided at the one, for example, the rail works and so on are not being provided as part of this sector. So there's not going to be direct read across in terms of time from granted DCO to completion of infrastructure and enabling works and so on and so on. Of course, I know the panel will understand that,

 49:54

yeah, if you can just explain that in the note, and then we'll take it, take it into consideration. Thank

 50:06

you. Okay, moving on from that question, then on to the next one. So the proposed development is located adjacent to the EMG one strategic rail freight interchange and East Midlands Airport, areas of which are also covered by the Free Port. We're also interested to understand the extent of dependencies between the relevant operations. For instance, to what extent would the proposed development rely on the movement of goods via the EMG one strategic rail freight interchange and East Midlands Airport, over to the applicants, please.

 50:50

Sorry, Alexander booth, for the applicant. Whilst you were speaking, I was just bringing up some documentation, I anticipated that that question that you've just put that is, as regards the fourth item on the agenda, operational benefits of locating EMG two near the EMG one, rail freight interchanges and the airport. Is that right? Yes, I'm grateful. I listen most of the time. But in terms of the benefits and benefits of proximity, both to EMG, one strategic rail freight interchange and the airport, clearly, sir, what we're looking at is an inherent benefit in the proximity of any logistics Development close to both those key freight interchange hubs. The position is essentially that the benefits of CO location are summarised in the statement of reasons at paragraphs five, I think point 34 and following through to five point 39 and I can, I can summarise them as follows. Firstly, even leaving the airport to one side, proximity to the rail freight interchange is a very important consideration in that it allows for transport, transfer of freight by rail, consistent with government policy in the NPS and elsewhere. And that is a significant benefit. There is also a significant benefit in so far as having the two facilities under a single management and operation allows for, if I can put it this way, an enhanced functionality so the skills and employment group that operates in relation to EMG one that can be extended to embrace EMG two, the Same position will be true of the transport Working Group and also so the Community Liaison Group. So what we have is a functionality and a practical operation which will serve both facilities and embrace, effectively, the management of two there's also practical savings and efficiencies that are available. At the moment, it's not proposed that we provide a shuttle bus running between EMG one and EMG two. The reason being that there are already four public bus services that will be running, you know, within the hour, multiple times as between those two facilities. And we don't yet see the need for that. But if the need does manifest, then of course, those sorts of facilities can be provided. And in that context, we note that Maersk anticipates retaining capacity in EMG one, whilst also setting up its national headquarters in EMG two. And so we're going to keep that matter under review, but there is an obvious synergy there. And in circumstances where there is take up, there is need for facilities such as the shuttle bus to run with a chip that can be provided all of those benefits, that is to say, practical efficiencies in terms of running the facility and then management in terms of the various working groups, quite apart from access to the rail freight interchange managed by maritime all of Those are benefits which are realised by reason of EMG two operating in close proximity to EMG one,

 54:52

I think the area we're particularly interested in, in regard To the Co Location, is the extent to which EMG two would use the rail freight interchange to move goods, or whether they would rely on the highway network in isolation, whether there's anything in the DCO that would secure that relationship. So you could rely on the potential benefits of moving things via rail rather than just by road. So I

 55:29

think we'll can come back to you in writing on that point. I mean, the position is that we do anticipate that there will be material use of the rail freight interchange, what we cannot do. And this, of course, isn't being promoted as an srfi. It's being promoted as a business and commercial development. That's why we have a section 35 direction. We're not falling within the terms of the statutory definition. It's occupier led that demand for rail use, or use of the rail freight interchange will be occupier LED. And indeed, construction and occupation of facilities at AMG two is going to be occupier LED. We, we say, reasonably anticipate significant take up of the of rail freight capacity. And indeed, Merce, who anticipate having a significant presence within the EMU two facility, of course, make very significant use of the interchange as it currently stands. But we wouldn't invite a requirement to that effect. And I think it's probably best that we set out our thinking and writing as to why it is that we see and the percentage that we anticipate of freight being moved by way of the interchange, the rail interchange, and not simply by by road.

 56:53

Yeah, so I think that would be helpful. What we're trying to understand is the likelihood of the benefits, the potential benefits being forthcoming. Because obviously, if we were to give benefits related to the use of the rail freight interchange, weight in the planning balance, and then for whatever reason, through market forces, those benefits didn't materialise, then obviously would subvert what we'd assessed and any decision that might be made. So the question is the degree to which we need to secure things in the MCO and the DCO, and the extent to which we can rely on likelihood or some other metric.

 57:44

Yes, sir, sorry. Alexander booth, for the applicant, that's entirely understood. That is to say, insofar as the panel, and indeed the Secretary of State behind you wishes to under balancing exercise in terms of attributing weight to the movement of freight by rail, you need to understand the basis on which you would be assuming that whether or not it's secured, what the evidential position is in terms of likelihood, and so on and so on so so we'll come back to you on that. Thank you

 58:09

much. Appreciate it. Thank you.

 58:13

Okay, that

 58:16

comes to the end of the Free Port issue, but before moving on to the next issue, I'm going to come to other parties to see if they have any comments about anything we've discussed in relation to the free port. So are there any other comments on the free port issue?

 58:38

Anything from Prologis or East Midlands Airport?

 58:46

Okay, thank you very much moving. Oh, we have a hand. Sorry. Back. Do we have a roving? We've got two hands?

 58:56

Yes. I'd just like to make the point that the Introduce yourself. Sorry, yes. John Marriott, on behalf of protect guidance and CPRE the Freeport, it consists of three separate sites. This is the only one that currently has a well, that's not quite true. Of course. Ratchet power station does have a rail access the there's obvious benefit in the other sites, in the free port, having real access, if that's if they're going to be logistic based. And the other point, of course, is that most of the traffic coming into these sites comes from the ports by rail. It's not clear. I mean, I think the original intention of SRF eyes was to be able to carry goods around the country by rail, not just bring it in from a port. And last, over the last 10 years, our exports have exceeded import. Sorry. AV, feeding our imports. And get this right behind me, and it spreading. Got up from about 113 billion a year to about 250 billion a year, detriment in terms of the balance of that's just goods, not services.

 1:00:16

Thank you. There's a another hand from the gentleman I thank

 1:00:27

you, sir, Mr. Ray Sutton, resident Kegworth parish council, representing, not representing North West Leicestershire District Council. Thank you for the Request for Evidence, because clearly, there is much to come, and indeed, much of what I have to contribute today will be in written submissions, which is represent representations, which is correct. But I do wish to say that the free port has many sites we I've just checked, and it is about two and a half miles from East Midlands Airport to Ratcliffe, as you know, and it is instructive to look at the tax sites. On all these sites, I recognise the Secretary of State has given permission for this process based on this one site, I notice, I think you should, I hope the panel will ask further questions about the issue of proximity to the airport, even though it isn't exactly in line, because it is possible to argue that the airport is the raison d'etre for this free port, and I think that needs to be adequate cover, adequately covered off, Because the proximity of this site to the airport, especially if the compulsory purchase order goes through, does not give the airport any flexibility about its development to the west of its runway. And I may get the direction north, I think North, or one way and the other. It's north and south, I think so. So I think that's something that should be considered and going to the the benefits and the and the need for evidence there, we are repeatedly reminded locally and elsewhere, and we have good liaison with the Ratcliffe site, who have a local development order. I live less miles from the Radcliffe site, and we've had full communication right throughout the local development order process, and it's up for review, and they've been slow to recruit. There's a giga factory site. They're a massive one that that is as not recruited, and no doubt that will be the subject to the review. I think it's June this year. And I think a key question also is whether the integrity of the Free Port sites has been considered, and these issues have not been covered by the learned exchanges taking place this morning. I'll leave it at that, sir, to give a flavour, but it is about the strategic considerations of Freeport. Clearly, the Secretary of State has granted this process on the basis of a multiplicity in the sector. In the section 35 notices, it has granted it on a multiplicity of different aspects, but they are linked in complex ways. And so I do think that focusing on this site, and given the two main landowners of the main site, I think there are many reasons why the alternatives, which I know, is not perhaps the key issue here, but it is within the free pool and the integrity of it, and I shall be speaking at another point, I hope, about the need to think about also the spatial planning issues in relation to the adjoining combined county authority, the mayoral authority, which is not insignificant in relation to these considerations of need and alternatives. Thank you.

 1:04:12

Thank you. Mr. Sutton, so yes, this issue specific hearing isn't you know the be all and end all of our questions, we will be reviewing deadline one submissions and other submissions throughout the process, and be asking further questions and hold potentially other hearings accordingly. Thanks for your comments. I'm wondering if the applicants want to come back on any of those points in relation to the airport point in particular, or take them away and respond?

 1:04:47

Thank you, sir. Alexander booth, for the applicant, no, sir, I wouldn't propose, I think, to respond to those matters now, I mean to the extent we need to do so we can do in writing. I suppose the one observation I would make is that it's not a question of which part of Freeport government wish to see developed, we would say that it's very clear that the totality of the free port should be built out within the window. That's what was originally envisaged, and that's what we're seeking to do. And the land on which we are promoting this development is land identified originally for the purposes, precisely the purposes we say that we're bringing it forward for. I don't think I can say anything more at this point.

 1:05:30

Thank you. There's no further comments. Can't see any hands in the room or online. So hopefully we can move on to the next issue relating to the EMG to works. I'm hopeful we can get through it.

 1:05:54

We break for lunch.

 1:05:57

So if we can start with the applicants, and if they can provide a short overview of the need for the EMG two works and how that need may be established in policy terms within the NPS, over to the applicants.

 1:06:16

Thank you, sir. Alexander booth, on behalf of the applicant, so in terms of the need case for the EMG to works, given that the next agenda item deals with highways matters. What we're looking at here is, as I understand it, is need for the legit advanced manufacturing development, essentially on the main EMG to site. And in those circumstances, what I'm going to do is turn to my right, and two seats down is Mr. Steve Harley of oxalis planning, who is going to provide an overview, by reference to the savills report, which I know that the panel has and otherwise in relation to the need for the commercial accommodation. That we're supposed to provide.

 1:07:07

Thank you, sir. Steve Hartley, for the applicant, I'll provide a response in outline, sir. Before I do, I wanted to just set up it helps you. The fundamentals of the applicants need case are set out in the executive summary of the planning statement, which is document 5.4 with further detail found in that document section five, and specifically paragraphs 5.15 through to 5.147 5.1 47 other key submitted documents relevant To the issues I'm going to touch on briefly include, as Mr. Booth just referred to the industrial and logistics need assessment report by savills for the applicant, which is document DCO 5.5

 1:07:56

if it helps, for the purpose of responding to your question in outline. I think it's best presented under three related and I'll say a bit about each, if I may. Firstly, strategic context. And we've heard a little bit about some of that already from Mr. Booth, but this relates to the clear and compelling strategic policy and economic context for the EMG, two proposals, including the context provided by the site's location within the free port, which in many ways actually encapsulates a number of the issues which I'll touch on. The second broad theme is opportunity and locational strengths, which in brief, relates to the proposals being located at what we describe in the planning statement, nexus of economic activity, infrastructure and policy objectives. And the third and final topic, market need and demand. And again, this is a reference to the significant evidence of market need for additional strategic sites for distribution, warehousing and logistics. I'll refer to relevant evidence submitted by the applicant, but also crucially, by other bodies, including local authorities, and I'll refer to that as well. So under each of those three, sir, I'll just draw out of key points. Stop me if you think I'm saying too much on any but I won't take long. The strategic context is provided by a range of Policy and Strategic strategic documents found at the national, regional and local levels. Nationally. These include the context provided by the NPS, which provides clear in principle, support and recognition of the need for an expanded network of SRF eyes. It also includes, at the national level, the significant weight attached to supporting productivity found in the NPPF, which also exclude, includes explicit recognition of the importance of the freight and logistics sector at the regional level. The EMG, two main site specifically, has a key role as a designated site within the free port. Which we've we've discussed that designation in 2022 followed other regional or local strategies and policies which recognised the strategic context and strength of the area around junction 24 that includes, for example, the Leicestershire gateway concept established by the Leicester and Leicestershire growth strategy of 2018 which is focused very, very much on this area specifically. And the planning statements and the sections are referred to provide details of a number of other relevant strategies and documents which pre date but arguably culminated in, or helped culminate in the Freeport designation and the growth aspirations established there, and then just finally, quickly locally, the local authority has confirmed its intentions to allocate the EMG to main site in the emerging new local plan for North District. And that forms part of a wider and direct recognition of the need for this and other sites. And I'll come back to that briefly under under one of my other headings, the second heading I mentioned at the outset is opportunity and locational strengths, and this covers the physical and spatial characteristics of the area, those characteristics which have inspired many of the regional and local policies or strategies I alluded to above, and specifically focused on the opportunities for additional economic investment and growth. And as we say, AV, Freeport, the location is a key element to the need case. The mg, two proposals are located at key junctions on the strategic road network, which will be very well said, and we're sitting very close to one of them right now, and on a co located with and represented extension to the nationally significant EMG one rail terminal. And we may come on to it, and Mr. Booth has already touched on it, but the proposed

increased crane heights at the terminal and the creation of additional floor space, and that goes and through those through those links EMG to will deliver further operational efficiency at the terminal and further enable easy access to and use of rail freight part of lower carbon efficient supply chains, which are key priorities of the MPs. As you'll know, the strategic strengths and market attractiveness for nationally significant Logistics and Distribution is a direct consequence of this location and its access, accessibility and and it's that which, we say, underpin the freeports E magic area, which Mr. Booth mentioned, which which the site is, is allocated in, sorry, located in so, in simple terms, this specific part of the East Midlands has some unique attributes, we say, which generate significant opportunities and potential for additional significant economic activity. That said, there are also known infrastructure capacity challenges, and I know highways issues forms a separate part of your agenda, so I won't dwell on that, but my colleagues will discuss that related points with you in due course, the third and final of my three headings, there is a consensus around the very significant market need and demand for additional strategic sites for distribution warehousing. Here, this is established by evidence from the applicant and the sevills report I've mentioned, and that itself, that report itself, refers to and analyses the evidence prepared by others, however crucially, sir, since that work by by savills for the applicant, the Leicester and Leicestershire local authorities published additional evidence prepared for their senior to inform local plan preparation that work clearly, clearly independent of our own, concludes there was a gross need for almost 4 million square metres of additional floor space for strategic b8 development over the 23 year period, examined, and the apportionment included in that report identifies a residual unmet need in excess of 1 million square metres in North West Leicestershire alone, clearly considerably in excess of the floor space we're proposing a signal, I think, of the market strength specifically in this area, the EMG two proposals respond directly to that need, and we say, are uniquely positioned to address it, where close proximity to EMG one, as we just been discussing, will enable further efficient access to rail freight, but clearly, more sites will be required if the market need is to be met and opportunities fully capitalised, so you're without straying on. I can pause there if hope I was just going to touch on the section 35 direction. Which forms one of your separate bullets? Should I should I stop

 1:14:13

and come back to that?

 1:14:14

I've got specific questions about the section 35 directions. So perhaps I'll come to those. Perhaps don't cover those necessarily now, and maybe when I get to my questions on those, you can come back in. Is there anything else you want to say on the neat case

 1:14:36

for now, sir, that's that's all for me. Then thank you.

 1:14:40

Okay, so moving on to the questions then.

 1:14:47

So the section 35 direction establishes that the relevant EMG two works are directed into the development consent regime and treated as an N slip, and we're wondering whether the applicants can please confirm that they share our current understanding that the section 35 direction does not necessarily establish the need for the relevant EMG to works. Rather, it's a procedural direction by nature, and therefore the need case should be fully evidenced by the applicants and fully examined by us accordingly.

 1:15:21

So Alexander booth for the applicant. So that must be, right? The section 35 direction is procedural in nature. It doesn't establish a need case we've already accepted, by dint of this being a section 105 scenario and the need for a section 35 direction that there isn't an NPS wishes need, as there might be in the context of other forms of development, energy development, say. So we need to demonstrate that to you the examination. I suppose what we would say in that context is that whilst there's obviously significant disagreement between some of the parties at this examination on on many issues. One issue where we are likely to be aligned with the likes of Prologis and the airport is the need for development of this type, because they themselves are seeking to promote a development, albeit, we say a smaller, inferior, one of the same type. So in terms of there being a need, and indeed, probably the quantification of that need, I don't anticipate there being significant dispute, but we do need to make good our need case for the examination.

 1:16:36

Thanks. Thank you. Okay, on to our next question. So the section 35 direction directs the relevant EMG to works into the development consent regime on the basis they would include a carbon neutral campus. Firstly, would the applicants be able to explain more about the carbon neutral campus and how it would as part of the wider EMG two works. And secondly, given the carbon neutral campus was integral to this section, 35 direction being made, should the delivery of it be secured in the draft DCO over to the

 1:17:20

Sir Alexander booth, on behalf of the applicant in terms of the carbon neutral campus, I think perhaps again, this would be a discrete area where we can usefully provide you with a written note in broad terms the position, though, sir, is I'm not sure the applicant would accept your representation of the Carbon Neutral campus as having been integral to the decision to make the section 35 direction. It's right that it's referred in the application for that direction, and it's right that it's referred to in the direction itself, but I don't think we would accept that it was integral to that decision making process as regards the carbon neutral issue, as the note will set out, you will be aware, and indeed, the documentation before the examination, sets out that the carbon neutral campus, slash headquarters, that's the headquarter mask. So that's what we're talking about. It's not a question of the entirety of the facility. It's what Maersk identify as they themselves delivering, and indeed delivering, I think it's by 2040 that's the deadline that Maersk have set themselves. So that's what we anticipate them delivering. And in terms of requirements as regards the carbon position of the facility more generally, that would not be and because that is not the totality of this development, is not the carbon neutral headquarters, slash campus of Maersk, we would anticipate requirements speaking to the Low Carbon position of the facility as a whole. So that's what we anticipate.

 1:19:08

Thank you. I mean, you say it's not integral, but it was mentioned, so presumably it does have some sort of a bearing on that direction. So do we deal with Well,

 1:19:19

I suppose so we say, we don't say that it's irrelevant. But I mean, the term integral, I think, suggests to me that it depended on and we do not. We would not accept that. That is the position. And indeed, what we're looking at is simply the campus slash headquarters of this particular operator who's indicated that they wish to establish their national headquarters within the EMG to campus. So we would expect you, the panel, and also the Secretary of State, to have regard to that intention on the part of the occupier, operator, Maersk, and have regard to the broader requirements that we suggest for inclusion within the DCO which secure its low carbon credentials, irrespective of Maersk, thank you, sir.

 1:20:11

Okay, thank you, Mr. Booth.

 1:20:15

So I think that's all the questions I had under this issue. So before moving on, I'm just going to see if there's any comments. I could see Mr. Philpott with his hand up, so I'll come to him first.

 1:20:31

Thank you, sir. Harry wood Philpott, on behalf of Prologis, just two short points, sir. The first is there's been repeated reference to Maersk this in this hearing, I'm not aware that there's anything either in the DCO that guarantees that Maersk will be a feature of this development, if it is allowed, or indeed any binding contractual obligation that's been put before the examination that is the limit of the status of it. It doesn't have any it shouldn't have any particular bearing on the decision making in those circumstances. The second point is simply this, that the section 35 direction applies to a particular description of development, and if the development that is described in the section 35 direction is not reflected in the decision that mismatch has consequences in terms of virus and the Secretary of State in the section 35 direction notes the project comprises, amongst other things, a substantial carbon neutral campus headquarters, including co located head office functions. That is the development path to which the direction relates. So I just make those two observations.

 1:21:57

Thank you. Mr. Philpott, do the applicants want to come back on anything?

 1:22:03

Alexander booth, the applicant, no, sir, I don't think we need to. I've indicated we'll come back in writing on that point. I mean, I think you're aware of the letter from Maersk, which is, I think, Appendix three to the planning statement, which speaks to their commitment to and support for the development. We're, of course, aware also of Maersk, substantial presence, existing presence on the MG one. But we'll come back to you as regards the section 35 direction and the carbon neutral headquarters position in writing.

 1:22:38

Thank you. I can see Mr. Sutton has his hand

 1:22:42

raised. Thank you, Mr.

 1:22:44

Ray Sutton, a resident and Kegworth parish council. So I just wish to emphasise that the overview of the need case should refer back to the skills delivery and the type of jobs created, and it was an issue that wasn't totally highlighted in my previous comment, but I think we've had some references to advanced manufacturing, but I think we need evidence as exactly how those will be delivered, as to opposed to other green industry related jobs, and also to strategic warehousing. And the more I hear, sir, I hear that this is all for commercial, strategic, warehousing, development. Thank you.

 1:23:30

Thank you. Mr. Sutton, does the

 1:23:33

applicant want to come back on any of that?

 1:23:36

Alexander booth, the applicant, no, I don't believe I do. Thank you.

 1:23:40

So unless there's any further comments, we'll finish this issue. Just going to discuss with my panel leader about potentially table match. Just bear with me. I

 1:24:16

Okay, I think we're at a natural break just before we go into the highway works issue, so we'll break for lunch. The time is now practically quarter to one, so we'll have an hour and we'll come back at quarter to two. So this hearing is now adjourned back at quarter to two. Thank you.