



Hearing Transcript

Project:	East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Day 1 – Part 2
Date:	13 May 2026

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

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. 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 hearing.

Issue Specific Hearing 3 - 13_5_26 - 11_30am

Wed, May 13, 2026 11:29AM 1:18:27

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Traffic modelling, National Highways, Leicestershire County Council, MCO scheme, DCO scheme, mezzanine floor, travel plan, local road network, construction traffic, safety audit, abnormal load route, headroom clearance, sustainable travel options, road safety, traffic management.

SPEAKERS

Speaker 1, Speaker 6, Speaker 15, Speaker 12, Speaker 10, Speaker 4, Speaker 11, Speaker 3, Speaker 9, Speaker 13, Speaker 16, Speaker 14, Speaker 5, Speaker 7, Speaker 2, Eventurous AV Team

 00:41

Good morning, everybody again. It's half past so the hearing is resumed. As I said, we're now going to move on to traffic and transport, and we've got various the various questions we've put and I've got some sort of introductions to them, as you'd expect, have lost my mouse, The first point relates to the latest position on traffic modelling for of the proposed development, the position of the highway authorities and the areas of disagreement, where and where areas of disagreement rain, this disagreement rain, and whether there's a difference between in relation to the MCO scheme and the DCO scheme, if there is, please identify it. I think you will start with national highways as to where they have got to please.

 01:31

Fiona Ahmed, on behalf of National Highways, national highways has no outstanding areas of disagreement on the traffic

 01:37

modelling.

 01:38

Thank you. And Leicester county council,

 01:41

Harry Horsley, Leicestershire county council, we've been liaising with the applicant team on specifically that point for the MCO. Our view on the submitted note as currently presented is that it possibly omits a helpful explanation of what the benefit that could be derived from that specific works package on the circular actually could be which would then inform an explanation as to whether it's worth the effectively, the traffic management impacts of delivering it for just the proportion of traffic that will be general generated from the MCO. So we've liaised as recently as Friday of last week, on that which the applicant team is considering their position on whether it's something they wish to update in terms of formal submission or not. But we are mindful that the network in that location is predominantly national highways, therefore conscious of the position that they've taken.

 02:40

Thank you.

 02:49

We had a discussion. We've had a discussion at the last ones about the so called mezzanines, and particularly because there was the traffic generation we'll come back to later. We had a discussion about terminology, and we'll come back to that later on, today or tomorrow, when we discuss the draft eco. What I'm interested in now is, where are we as to the quantum of whatever we're going to end up going to be called, and what at the stage would it be allowed to be used for national highways. Do you have any particular comments on on that? Obviously, the quantum is again a slightly different figure, queer issue as well.

 03:32

Fiona Ahmed, on behalf of National Highways, we've held extensive discussions with the applicant on the mezzanine flooring to understand the usage from an operational perspective, the mezzanine floor is unlikely to be a chip generator in comparison to the ground floor. Therefore, this hasn't been quantified through further modelling. However, it should be noted that the modelling undertaken today provides a robust assessment which doesn't account for the potential success of the travel plan. The mezzanine floor has been dealt with through an agreed requirement, which is number 27 with the applicant that reflects its treatment in the modelling. Furthermore, this requirement will be supported by a travel plan and associated monitoring to ensure that the trip levels are not exceeded.

 04:21

Clearly, we're going to have a discussion later about the about the wording of the of that requirement, because there's certain things which I'm sure that district council are not content with it. I've also got certain questions I would also want to have on it. So we come to that Leicester City Council. This is just, this is a county council. County council. My

 04:43

apologies. Harry Horsley , Leicester County Council. Our position is that we remain concerned about requirement 27 therefore a a way of dealing with that could, could well be to assess the additional 100,000 square metres of the proper noun, the noun that's decided upon, and then confirm the position in terms of strategic mitigation. And therefore that might deal with the matter of not requiring the requirement, not with saying that we have been liaising with applicant team on the local road network impact of the additional 100,000 square metres which they have, they have undertaken, which we're grateful for, and we're working through the residual impacts that on the local road network. So I think probably just the point to make is that a suggestion has been made that that additional 100,000 square metres uplift could be run through the visit modern and that might well bottom out the point such that there could be sort of wider agreement to the impact being accepted with this, with the mitigation proposed.

 05:43

Thank you. Does the applicant have to any particular comments to make on those points? As I say, we will be returning to requirement 27 later on.

 05:55

Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, obviously, Harry has referred to the meeting that we had on Friday, we will be looking at updating the MCO note to elaborate on the points that have been raised there, and we await any further guidance, I guess, with regards to any requirements to look at further vision modelling and the likes, we'll hold our thoughts on that for the time being.

 06:18

Okay, thank you. There are going to be some further questions in the XQ on traffic modelling, just from our point of view, I have to have one question which I'd like to deal with now relating to Rep 1058, if you could get that up, bum, bum. Which is for those who don't know the exam library intimately, is the PRT, M 2023, sensitivity of test, technical note and road local road network Impact Assessment note. And then, could you go to our PDF page 195, please? Right? And then it's that. It's the table. It's table three. Is what I'm interested what I'm interested in. Thank you. What we've noted on this one, particularly is in the third in the last big column, either with development and mitigation, that all the figures for the m1 southern circulatory are greater than nought point nine, which means they're close to capacity, and one's at not 1.98 given the inherent limitations of modelling, which can only be described as best assumptions, it's not a criticism of it's all that's available. Could at, could national highways, and then the applicant set out whether they consider additional mitigation should be provided. Give it explain or explain why you don't think it should be provided. And if you could have that, please, national highways first,

 08:10

Fiona Ahmed on behalf of national highways, and as stated before, national highways have reviewed and agreed this, and we don't believe that any further mitigation is required. And if you need further details, perhaps we take that away in a written note.

 08:23

Yeah, given how close those figures are to one, I think I would would like an explanations to one, because it does only means make assuming they're correct, that they it only needs there to be a small change in some of the variables, and you you're over one quite quickly. If I could be have a grateful does the applicant? Does the applicant wish to make a call

 08:46

on behalf the applicant will, will take that away. So if that's okay, similarly, thank you.

 08:52

As I said, there are going to be some other modelling questions coming, coming in the XQ to that. That was one I wanted particularly to highlight. In the statement of common ground with Leicestershire City Council submitted by the county council, there are a few items which were unresolved. I'd like to go through them, discusses just where we are. One, first one is the personal injury collision analysis in light of the PRT, av 2023, analysis, I'll start with with the county council first, and then we can go from

 09:28

there.

 09:30

Harry Horsley, Leicester county council. So our discussions the applicant team, sort of continue with the In note and residual impact on our network, which the applicant teams agreed to update the PRC analysis within Kegworth and Castle Donnington. So we're happy with the progress that's being made, but just wish to see the outputs of it. Thank you

 09:51

for the applicant.

 09:51

Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, as Harry suggested, we'll be looking at that in greater detail. Thank you,

 10:00

and that's expected in for deadline.

 10:01

Four,

 10:03

yes,

 10:06

they're down some action point. The next one is the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing at the north west corner of the open space area with the crossing to the airport. There was some discussion about this in relation to the Road Safety Audit auditors, but I think, Notwithstanding that, I think it would be easy to sort it out more generally. Now, given it wasn't specifically referred to in the Road Safety Audit, could the county council expend its concerns a bit more and then I'll wait for the applicant to

 10:41

reply.

 10:43

Harry Horsley, Leicester county council, you're quite right, sir, we did miss that in our initial assessment of the access roundabout drawing as it's labelled, but grateful that it was raised as part of the earlier hearings upon reflection review of that design. We are we have significant higher safety concerns at the prospect of an uncontrolled crossing in that location. We have discussed the applicant team options of how to progress works in that area, though, and it's likely to be one of either exploring a signalised option there, but as pointed out in inspectors, questions would lead to an additional red phase, albeit probably not triggered too often, but the impacts that would be need to be considered. The wider prow proposal is probably more an amenity type connection than a fundamental access provision. So the other alternatives that we did suggest was that it may not be required as a provision there, especially if it leads to a road safety issue that we aren't happy with. The third option, I think, in terms of our discussions with the applicant team, was that we'd agree to disagree and leave it as an item of contention on our so much common ground, which would respect their position. If that's the approach they took to take,

 11:58

that's absolutely fine. I hear from the applicant next on this?

 12:04

Yes. Simon Hilditch for the applicant. So in terms of the Road Safety Audit, while it wasn't picked up in the Road Safety Audit Report, that's because it was actually mentioned as part of the Road Safety Audit brief, and the Road Safety auditor did not raise any concerns about it or problems with it at that stage. And as a fundamental principle, we don't agree that having uncontrolled crossings within signalised junctions is inherently unsafe. In fact, the next signalised junction down has that exact same same provision. However, we fully committed to working with the county council, and if there's a way forward to resolve it to everyone's satisfaction, then we will seek to do so

 12:45

fast as it is, all within the red line of the application site.

 12:48

Yes, absolutely.

 12:51

It may well be. We'll see, see how things progress. If there's a dispute, we may well ask somebody, in due course, to produce a without prejudice requirement, just to include a phase into that given the proximity to the airport, does East Midlands Airport have any any comments they wish to make about that particular junk, that particular junction, given the proximity of the new access coming in from the south, essentially from across the open space, closed open space.

 13:27

Simon Pratt representing East Midlands Airport, I think just going on the signal control crossing versus the uncontrolled crossing, certainly we'd be interested in seeing how the signal control crossing would affect the movements at that particular junction, the access to the airport, but as part of the airport, as well, from the modelling and the information we've we've gleaned, it's very difficult to understand the capacity and the effect of traffic on that roundabout. Now that might affect the operation of the airport. So

 14:00

we would just like some clarity on the outputs from the models with regards to that effect could just simply be provided. Thank you. Well, obviously discussions will continue on that, and in due course, we'll see how they, whether they whether they resolve in the sense that they agree to agree or agree to disagree, and we'll then have to worry about it, and there on earth that's fine.

 14:23

John Riley, Pinsent Masons for the airport. With respect you just covered off there the discussions continuing, but we didn't, I think, wrap up Mr. Pratt's request for further clarity for modelling outputs. And I wondered if he might elaborate

 14:39

that we're coming. We're coming to that in a bit, in a minute,

 14:41

to make sure I didn't get

 14:42

missed. Yeah, no, we're about to do some work discussions about particularly construction truck traffic on the network. Which is one of these is much more. Which is what the point you're much more raising the third of the three points that the county council had raised relates to Derby, road traffic on Derby, road keg work, and I was wondering where you'd got to on that.

 15:11

Harry Horsley, Leicester county council. So, as mentioned earlier, gratefully received the In impact note, which overlays 100,000 square metres of mezzanine and residual impact on, or potential residual impact on, to the local road network. We've discussed the well we've reviewed that provided our comments back to the applicant team, which basically identifies the two main links through Kegworth and Castle Donnington as showing almost returned to pre bypass levels of traffic on those links, which, from our perspective, is of concern to us, and we wanted to understand if there was a measures that could be implemented to discourage that and thus put traffic onto the more appropriate bypass routes. We had a really positive discussion with the applicant team around a monitor and manage approach that could be taken for that which verbally was committed to do so. So what we would envisage that could look like is a methodology of undertaking a sort of an existing baseline link flow assessment to understand the current position, a monitoring programme throughout construction and occupation that shows how those levels do or don't replicate what is shown within the prtm assessment, acknowledging that it may not, and therefore we don't want to be effectively over providing mitigation if it's not required, however it is, there would then be a trigger that would enable a package of measures to be implemented to encourage traffic onto the more appropriate routes and discourage it from travelling through the villages. That hopefully, is an area of work that the applicant teams going to undertake and share with us for future review. The only other points about, and I know itself, are on the agenda in terms of road safety audit discussion, but we'd obviously need to see what the measures are before we could comment on their suitability and appropriateness. But, yeah, it remains a significant concern to us, but there is a potential way for that. It could be addressed and mitigated, I think,

 17:14

is the applicant have a comment on that. But obviously, if it were, if it if mitigations were to be necessary, how they would be secured as well.

 17:24

Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, obviously, as Harry referred to, had a really useful meeting on Friday afternoon, so we'll be weighing everything up and considering matters and reporting back accordingly for deadline four. So simple as that, really at

 17:38

the minute, clearly, could you have it in that if should works be necessary, whatever solutions may be necessary, could you have a think about how they would could be secured? Because obviously, if they if it's outside the red line, you've got different, different issues than if it's inside this, which obviously the the first of the junctions we were talking about is within the red lines, it becomes slightly easier.

 18:02

Yeah, we will consider that accordingly. Thank you.

 18:05

Isabella Tafur, to for the applicants, yes, just to be clear that. So the impacts on Derby Road in Kegworth, we understand, were first raised with us by LCC on the 20th of April, so recently, and we The other issue relates to the potential through traffic in Castle Donnington and LCC have requested additional signage to encourage the use of the relief road, and we understand that there one potential that county council are considering are potential speed limits, that that sort of intervention, we are still reviewing whether, in our view, anything further is necessary. So that's a process that's being undertaken, given how recently, at least the first of those issues has been raised, but we will deal with anything we think may be necessary, and the way it's secured,

 18:59

clearly, the reason why it's only recently done, because the when the PRT M modelling was complete so it could, that was the first time it could be assessed. But yes, the county

 19:08

council,

 19:09

Leicester County Councillor Harrow, yeah, just wanted to say so didn't think it necessary to supplement our answers with the dates we receive. Things other than to mention the positive engagement has been ongoing. But yes, the having to get to the conclusion of what the impacts are on the Irn, clearly, now is the appropriate time to discuss what the measures could look like.

 19:29

Thank you. Now move on to 4.2 which is deals with construction traffic and the network. Sorry, yes.

 19:48

Bruce Bamber from protect Diseworth, sorry, I was waiting till there was an appropriate moment. I have a question about the modelling that I think is important to raise. I've been going through the various modelling reports that have been produced, and it's clear to me that the way the modelling has been done, there is the potential risk that some traffic has been overlooked because of we know that in the visim model, the more sort of concentrated, strategic combined model there has been reported the level of latent demand, which is the number of trips that are not able to get onto the model network in each of the scenarios. And that is well documented in the reports. What I haven't seen is a similar, similar level of detail for the EMFM model. Concerns have been raised about what, whether that there are unreleased trips within that model, because if those trips have been excluded from the emfm The emfm outputs are used as the inputs to the visim model. So it's possible that what the visim model is seeing is not the actual demand. I note the decision was taken to use actual flows rather than demand flows. So it has been a conscious decision not to look at demand but to look at the actual outputs from the model. But in order to make sense of that, we do need to know the number of trips, if there are trips missing that may not have been carried across from the emfm, the implications could be quite significant, because they will affect judgments about things like whether the a 453, needs to be dualled At a certain point in the future, it might affect the amount of traffic that is rat running through Diseworth or castle Donnington or Kegworth. It will ultimately affect judgments about the level of impact transport impact that the development is likely to lead to, and it could also affect judgments about the sufficiency of the mitigation that's being proposed. So I think it is important that that information is made available so that we can have at least some level of confidence that what we're looking at in the visim model is reflecting what would appear in the future.

 22:47

Does the applicant wish to respond to that?

 22:49

Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, there should be no latent demand in the actual vism modelling that's undertaken, certainly not the 2023 assessment years worth of works gone into the modelling work, the prtm modelling, the finessing of the traffic numbers, the visit modelling itself, the agreement of the base model, so on and so forth. There's an awful lot of effort that's gone into making sure that it's fit for purpose and everything should be correct and proper, but we could look at that item in detail, perhaps

 23:21

Thank you. And I probably would be sensible if you, if you're in one of the breaks you two could get together, and just because in the nice with no disrespect, expected to speak saying your concerns in very precede form into a in front of us is going to be slightly different to when you can talk in even more technical language than than in front then, then in front of me. Thank you. If we move on to 2.4 which relates to the various construction traffics with various about the question of construct effects, particularly in light of the 24/7 operation of the airport, before I ask the question, applicant, some questions about this. Advice to understand a bit more about from the airport about its operations. Whilst it's stated, cargo operations are mostly at night, but it doesn't necessarily follow through that when the vehicle movements trap ground traffic, vehicle movements not cut planes associated with those movements take place as imported goods will need to be processed after arrival, before putting onto vehicles for dispatch and vice versa. I was wondering if East Midlands Airport national highways or Leicestershire county council might have any information about how traffic movements associated with freight may distributed throughout a 24 hour period from the airport the

 24:46

please give us one moment. Sir, introduce Mr. John Bottomley from Manchester airports

 25:02

group. John Bottomley Manchester airports group, on behalf of East Midlands Airport. So just responding to your question about freight movements on the road to service the cargo operation at the airport, then that is quite right, that the flown freight runs through the airport from around about eight, nine o'clock in the evening through to five, six o'clock in the morning, and that freight generally needs to be in the cargo units at the airport around about three hours prior to departure. So for the earlier freight departures, that tend to be the long haul transatlantics that will go out around about sort of 9, 10, 11 in the evening that freight would then need to be at the airport about three hours beforehand for cargo that is then moving, probably into Europe, that is going throughout the depths of the night. Again, that is probably about three hours prior to departure. So those road vehicle movements would occur during the the evening. Those are the cargo movements that are going into the airport site. Obviously there are then the arriving aircraft, and again, that cargo would be offloaded. The offload would take around an hour, an hour and a half to then go into the shed, onto trucks, and then go out onto the network, so that you would tend to get a spread of cargo, road traffic that is inbound into the aircraft some three hours prior to departure, and then outbound from the airport from around about an hour and a half from flight arrival.

 26:58

So I'm just one, obviously, one of the issues is because, obviously that's all of that will be outside peak hour. Just wondering if the county and or national highways have any comments on that in relation to, particularly when we get into discussion about construction traffic, start with the County Council. Mr. Kings, sort of more more willing to come forward at this point.

 27:22

Mrs. Rebecca Henson, Leicestershire county council, yes, sir. So we don't hold particular information in respect of freight movements to and from the airport, but we have raised concerns with the applicant team about access to the road network as a consequence, not only of the operation of the freight elements of the East Midlands Airport. But of course, the peak summer holiday period associated with the airport, as well, as you'll be aware, sir, there is an international racing circuit close by to the application site. We have also raised that there are some significant events that take place at that location, not least of which is the Download Festival, which results in significant traffic demand and traffic management required both on the local and strategic road networks, so there will be restrictions in place in respect of access to the road network for carrying out of construction works in the evening and certain peaks throughout the year,

 28:34

national highways

 28:36

on behalf of national highways. So as we've mentioned, the construction act impacts are dealt with in the transport assessment appendix 74 as has already been said, that the peak hours have been assessed, which is when the baseline is its highest, which is the requirement any existing freight traffic on the network would have been captured within the traffic surveys which have been undertaken and utilised within the model, and also any future growth assessed with the airport would be included within the uncertainty log, which again, would have been included within the assumptions in the traffic modelling. And both of these have been agreed with national highways. National Highways is satisfied that the ctmp will satisfy any safety concerns associated with overnight and weekend users at the SRN, and we'll work with the contractor to minimise any disruption or closures as required,

 29:32

come to actually protect Diseworth next, assuming they do want to, would like to comment On they don't want to go, and that's fine. I fine, yeah.

 29:48

Bruce Bamber protect. Diseworth, I noticed on the in the uncertainty log, the freight is included, but there's no allowance there for any passenger growth.

 30:03

That's, that's, that was my that's the next point I'm going to ask exactly the same about keeping to freight. I was trying to keep freight separate from passengers because they will clearly be, I was assumed more seasonal. Again, wait for the airport to come back to us, because they're busy talking amongst themselves. Thank you. As I was wondering if you had any similar information about traffic, associated with passengers and staff, and whether and what the seasonal spread was, again, how much of it would be affected by works that were taking place and road closures and things like that.

 30:46

Yeah. Thanks. John bossonley for East Midlands Airport, just picking up on the point about passengers that on an annual basis, then the passenger throughput through the airport is is pretty seasonal, to be fair, and that is generally to be found with regional airports in the UK. So the bulk of the airport's passenger flying takes place from after the Easter holidays through to the early autumn, so the winter months are the quieter times for passenger throughput. But what I would say at that point is then the the autumn period is the peak time for air cargo as the the air cargo operation is responding to the Christmas peak in in that sense. But going back to the cargo, sorry, the passenger movements, then those movements, as they have a have a profile across the year. But then when you look at the passing passenger movements across the day, then that is also similarly peaked that the the airport has a passenger flow that is between from around about six to 630 to around about nine o'clock in the in the morning, where the first wave of passenger flights Leave East Midlands Airport. So those are aircraft that are based at the airport, and they are then flying outbound from the from the UK, into into Europe. So with those aircraft departing in that sort of time window, the airlines have a requirement for those passengers to be at the airport some two hours prior to departure. So those passengers are on the on the network, or on the public transport network, from around about sort of four, half past four in the in the morning, there is then a wave of those aircraft coming back, inbound into East Midlands around about lunchtime, early afternoon, with arriving passengers then leaving the airport from after around about an hour from flight arrival. And then there is a similar wave, albeit a smaller arrival wave later on in the evening, as the passenger aircraft, Return, return home, as it were, for the for the evening. And then there is a another wave of flight arrivals in the sort of 10 till midnight, sort of type window. So that is the profile of the of the airport operation in that sense.

 33:38

Thank you very much.

 33:42

So

 33:42

um, one of the references in one of the documents from the county council was a reference to the Christmas moratorium annually on the A453, before and after Christmas. Not being a local, could somebody explain to us what that's all about?

 34:02

Mrs. Rebecca Henson Leicestershire county council, we have a Christmas moratorium on certain parts of our network across the county relating to Christmas peaks in traffic. So for example, around our major shopping sites, we have a moratorium of no road works in the in the build up to Christmas. And the question was that the applicant needed to give consideration to Mr. Mr. Bottomley may be able to confirm that there's a peak in passengers wishing to depart the country for warmer climates before Christmas, and what impact that demand may have on the A453, and the need for a moratorium around there.

 34:49

So going back to the applicants of all this, the response to date has been to the effect as this will be covered in PCT CEMP, with the Outlander requirement set in Section 22 of the traffic management of the CEMP, given the only exception currently is for emergency vehicles. And given what we've been hearing about on the 24/7 nature of the airport and its importance in various ways. Well, I'm wondering whether actually, we need a bit more in that outline, traffic invite, traffic management plan, just to make it more clear that it is going to be able to deal with those peaks and troughs that we've had described to us at the moment, because at the moment, it does seem to be almost devil. Take the high most of the traffic that's going on to the others, and your highway works, takes, takes priority. That's probably getting a bit strong, but probably much does the applicant wish to make a comment on

 35:57

that?

 35:58

Isabella Tafur for for the applicants, so at the outset, I'd say plainly, SEGRO have addressed issues such as the airports operations and local road work moratoriums in the successful delivery of the first phase of the East Midlands gateway. There are over 7000 people employed EMG one and plainly, SEGRO have a vested interest in ensuring that adverse impacts on the road network are appropriately mitigated. Our position is that we have carried out a tag compliant assessment of construction traffic impacts, agreed with national highways overall, that the conclusion was that construction traffic flows would have a negligible impact on the existing highway network

 36:56

traffic flows, per se, it's the shots,

 36:59

yes, Well, in terms of the in terms of the works themselves, we say they are appropriately controlled through the construction Environmental Management Plan and its associated construction traffic management plan, respectively. The ctmp is an overarching document. Phase specific ctmps will be produced and must be agreed with the relevant highway authorities. And in terms of, you know, closures and road space bookings, I mean, we say that's appropriately dealt with through the protective provisions in favour of national highways and the county council so well, just in terms of the provisions secured in the DCO schedule two, requirement 11, prevents any phase of the authorised development so for certain specified, limited exceptions from commencing until a phase specific Kemp has been submitted to and approved, and each phase specific Kemp must include a construction traffic management plan the protective provisions for the benefit of national highways prevent any phase of the specified works from commencing until a traffic management scheme has been submitted to and approved by them, oblige the undertaker to give 28 days of notice of any specified works and to comply with national highways is a road space booking procedures, and those are replicated for the benefit of the county council in part two of schedule 13. And the purpose of the traffic management plans is to control the temporary measures that are required and what precisely is required will be developed as the detailed design process progresses and once the contractor is appointed and develops their methods. But at all stages, the relevant Highway Authority will retain control over approval of the ctmps and will have to comply with their road booking systems, having said that, sir, if you know, if you think it may be helpful to put more flesh on the bones in the ctmp, then that's certainly something we can take away and

 39:10

consider. We'll do a quick run around the round, round the table first, before I make, make a comment, I'm assuming national highway was essentially content with that. What the proposal say at the moment, Fiona

 39:22

Ahmed, on behalf of National Highways, yes, we're content with the information provided at the moment. However, we will happy, happily review further information if it's deemed necessary.

 39:32

The county council, however, I don't think are quite as happy,

 39:35

Mrs. Rebecca Henson Leicestershire County Council. I think that's fair to say, Sir, with all due respect the A453, and this location is a local road network for which Leicestershire county council are responsible for the network management, and the issue of any traffic management permits. The impact of this development on the local road network in this location will be significantly different to when East Midlands gateway one was built out and the associated highway works in a different time period when flows to and from the airport, both in terms of freight and passenger, were at a much more reduced level than they are in 2026 We do have concerns, and we'll come on to those no doubt tomorrow about the protective provisions within the DCO, which we've documented in our deadline responses. And we absolutely accept that the applicant will need to comply with the network management requirements of Leicestershire county council, but ultimately, so there's a consideration of how those requirements will impact on the construction and delivery programme of the highway works, and that's what we will wish to see. Thank you.

 40:50

I'm assuming

 40:52

that the District Council doesn't have anything particular on this point. Levers, leaving it to the county council. East Midlands Airport obviously has also got concerns on this which you've expressed already in writing. But is there anything you wish to add at this point?

 41:06

John Riley, Pinsent Masons for the airport, I think it's clear from our written submissions that we do not feel we have a full set of information that's necessary for us to determine the full range of impacts of both construction and operation of the proposed development on the airport. It may be that that information does exist and has been shared with the highway authorities. If so, we would like to see it as well. We are not confident that the process has been followed at this point of potentially partially sharing information with the highway authorities, but not with us, would be replicated again when phase specific ctmps were agreed we would not want to be shut out of the process again at that phase. So if you'll forgive us, we don't have any confidence in that proposed means of managing future impacts. We would like to see the information that's been requested or identified as missing now, rather than it be kicked down the road to be dealt with behind closed doors in the future.

 42:19

Obviously, there might we have discussion about this tomorrow, whether that making the airport an additional consultee in that in those processes, may be a way around it. But Notwithstanding that, the point has been made at moment from the county council in particular, that I think they would like to see a bit more flesh on the bones for the particularly the ctmps to see during particularly in the construction phase, is what we're the particular concern is, and I was wondering if the applicant could take that away as and have as an action point with a view to taking more account of the site specific nature of the A453, and the access to the airport. Would think that would be particularly beneficial, and particularly what trying to work out, what when those section, when the A453, does have to be closed for whatever reason, particularly for tie in, works, how it is anticipated that traffic would be able to get to and from the airport, and why the wider beyond just the emergency vehicles, which obviously exceptions can be made for, can I? Can I? Is that going to be possible for D4

 43:25

Isabella Tafur for the applicants? Certainly. So we will look into and consider that. I would note that we have already updated the ctmp at deadline two, and it's rep to zero, 20 7d I believe, and for example, the ctmp now makes explicit provision for the Donington Park event coordination protocol. So you know

 43:52

that is only but one of and others have been clearly identified and

 43:58

are

 43:59

clearly identifiable. It's not like it's not like it's something that may happen in the

 44:03

future. Yes, I understood. So we've, we've sought to put further flesh on the bones. I mean, our deadline to submission, but we will certainly go away and consider whether there's any further flesh we can add.

 44:14

We can now move on to 4.3 and could I ask that appendix two of appendix 19 a of the applicant responses to ex, q1, right. Rep, 1054, if you get that, I'll again, give you the PDF page, which I want to have a look at. And right. And then page 437 right at the end. Right. This is the one I suspect most people will be aware of this. I'm interested in the motorway junction area of the J 23 rather than the junction 23 a works in this particular one. And could you also have to hand as zero 11, D, which is the highways general arrangement, plan three and a PPO 40 9d which is the highway plans, long section, Section sheet, one north, m1, northbound to a 50 westbound interchange link, which is the one that is throughout the top of the two. But if we go back to the rep 1054, first, which is the works packages. Once under this plan, the proposed under this the plan, as you can see it in front of you now, the this included an underpass scenario where the carriageway for the link between the M1 and the M50 was going through under rather than on a bridge. However, we that's fine. We know the reasons you've given that, so that's not the issue. But what we haven't seen is in any analysis in relation to the effects on the red package, ie work four, which is red, and whether there would be any conflicts with the proposed bridge in that package, across the motorway, under the underpass. Scenario, the carriageway would be going down at this point, ensuring headroom for that bridge. However, in a bridge scenario, if you look at as zero 11 D, which is the general arrangement plan, the carriageway is rising by this point, which results in less potential headroom under they have any bridge. Our reading of the proposed height, if you look at the third drawing, it around. Change for 775 metres, there's the link road is about 2.2 metres above ground level. There's a difference of around four metres in height between what's proposed on this and what was proposed under the go back to the first drawing with the under, with the with the underpass, we're wondering we could what we're concerned about is by using a bridge solution in the proposed development for the link road, this would prevent the construction of a new bridge across the motorway because of the lack of headroom, firstly, because the lack of headroom on the link road. And secondly, if the response was, oh, we'll just raise the carriageway of the bridge, whether they're actually practical, given you've got to go in ensure the gradients work to get into the junctions with the A453, immediately to the west, given, I don't think you can move that junction north or south much because of this, because of the issue, because of the sight lines and where it fits on that particular section of road. And it would also apply to any sign gantries on the motorway as well, the hype issue, issue. Have you had any Have you had a look? You got any comments on

 48:04

it? Yes, yes. Thank you. So Simon Hilditch, for the applicant. So first of all, the drawing of the version of the solution, of the long term solution on the screen now is actually slightly out of date, and that was dated from November 2024 there is actually a more up to date version, which we will put in a deadline down for. It's available now if you wish to see it, but you may not, which actually, yes, yeah, but actually shows the alignment of the green package going over the top, consistent with the solution put forward as part of the EMG to highway works in relation to the the potential future red package, with the with the bridge. There's also a very subtle difference between those two plans, which you'll see on the later plan, the bridge is actually slightly further south, which addresses some of the some of the points you've raised. And the time sequence was effectively the that version of the drawing was November 2024 we then did effectively what you just explained in your question, the thinking process in early 2025 which was then built into the options that were set out quite clearly in the appendix. 27 of the transport assessment, which looked at underpass versus a bridge, which then concluded with the bridge was the correct solution. As part of that options assessment. There is an old there's another version of the long section, and I'm not sure if it's available. It is. It is with you that shows the potential red bridge going over the top of the link road. So therefore, in our view, it is wholly consistent that what we're providing as part of the green package could in future have the red bridge built over the top with adequate headroom.

 49:42

Thank you, obviously, if you if we could have the revised version of that, and it probably would be no harm for letting us have a copy of the drawing. As I said, it's for information only. It's not wouldn't be part of the formal submission into an examination drawing, as it were, but just so that it has been evidence that there is, that there isn't a hedgerow headroom problem.

 50:06

Yes, at the same time, we will refer you to specific part of the rep, the TA appendix, and the drawing that shows that particular bridge.

 50:16

Thank you. Does national highways have any comments about any of that?

 50:22

Jeremy bloom on behalf of national highways. I think it's should be pointed out that those that diagram and those work packages don't actually have any status, and they're not agreed by national highways. The need for the red package hasn't been demonstrated yet. We do think it's unlikely that some works on the significant works on the eastern side of the GRE tree will be needed in association with some of the developments that are proposed to be brought very that form. So from our perspective, we wouldn't see that as material consideration in determining or otherwise,

 51:06

it's more what we were, what we were concerned else, that there was versatile stymieing of something which, because of something We hadn't seen, that was a thank you.

 51:22

Right? Move with Steven Carmody on behalf of East Midlands Airport, if you refer back to the plan and the proposed scheme by the applicant with the over bridge of the A453, we do have a query with regard to the headroom clearance of that structure across the A453 and whether it accounts for abnormal load movements. And we'd like the views of national highways and the local authority, as we believe the A453 is an abnormal load route, and there may be a risk to increasing that headroom.

 51:56

That's not part of this examination, because the the bridge we're talking we're talking about is from the aim one to the M50, not, therefore,

 52:09

that's the structure, that's the bridge I'm talking about. So he's the one from the M1 to the A50 is there.

 52:15

So

 52:15

you're concerned that there is a not, not enough. There's insufficient clearance on the link road bridge that's proposed. Yes,

 52:23

sir,

 52:24

right. Don't recall seeing that in writing, but it doesn't mean it wasn't there, and I've just missed it clearly, does the Act does the because there is a, there is a notified clearance in in the on the drawing, I'm sure. So if I'm sure, the app can be able to

 52:41

help? Yeah. Simon hilditch, for for the applicant. So the headroom is very discussion is very, very clearly set out in the appendix 27 it is a high load route for 18 foot high loads, and the bridge headroom has been made suitable to cater for 18 foot high loads.

 53:00

Is that, does that answer your question in the positive?

 53:03

No, it doesn't, sir. Apologies. With regard to the airport, position of what abnormal load height is available for access from the airport going north, if there was something coming into the airport, I don't believe there's been any discussions about the clearance and the suitability of clearance going north on to the m1 if the airport was impacted,

 53:26

can we leave the two of you to have a discussion offline over that to see what you what the airport thinks is a minimum necessary? Obviously, there may be other solutions that are that are achievable. Yeah, I'm not. There may be other routes that may have to be taken. I'm not. It's not for me, me to adjust it, but there's certainly you to can discuss it between yourselves. Thank

 53:48

you.

 53:49

We're happy to discuss this. I think our standpoint would be to work to the standard abnormal load route standards as specified by national highways. We work to that standard as a minimum, as a principle, and if we can do that, then there would be no further discussion. Yeah, and we'll put that in an action point for you to discuss, and then come back with a note default, thank you. Right. Moving on to 4.4. I'm sure that national highways, Leicestershire county council, and have seen the critique of the east of the transport assessment by East Midlands Airport, and I'm sure the applicant will respond in due course at deadline

 54:30

four. But I'm the meantime, I was wondering whether or not national highways or Leicestershire county council have any comments if

 54:36

you want

 54:40

to go for who wants to go first? Probably, probably probably the county council, I suspect.

 54:46

Thank you. Leicester county councillor, Harry Horsley. Only to say it was a thorough and well put together note, and we've, we've read it, considered it, but have it doesn't raise anything that we haven't already explored or continued to explore the applicant team. So it's all I want to say at this point.

 55:06

Thank you,

 55:06

Fiona, on behalf of National Highway, so we've got a similar view to the county, in that we've reviewed the note, and it doesn't affect national highways position that we've currently formed in that it mitigates in that they've established, we've formed an opinion on the traffic impacts and that the traffic impact is appropriately mitigated, so we don't have any specific comment on that.

 55:24

That's fine. Obviously, I'm not. You know if this is predominantly a written process, as you fully appreciate and we've got them in right? We've got the critique in writing. It was just giving them an opportunity at this point. I'm sure the applicant will respond fully at d4 to that representation. Is there anything which anything, particularly in light of the sponsors you've heard today that you wish to respond to? Then we'll kind of protect

 55:50

Diseworth, Simon Pratt, CP, representing East Midlands Airport. We're just concerned slightly with some of the modelling outputs and the fact that some of the junctions were showing excessive queuing, and there was no there was no mitigation to address that in certain areas, one of the junctions actually indicated that with the excessive queuing, the traffic would be red diverted onto the road network, redirected onto other areas of the road network. And our concern was, well, how much what's going to be rediverted? Where is it going to be redivert and has that been taken into account in the modelling? There just seems to be a little bit of unclarity from our perspective as to what was happening at these junctions. One of the concerns was the southbound off slip, where there seemed to be quite large cues on, on that approach to the to the roundabout junction, and times each could go back as far as the one main line, or that would would appear from the queues. I was just understanding how the models had been accepted and what consideration had been taken for, excuse me, for these particular items.

 56:54

Thank you. Obviously the the if you feel you want to discuss it between yourselves and the and these members, please do take the opportunity from discussions we previously had and what I've read, I think I know the answers to why that's occurring, so I don't need to ask questions about that. Protect Diceworth, is there anything you want to say at this point?

 57:13

Thank you. Bruce Bamber, protect Diceworth, just building on that point, the particular junction that we've got concerns over is the green junction with the A453, there's there's delays of over four minutes predicted in 2028 and over eight minutes in 2038 the response of the applicant to this at the moment is twofold. First of all, the point that the emfm is over estimating the capacity of that junction, therefore putting too much traffic through it. And this is the point that was raised. If the junction were constrained more in the model, where else would that traffic go? We don't know at the moment, presumably it would go on to other parts of the strategic network and add to the traffic there. The second point is specifically focusing in on Diceworth, the route via the green junction, if you're going to and from the east on the A, four, 5c, if you took the route via Grimes gate, which is the route that goes through the middle of the village, which goes through the conservation area, it goes past the primary school and the church. It's a very sensitive area. The delays at that junction are being shown as almost negligible at the moment, so that what I would expect to happen if this does occur is that drivers would choose instead to avoid the delays at the green to drive through the centre of Diceworth. There is only 100 metre difference in the length of the journey to go through the centre. So that is our concern, that there is the potential for additional environmental impacts on that very sensitive area that haven't as things stand with the ES been taken into account at the moment.

 59:18

The applicant session may have any comments on what, obviously please do to talk amongst yourselves outside the hearing.

 59:23


Isabella Tafur for the applicants. Thank you very much, sir. You've anticipated correctly that we would prefer to respond to the detailed comments raised by EMA in writing at deadline four. Happy to pick up the matters raised by protect Diseworth and discuss outside of the room. Also, before

 59:41

we move on next topic, it's one area which I'd like to clarify the airport's position in its d3 submission at the opening on the traffic and transport section, it appears to say that the airport is saying that the proposal would overcompensate for the proposed development. It is stating paragraph 7.5 the works proposed to junction 24 are designed to do more than simply mitigate the proposed development. Yet in paragraph 7.7, it is titled lack of mitigation. Can the airport clarify what position it's holding?

 1:00:30

Simon Pratt, representing East Midlands Airport, I think that covers two different points. Just to cover what I've said previously, that I felt that there was junctions on the road network that didn't seem to be that seem to be over capacity, but no mitigation being provided. And that's the lack of mitigation at those points. The first point that you raised with regards to over mitigation at junction 24 it's it's not clear from us that as to what options have gone through with regards to possible mitigation on the road network before they've got to the A50 link road, and it's just understanding whether there was other options that could have sufficed in mitigation terms, or whether this was the only option. Apparently, what I understand there's an options report. I've not seen that, but it's just really getting some clarity on how they've got to the mitigation that they have at the moment, let

 1:01:36

us work on an assumption that it may or may not be accurate, but if I'd like to understand the Paris party position, if, and I reiterate the if we conclude that the junction 24 works are more than necessary to mitigate the proposed development, but some, but conversely and elsewhere, there would be, would be residual effects, which, whilst not unsafe, would not mitigate the effects of the proposed development in other locations is factoring one against another a reasonable approach. We'll start with East Midlands Airport.

 1:02:18

Simon Pratt, East Midlands Airport, I don't think it's factoring one against the other, because if you've got capacity issues at other junctions, then you've got, you could have a potential road safety issue, and so you've got to take that into consideration.

 1:02:35

Say you had to assume it was not unsafe.

 1:02:40

So we assume it's not

 1:02:42

safe. It wouldn't whilst it wouldn't mitigate the effects, it would not lead to unsafe highway conditions.

 1:02:48

I think,

 1:02:50

from our perspective, we were just looking at the junctions in their own right and looking at the each junction in its individuality, as opposed to doing one against another. Move on to national highways.
Fiona

 1:03:06

Ahmed, on behalf of National Highways, national highways is satisfied that the mitigation provided on the SRN is acceptable and we can't pass comment on the local road network.

 1:03:16

County council.

 1:03:17

Harry Horsley, Leicester County Council, the whole modelling exercise for this site has been incredibly complicated, not least because it includes significant background growth that doesn't include its own mitigation strategy, which is not yet established. So as part of considering the residual impact of this development on wider junctions that we know for the growth that's associated with that background growth would include its own mitigation strategy. It's a difficult job for both the applicant team and stakeholders to comment on the exact impacts of those and differentiate that between other growth that would in itself have to go through the determination process and thus have its own mitigation strategy. So our position has been to note that, but then consider what the residual impact of this development is, with and without just this development and the strategic interventions that it is being proposed are considered to be appropriate for this development. But there is an acknowledgement that junctions such as the green and Grimes gate, etc, there may well be within this modelled exercise, residual impacts. However, there is significant strategic residential growth, for example, that would come forward and would need to grapple with them those same issues. So it's it's doing the best that we can as stakeholders within the information and the sort of plan process that we have at our disposal at this time, I think so hopefully that's helpful in terms of understanding our thought process of how we've gone about assessing this application.

 1:04:44

Thank you and to the applicant.

 1:04:47

Isabella Tafurr for the applicant,

 1:04:51

before you come there, can I? Can I get protect Diseworth and then come back to you, is probably

 1:04:56

better. Thank you, sir. Bruce Bamber, protect Diseworth. No, it's not acceptable to allow an unacceptable impact in one place and provide mitigation elsewhere. I'll take the example of the green where, if the green is going to go well over capacity and there's going to be long delays there, although it might not lead to a safety adverse safety impact, for example, it may well lead to quite well unacceptable impacts. In terms of Diceworth village itself and the delay at the junction itself, could be considered a severe impact. So although I don't think you can take a package and say, well, that's okay, because some of this has been mitigated, and I also am a little bit wary about pushing down the lane issues that can't seem to be too difficult to fix at the moment, again, the green is an example. The applicant has said, Well, we're not proposing mitigation there, because in consultation with the local community, we were told people didn't want to have more capacity because it would cause rat running. Now that I do not think is a justifiable reason not to provide adequate mitigation, because obviously there are those knock on effects that may well have those adverse impacts. So I think it is important that all those impacts are considered and also considered in relation to what this development is contributing towards them.

 1:06:44

Thank you and the applicant. Sorry,

 1:06:47

Isabella Tafur for the applicants, responding just briefly to the comments from Protect Diseworth on there, we don't consider any of the residual effects are unacceptable at all. But in response specifically to your question, it's important to look at the impacts on the network as a whole. I'll give as a brief example, highways NCIP the lower Thames crossing resolving a strategic issue promoted by national highways, but would result in some adverse impact on the local road network, because more people will be diverting to use the strategic route, and the appropriate response is to consider impact on the road network as a whole. So in our view, it would be appropriate for you to consider both any benefits that arise from the highway interventions and adverse impacts.

 1:07:40


Thank you, right. I'd now need to move on to 4.5 which is the rates of the rules. Road Safety Audit, through my beaming with through it, a few questions. Can I have the response to the Road Safety Audit? Rep, 1057, up, please. It just makes my life easier. And because the road safety audit and numbering isn't in numerical order, we're going to be doing the movies all over the place. We start with 2.2 point two, thank you. This deals with site access, and there's concern about overrunning and potential site swipes. There the comment in the from the design team at the right hand end is that there, it's been checked and there and it's been shown not to be a problem. Could a drawing please be submitted showing that that isn't a problem, rather than just being, no disrespect to the to the response team, to the auditors, can we just have a drawing showing the tracking of that particular please.

 1:09:03

Simon Hilditch, for the applicant, sorry, I believe, but I will double check, following the hearing that it's in Appendix 26

 1:09:10

the reference to precisely wherein that would be. Thank you. The next one's 10.2 i They're not in the not in numerical order. It's near the top. There we go. Right this. This deals with, think of our roundabout to say here, the issue relates to vegetation. What I'm interested to confirm that any vegetation necessary for removal is, or would be, under the terms of the DCO, entirely within the highway to ensure maintenance can take place. And before you refer me to article 38 of the DCO and the 50 metre buffer in that, we're going to assume and discuss that later, for the purpose of the answer, I want to assume that doesn't exist. So can you do all the recitation clearance within the highway boundary, either as is or would be?

 1:10:11

So? Simon Hilditch, on behalf of the applicant, I believe the answer is yes, within the order limits, but we will take that away and confirm following the hearing.

 1:10:20

Thank you. 11.1, just keep move down. It's Yes, it's slowly, which is work 19, which deals with the link to the west of the EMG one site. It's a comment. There's a comment about measures to reduce cycles cyclist speed. Can you explain roughly what do you think they are likely to be and how would they be secured?

 1:10:45

Simon Hilditch, for the applicant, so in terms of how they'll be secured, they can be secured through the detailed design work. Effectively, the detailed design has to take a full account of the stage one safety audit, and it's re audited. These points will be addressed by the auditor at stage two. So that captures how I believe it'd be secured. In terms of the measures, there's potential measures such as, didn't have to get to the balance with cyclists, right, so not to detract them from using a route in the first place, and safety issues versus wanting to be displayed down. So potential measures such as barriers and chicanes, but we have to be careful where we put them, because it's also the access into the playing field. So there is a design exercise to do. It detail design to get to that right, but I don't believe it is unsolvable.

 1:11:33

And 5.4 which is to do with junction works, 9,10, 11 and 12. And this is a question for national highways, because it deals says in the oversight organisation response, it is stated following a meeting with the designer to discuss the issue. NH is satisfied the proposed solution is optimal. What could national highways confirm whether it is truly optimal, the best on or most favourable, or should it? Should it have been recorded that the risks are as low as reasonably practical a LARP? I'm just wondering with which of those two it is Fiona Ahmed,

 1:12:13

on behalf of National Highways, I think we'll take this one away and give you a written response.

 1:12:17

Thank you. It was just having done some stuff recently on with the LARP as about as a criteria, the word optimal rang bells, back to six point back to the applicant at 6.2 again, the this to do with the vehicle restraint system. Again, is it or with it? Or what is it? Or would it be entirely within the highway network, highway work, highway land to again, to ensure delivery.

 1:12:49

Simon Hilditch, for the applicant, yes, is the EMG one access, and yes, it will

 1:12:49

be. And

 1:12:49

then on 7.1 which is the last one, just the next one, next one down against the vegetation question again, I suspect you'll probably want to take this away, because I want you to ignore article 38 as to whether or not is or is entirely with the vegetation, which would be entirely within the highway. So Simon, hold

 1:13:18

it through the applicant. I was just re reading this specific point, which is for the active travel link. And yes, again, I firmly believe it is within the order limits, because obviously it's not just within the existing highway. The active Travel Link is outside the existing highway, but we will come back to and confirm that as a post hearing action, yep.

 1:13:40

Thank you very much.

 1:13:41

Right? I'm just thinking how long we want the next topics going to be and whether I know it's I know it's slightly early the debate. The debates on the next one are quite long. Yes. Stephen

 1:13:58

Calvert, on behalf of East Midlands airport, with regard to safety audit process and procedure, I appreciate we've just gone through the actions from the audit. I think there's been a number of discussions in the room already about the completeness of the available data design, data modelling and other elements with regard to the ability to undertake a safety audit stage, while at this stage to a comprehensive status to understand the safety implications or impact of the scheme proposed. I would lead you to the opening statement in the safety auditor's report, which actually limits the safety audit, which excludes the bridge and some of the links and some areas of work. Also, we believe that the level of data provided to the auditor isn't comprehensive with the rest of the works in fact, it actually relies on six departures, and at this time, the number of departure from application or departures from standards is believed to be higher than that. So we believe that the audit, in its principle, is not in a suitable position to be assessed or undertaken without further information being provided. At this stage, we have not seen the safety brief, safety audit brief, which national highways need to sign off to understand the content that was provided, and we've been unable to comment on it from that position.

 1:15:21

Thank you. Obviously you're having a conversation outside, outside here national highways, I believe were content with the wood and were content with it being signed off. So the brief, obviously, it does have these exclusions on it, and we discuss those as we continue, I'm looking at the next one, which is sustainable travel options, and actually looking at the length of my questions. I really want to start another topic area, so I think we'll have, we'll stop now for a slightly early lunch. Mr. Philpott, is there anything quickly before

 1:15:57

the lunch? Yes. So just a housekeeping point, yeah, right, if I may. I mentioned at the start of the day that Mr. Taylor would be able to deal with some of the outstanding queries from yesterday about the joint application. It occurred to me, mindful of the number of things you've got to deal with on the agenda, those points might actually be not only acceptably but perhaps even better, expressed in writing. And therefore, if you're content, we'll put those in at deadline for if you're happy, to deal with it in that way, and then save taking time in the programme today,

 1:16:36

my slight Yes, in principle, my slight concern of doing that is that, obviously it slows the process down, because those answers aren't available today, and they only become available through in four weeks time. It's whether or not things could be whether there is any query at those points could be expedited. Well, essentially,

 1:17:07

so what I would say is that whilst, of course, I'm happy for Mr. Tate to provide his explanation today, if it suits you, I also think that matters will be further advanced by deadline four, and therefore the information you get will probably need to be updated then anyway, to report on progress, it may actually short circuit what would otherwise be an unnecessary round of questions, which may be answered by the time you get to Deadline four. Very happy to do it in stages and do a bit now and a bit of deadline for but thinking about it, I just wonder whether I ought to raise it and take the opportunity of lunch. Happy either way, I

 1:17:52

think if we, if we think about it, I'll have a think out of over lunch, and we can then come back to you in, say, an hour's time, if we adjourn now until 1.50pm is everybody happy with that? So just over an hour recommence again at 1:50pm and the hearing is adjourned.

 1:18:11

l.