

WMI – Amended Consultees for Amendments to Article 44, and Requirements 25, 34 and 35(b) NMC Application

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Regulation 7 letter has been prepared to set out the proposed amended consultees for a Non-Material Change ('NMC') application to be submitted to the Secretary of State proposing variations to Article 44 and Requirements 25, 34 and 35(b) relating to The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order 2020 (SI: 2020 No. 511) (as amended by: The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order Correction 2020 (SI: 2020 No. 1163); The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Amendment Order 2020 (SI: 2023 No. 1132); and The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Amendment No. 2 Order 2020 (SI: 2025 No. 481)) ("the Order"). The NMC application is to be submitted by Four Ashes Limited ("FAL") the undertaker of the West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange in respect of the Order and relates to the following proposed changes:

- (a) Amend Article 44 of the Order to clarify the interaction between planning permissions granted by the Local Planning Authority ("LPA") pursuant to an application made under the Town and Country Planning Act and approvals made pursuant to the Order to ensure that neither consent could prevent the lawful implementation of consented development on land at the West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange. This change is made to ensure certainty in light of the Supreme Court's judgement on Hillside Parks Ltd v Snowdonia National Park Authority [2022] UKSC 30 ("Hillside");
- (b) Changes to the warehousing floorspace occupation and timing trigger set out in Requirement 35 (b) and related notification requirements in Requirement 34 of the Order relating to when the rail terminal works are required to be completed. For the avoidance of doubt, no change is proposed to Requirement 35 (a) which requires the rail terminal works to be completed prior to occupation of more than 186,000 sqm of warehousing floorspace; and
- (c) Provide an update to the Table included with Requirement 25 as set out in the draft Amendment Order to reflect previously agreed changes and additional further changes being proposed in discussion with the relevant highway's authorities.

Changes to Article 44 of the Order

1.2 Due to the dynamic and evolving commercial requirements of modern-day warehousing, such as the insertion of mezzanine floors in higher bay units, enquiries from potential warehouse occupiers at West Midlands Interchange ("WMI") have identified design requirements that differ from certain Development Parameters prescribed by the Order. To allow for such changes under the Act would, in normal circumstances, require a change to be made to the Order through a material or non-material amendment which would likely take a minimum of 6 months to consent (not including the preparation and pre-application consultation for the application).

- 1.3 It is open for FAL to make a planning application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") to the LPA and it is noted that planning permissions pursuant to the 1990 Act for warehouses that fall outside of development parameters defined in Development Consent Orders have been issued by the relevant LPAs within the Order Limits at other rail freight interchanges, including DIRFT, East Midlands Gateway and Northampton Gateway.
- 1.4 Additionally, in the case of WMI, a planning application under the 1990 Act was made to the LPA to secure planning permission for a driver welfare and office building at the consented Rail Freight Terminal ("RFT"), which was necessary as the proposed floorspace of this building exceeded the amount able to be provided at the RFT by virtue of the floorspace limits shown on the Order Parameter Plans. The application has been approved by the LPA (Council reference: 24/00302/FUL and 24/00302/AMEND).
- 1.5 In developments such as WMI, where the Order permits a range of developments with separate uses (and end users), developers require flexibility to make applications that can be determined at a speed appropriate to their scale which is why FAL has made applications under the Order and the 1990 Act. However, there is no clarity in the Acts or case law which governs the interaction of 1990 Act planning permissions with development consented under a DCO.
- 1.6 Article 44 (3) of the Order sought to address this issue, and its purpose was to allow 'slot in' planning applications to be made at WMI under the 1990 Act without this being in breach of the Order. However, after the making of the Order, the Supreme Court's Hillside ruling was handed down. An effect of this judgement is that if a new, inconsistent, development makes it physically impossible to complete an earlier, approved development that the slot in application sits over, the original permission becomes incapable of being implemented further. Whilst Hillside considered the interaction of planning permissions governed by the 1990 Act, it is possible that the same principles could be applied where a 'slot in' planning permission is obtained and implemented to amend or adapt development consented under a DCO.
- 1.7 In response to Hillside, FAL proposes the replacement of Article 44 (3) with alternate contemporary wording in the Order to the effect that the grant and implementation of a planning permission made under the 1990 Act at the site will not prevent the approval and lawful implementation of applications made pursuant the Order for the Authorised Development. The amendment is proposed to enable the successful and comprehensive delivery of the Authorised Development, which requires an ability for FAL to respond reasonably and confidently to the operational needs of prospective commercial occupiers, including those which may not entirely fit with the development parameters set by the Order, without creating undue legal risk to the ability to approve and implement future works and phases consented through the Order.
- 1.8 In essence, the purpose of the amendment is to regularise the position considering the Hillside decision. That is, the amendment will secure the continuing effect of the original intention behind Article 44(3), namely, to ensure that the carrying out of development pursuant to planning permissions granted under the 1990 Act would not adversely impact upon delivery of the consented NSIP.

- 1.9 Recent (post Hillside) Development Consent Orders have included generally similar wording to that being proposed in this application, such as Gatwick Airport Northern Runway, Viking CCS Pipeline, London Luton Airport Expansion, Lower Thames Crossing, Immingham Green Energy Terminal and Bramford to Twinstead. An equivalent provision is also proposed in the East Midlands Gateway 2 DCO application (which is a commercial and business DCO currently at the examination stage).

Proposed Change to Requirement 35 (b) (and Requirement 34) of the Order

- 1.10 Requirement 35 of the Order states that:

The undertaker must complete the rail terminal works prior to the earliest of—

(a) the occupation of more than 186,000 square metres of warehousing; or

(b) the sixth anniversary of the first occupation of more than 47,000 square metres of warehousing.

- 1.11 The amendment to Requirement 35 (b) of the Order proposes that it be changed to:

the fifth anniversary of the first occupation of more than 150,000 square metres of warehousing.

- 1.12 To ensure consistency with the change in floorspace threshold in 35 (b), it is also proposed to amend Requirement 34 to marry up the notification obligations with the changed floorspace thresholds.

- 1.13 The proposed amendment to Requirement 35 (b) would enable a greater amount of warehouse floorspace to be occupied before triggering the date for commencement of the rail terminal works than is currently provided. The amendment also proposes that the terminal be completed in a shorter time frame than currently required once the revised occupation trigger in Requirement 35 (b) is reached (i.e. within 5 years rather than 6 years). For the avoidance of doubt, no change is proposed to the primary occupation threshold in Requirement 35 (a) of the Order in terms of the overall 186,000 square metre warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the rail terminal works.

- 1.14 Occupiers have been identified for two of the rail-served warehouses at the site (Development Zone A7c (also referred to as Plot 5030) which is currently under construction, and Development Zone A7b (also referred to as Plot 5010), which received detailed design (and related) DCO Requirements consent from the LPA in May 2026). Occupation of the next warehousing development beyond these two committed plots would trigger the current provisions of Requirement 35 (b).

Context: Overall Scheme Progress and Phasing

- 1.15 Significant investment (circa £250m) has been committed by FAL to date to deliver the WMI project, notably in relation to site enabling works, highways, power and other infrastructure, rail design and construction of the first warehouse. As a result of this investment, substantive progress is being made on site, including major earthworks, highway works, the creation of development plot plateaus, and works to create the two community parks required by the Order. Various highways works, including the new Vicarage Road roundabout, are either complete or well underway. These works enable access to Development Zones within the southern part of the site, including A4b, A5a, A5b, A6, A7a, A7b and A7c at the site, which will deliver approximately 350,000 sqm of warehousing floorspace.
- 1.16 At the time of making the Order, the Illustrative Phasing Plan included as part of the 2018 Environmental Statement ("ES") identified the phasing of the development commencing from the north of the site working in a southward's direction, with the first warehousing units being delivered in Development Zones A2, A3 and A4a. This Illustrative Phasing Plan indicated that the final phase of development would comprise the warehousing at Development Zones A7a, b and c located south of Vicarage Road. However, since the making of the Order, for various site reasons including power availability and groundwater, FAL has adopted an alternative phasing approach which is to first focus delivery of the Authorised Development within the southern part of the site via Vicarage Road and the new Vicarage Road roundabout as explained above.
- 1.17 FAL recognises the importance of delivery of the rail freight terminal as a critical part of the overall WMI project, evidenced by:
- (a) The scope of the 2023 non-material change to the DCO, which included an additional small parcel of land previously outside of Order Limits to fully accommodate the new Rail Freight Terminal identified as a result of progress of the detailed design undertaken since the Order was made.
 - (b) Consent for the Design Details (Requirement 4) and other Order Requirements for the rail freight terminal and associated track infrastructure, pursuant to Work Nos. 1 and 2 of the Authorised Development set out in Schedule 1 of the Order, has been approved by the LPA (Council reference: 24/00721/WMI), alongside a separate planning permission issued for an associated office and driver welfare facility at the terminal (Council reference: 24/00302/FUL and 24/00302/AMEND).
 - (c) Progress has been made between FAL and Network Rail regarding the separate various technical approvals and agreements needed for the terminal, including further to the PACE (formerly known as GRIP) process.

Amendment to Requirement 35 (b) RFT Commencement Trigger – Technical Justification

- 1.18 The level of warehouse occupation included in Requirement 35 (b) was set to mirror the highway works triggers included in Requirement 25 concerning the amount of warehousing able to be accessed via Vicarage Road (47,000 sqm) in advance of other highway works taking place, namely completion of the A5 roundabout (and A5 / A449 Link Road).
- 1.19 The highways works triggers in Requirement 25 were based on the 2018 ES which assessed a scenario where 185,900 sqm (2m sq ft) of warehouse development, (with 139,400 sqm served via the A5 access and 46,500sqm served from Vicarage Road), was delivered in the absence of both the A449 / A5 Link Road through the Site and the rail terminal works. To inform and support the change to scheme phasing explained previously, WSP (FAL's Highways Consultants) undertook a technical review of the 2018 ES in 2025 and concluded that there would be no materially new or materially different likely significant effects to those identified as part of the 2018 ES arising from a scenario based on serving 186,000 sqm of floorspace entirely from Vicarage Road in the absence of both the Link Road and rail terminal. On that basis, Requirement 25 of the Order was amended in agreement with the relevant highways authorities in October 2025 to allow up to 186,000 sqm of warehousing floorspace to be served from Vicarage Road prior to completion of the Link Road. The new Vicarage Road roundabout is under construction and is expected to be open for traffic in September 2026.
- 1.20 The proposed change to Requirement 35 (b) complements the agreed updated approach to highways made to Requirement 25, which in turn was proposed to reflect the revised phasing of development of the overall WMI development.

Amendment to Requirement 35 (b) RFT Commencement Trigger – Policy Justification

- 1.21 The change to the warehouse floorspace trigger being proposed to Requirement 35 (b) accords with the Government's National Networks National Policy Statement, including paragraph 4.88: it reflects the recognition that there may be a need to deliver warehousing ahead of final delivery and commissioning of rail connections whilst still ensuring that rail connections are brought forward in a timely manner by the use of requirements, which in this case also still includes the primary warehousing floorspace occupational cap in Requirement 35 (a) which remains unchanged.
- 1.22 Also, no other Strategic Rail Freight Interchange ("SRFI") DCO includes a secondary occupation trigger limb like that provided by Requirement 35 (b). Additionally, where an occupation cap is set, other SRFI include higher maximum floorspace occupation triggers prior to the completion of their respective rail terminals than Requirement 35 (a) for WMI – e.g. East Midlands Gateway (260,000 sqm (47% of floorspace)) and the proposed Mountpark OxSRFI (232,258 sqm (38% of floorspace)), whereas WMI includes 186,000 sqm (equating to occupation of 25% of total warehousing floorspace before terminal works need to be completed).

- 1.23 The proposed amendment is not materially different to the Order as made. It does not change Requirement 35 (a), and whilst the change does not propose removal of Requirement 35 (b), the amendment more closely aligns WMI with the approaches adopted for other Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges where warehouse occupation triggers have been imposed, while remaining within assessed technical / environmental limits.

Amendment to Requirement 35 (b) RFT Commencement Trigger – Commercial and Delivery Considerations

- 1.24 Notwithstanding progress in site delivery outlined above, since the Order was made in May 2020, external macro-economic changes in circumstances, including extraordinary increases in infrastructure construction costs since 2020, allied to a much lower rate of warehousing delivery at the site than was envisaged through the Order, have occurred. These factors contribute to the change now being proposed to the warehouse floorspace trigger in Requirement 35 (b).
- 1.25 The costs associated with the delivery of the various infrastructure and other works required to enable commercial development at WMI have been materially above the levels initially anticipated, with a particular rise in costs seen between 2020 and 2022. As at the start of 2026, no warehouse floorspace had been completed at the site compared to an anticipated 334,162 sqm based on the indicative WMI Environmental Statement ("ES") Phasing Strategy. The first warehouse at the site, which is currently under construction to provide a floorspace of 20,605 sqm (GIA), is expected to be completed by September 2026. By 2028, based on current firm occupational requirements, 39,665 sqm of floorspace will have been completed and occupied at the site, compared to an expected circa 400,852 sqm based on the ES Phasing Strategy (which equates to below 10% of the amount envisaged in the ES).
- 1.26 The actual rate of warehousing delivery and take-up is therefore well behind the anticipated rate assumed in the ES, and this fact should also be considered in the context of the significant level of investment made by FAL in the delivery of site infrastructure to date, which as noted has materially increased in cost due to higher-than-expected inflation in construction costs. Additionally, while progress is being made with the RFT, a more mature delivery programme for the rail terminal needs to be developed, which requires further work with Network Rail. The firm delivery programme for the rail terminal cannot be finalised until the end of 2027.
- 1.27 These factors create a critical investment issue with a circular set of constraints. The current 47,000 sqm trigger requires a significant further investment of another circa £250m in the site at a point where insufficient value and income will have been created to support that commitment (the current occupational trigger in Requirement 35 (b) equates to only circa 6% of total consented warehousing floorspace at WMI). At the same time, the current trigger level in Requirement 35 (b) creates uncertainty over the timing of RFT delivery, because achieving the trigger requires a substantial scale of occupational commitment before the infrastructure necessary to provide occupiers with long-term delivery certainty can itself be committed. This creates a misalignment between the level of investment required and the level of certainty needed to support it, constraining both investment and leasing activity by limiting FAL's ability to provide the certainty that major occupiers typically require. Raising the threshold is therefore necessary to allow the project to reach a more stable position, enabling commitment to the next phase, including delivery of the RFT (and the full Link Road).

- 1.28 FAL is not looking to change the threshold set out in Requirement 35 (a) which still limits the ability to occupy warehousing above 186,000 sqm prior to the rail terminal works being completed, consistent with the floorspace threshold for the Link Road highways triggers in Requirement 25. For FAL to realise the full value of the site it must deliver the RFT and Link Road. FAL is simply trying to address the imposition of the lower threshold in Requirement 35 (b) given the updated highways data which has been agreed with the relevant highway authorities and the commercial and delivery considerations that now apply.
- 1.29 The amendment also proposes that the terminal be completed in a shorter time frame than currently required once the revised occupation trigger in Requirement 35 (b) is reached (i.e. within 5 years rather than 6 years). This shortened time frame is possible due to the proposed increased secondary occupation trigger and the continued progress and associated maturity of the rail terminal delivery programme that is anticipated will exist by the end of 2027.

Proposed Change to Requirement 25 of the Order

- 1.30 Requirement 25 of the Order identifies that the undertaker must complete the various highway works identified in the table accompanying the Requirement by no later than the stage of the authorised development set out in the table or by such alternative later triggers agreed by the Highway(s) Authority.
- 1.31 Since the Order was made, FAL has agreed with the relevant Highway Authority(s) changes to certain triggers set out in the table in Requirement 25, including to raise the amount of warehouse floorspace able to be served via Vicarage Road before completion of the Link Road from 47,000sqm to 186,000 sqm. However, changes made to Requirement 25 are difficult for stakeholders to track and understand as the Order isn't updated to reflect agreed changes.
- 1.32 FAL is seeking a further amendment to triggers in Requirement 25 to increase the amount of floorspace that may be occupied from 47,000 sqm to 150,000 sqm before the commencement of the five-year period within which the Link Road and associated A449 Roundabout must be completed. The proposed amendment would align Requirement 25 with the change proposed to Requirement 35(b) for the RFT and this change is supported by similar technical, delivery and commercial considerations. As the RFT and Link Road are functionally and physically linked, their delivery needs to remain aligned through consistent occupational triggers and delivery periods. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the Secretary of State determine the proposed changes to both Requirements 25 and 35(b), and re-issue an updated version of Table 25 as part of any Amendment Order.
- 1.33 Similar to Requirement 35 (a) applying to the RFT, Requirement 25 imposes an overall 186,000 sqm warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the Link Road and A449 roundabout; the proposed further change to Requirement 25 does not alter this primary occupational constraint for the completion of these major pieces of highway infrastructure.

Regulation 7 – List of Proposed Parties to be Consulted

- 1.34 **Table 1** (and **Appendix 1**) of this letter lists those parties that FAL consider should be consulted in respect of the NMC application with commentary on why those consultees should be included in the consultation on the NMC application. **Table 2** lists those parties that FAL considers should not be included in consultation on the NMC application, together with an explanation to why they are excluded.
- 1.35 Should the Department for Transport have any queries regarding those to be consulted or not consulted, as set out in this letter, the Applicant would be happy to provide further explanation and answer any queries in a meeting with Department for Transport.
- 1.36 Regulation 7 of Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 (as amended) ("the 2011 Regulations") states that applicant must consult the following:
- (a) each person for whose benefit the development consent order, to which the application relates, has effect;
 - (b) each person that was, in accordance with section 56 [Planning Act 2008], notified of the application for the development consent order which is the subject of the application; and
 - (c) any other person who may be directly affected by the changes proposed in the application.
- 1.37 Section 56 of the Planning Act 2008 sets out that the following should be notified of the application for the DCO:
- (a) such persons as may be prescribed;
 - (aa) the Marine Management Organisation [*not relevant to WMI*];
 - (b) each local authority within Section 56A;
 - (c) the Greater London Authority [*not relevant to WMI as no land in Greater London*]; and
 - (d) each person who is within the categories in section 57 [*i.e. those persons impacted by the proposed DCO*].
- 1.38 The Secretary of State can give written consent to certain of the above persons not being consulted (Regulation 7(3) of the 2011 Regulations).
- 1.39 The Applicant has applied the following methodology to inform this scoping exercise, to determine which parties should be consulted:

- Consideration of whether the NMC application proposes changes which are relevant to statutory consultees; and
- Consideration of whether a party has an interest in land within / adjacent to / affected by the scope of the amendments proposed in this NMC. Given the nature of the proposals, the NMC application will only have localised effects and, for example, not be relevant to Local Authorities beyond Staffordshire County Council and South Staffordshire District Council where the West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange site is situated – please see further Tables 1 and 2 below.

1.40 In defining whether a party with an interest in land is affected by the proposed amendments, the Applicant has undertaken a land referencing exercise. This has identified persons with an interest in land ('PILs') set out in Table 1 (and Appendix 1) who will be consulted; (note, where persons with an interest are also identified elsewhere in Table 1 as a party proposed to be consulted because, for example, they are also defined as a prescribed person under S56(2)(a) of the Planning Act 2008, these are marked with an '*' in the list in Appendix 1 for clarity). In this case, whilst the changes proposed will not cause an overall increase in traffic movements (or other environmental effects) in the context of the completed authorised development, there was local public interest in the timing and surety of the delivery of the rail terminal works at the time of the making of the Order. Given the previous local interest, for completeness the persons set out in Appendix 1 include all persons with an interest in the land covered by the extent of the West Midlands Strategic Rail Freight Interchange site.

Table 1: Parties Proposed to be Consulted Under Section 56 of the Planning Act 2008 on this NMC

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Inclusion in NMC Consultation?
The relevant parish council [Penkridge PC, Brewood and Coven PC, Hatherton PC and Saredon PC]	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes [Penkridge PC, Brewood and Coven PC, Hatherton PC, Saredon PC] – the proposed NMC application will potentially allow a greater amount of warehousing floorspace to be occupied prior to completion of the rail terminal works, albeit only for a time-restricted period and with no change proposed to the overall 186,000 square metre warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the rail terminal works. Whilst the change will not cause an overall increase in traffic movements (or other environmental effects) in the context of the completed authorised development, there was local public interest in the timing of the delivery of the rail terminal works at the time of the making of the Order.

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Inclusion in NMC Consultation?
The Secretary of State for Transport	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes, as consultee.
The relevant highway authority (Staffordshire County Council & National Highways)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes – the proposed NMC application will potentially allow a greater amount of warehousing floorspace to be occupied prior to completion of the rail terminal works and the link road, albeit only for a time-restricted period and with no change proposed to the overall 186,000 square metre warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the rail terminal and link road works.
The Canal & River Trust plus other relevant canal bodies: • Inland Waterways Association (Lichfield Branch); and • Lichfield and Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes – CRT included as a Person with an Interest in the Land (PILs), as defined through the land referencing exercise explained at paragraph 1.11 above and listed in Appendix 1. Other relevant canal bodies also included for completeness although the proposed changes will not cause any material change in impacts on the canal.
Relevant Statutory Undertakers: • Cadent Gas Limited • National Gas Transmission plc • National Grid Electricity Distribution plc (formerly Western Power Distribution Limited) • Severn Trent Water • South Staffordshire Water plc	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes – included, as relevant, as Persons with an Interest in the Land (PILs), as defined through the land referencing exercise explained at paragraph 1.11 above and listed in Appendix 1.

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Inclusion in NMC Consultation?
Operators of Electronic Communications Code Networks (British Telecommunications plc, Sky UK Limited, Vodaphone Limited, Openreach Limited, EE Limited, Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited, Last Mile Electricity Limited)		
South Staffordshire District Council	S56(2)(b) – Local Authorities	Yes – the Council is the local planning authority for the area of land which the proposed non-material changes relates to.
Staffordshire County Council	S56(2)(b) – Local Authorities	Yes – the Council is the local highway authority for the area and also advises South Staffordshire District Council in respect of economic development and other matters.
The Rail Land Infrastructure Manager (Network Rail)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes – the proposed NMC application will potentially allow a greater amount of warehousing floorspace to be occupied prior to completion of the rail terminal works, albeit only for a time-restricted period and with no change proposed to the overall 186,000 square metre warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the rail terminal works.
The Rail Network Operator(s) (West Midlands Trains, Avanti West Coast, Cross Country, London Northwestern Railway)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes – the proposed NMC application will potentially allow a greater amount of warehousing floorspace to be occupied prior to completion of the rail terminal works, albeit only for a time-restricted period and with no change proposed to the overall 186,000 square metre warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the rail terminal works.

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Inclusion in NMC Consultation?
Integrated Transport Authorities (ITAs) and Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs) [Transport for West Midlands]	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes – the proposed NMC application will potentially allow a greater amount of warehousing floorspace to be occupied prior to completion of the rail terminal works, albeit only for a time-restricted period and with no change proposed to the overall 186,000 square metre warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the rail terminal works.
Natural England	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	Yes – whilst the change will not cause an overall increase in traffic movements (or other environmental effects) in the context of the completed authorised development, or cause different impacts on European sites, Natural England is to be consulted for completeness and given that Government guidance on making changes to a DCO identifies that an application may be material if it would invoke a need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment.
Person with an Interest in the Land (PILs), as defined through the land referencing exercise explained at paragraph 1.11 above and listed in Appendix 1.	S56(2)(d) – persons impacted by the DCO	Yes – whilst the change will not cause an overall increase in traffic movements (or other environmental effects) in the context of the completed authorised development, there was local public interest in the timing of the delivery of the rail terminal works at the time of the making of the Order. Given this previous interest, the persons set out in Appendix 1 include all persons with an interest in the land covered by the extent of the West Midlands Strategic Rail Freight Interchange site.

Table 2: Parties Proposed Not to be Consulted Under Section 56 of the Planning Act 2008 on this NMC

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
Other Local Authorities and Highways Authorities: • Stafford Borough Council; • Cannock Chase District Council; • Walsall Council; • City of Wolverhampton Council; • Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council; • Bromsgrove District Council; • Wyre Forest District Council; • Shropshire Council; and • Telford and Wrekin Council. • Leicestershire County Council; • Derbyshire County Council; • Cheshire East Council; • Stoke-on-Trent City Council; • Warwickshire County Council; • Worcestershire County Council;	S56(2)(b) and S56A(2) – ‘A’ authorities	No –the proposed NMC application does not affect the quantum or location of rail-served warehousing or other works permitted by the certified Parameters Plans. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from ‘slot in’ type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to other local authorities and highways authorities arose as a result of a future planning application, they would, where required, be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
• Birmingham City Council; • Peak District National Park Authority; and • West Midlands Combined Authority.		
Other Parish Councils: • Cheslyn Hay PC; • Dunston With Coppenhall PC; • Essington PC; • Featherstone PC; • Great Wyrley PC; • Hilton PC; • Huntington PC; • Lapley, Street and Wheaton Ashton PC; and • Shareshill PC.	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons and also non-prescribed consultee respondents to Stage 2	No – none of the proposed elements of the NMC application are situated in the administrative boundaries of the noted parish councils. The proposed NMC application will potentially allow a greater amount of warehousing floorspace to be occupied prior to completion of the rail terminal works, albeit only for a time-restricted period and with no change proposed to the overall 186,000 square metre warehouse floorspace occupation cap not to be exceeded before completion of the rail terminal works. The change will not cause an overall increase in traffic movements (or other environmental effects) in the context of the completed authorised development. Any short-term changes will be localised in nature, and these PC areas will unlikely be indirectly affected by the proposed amendment.
The Crown Estate Commissioners	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – The Crown Estate Commissioners has no interest in any of the land affected by the proposed NMC application.
The Health and Safety Executive	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – whilst the Site falls within Consultation Zones of a major accident hazard site (Four Ashes Chemical Works), the proposed NMC application does not affect the quantum nor location of rail-served warehousing permitted by the certified Parameters Plans. The Health and Safety Executive did not object to the DCO scheme and there are

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
		no changes in terms of land use, HSE are not affected by the proposals. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Health and Safety Executive arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
The National Health Service Commissioning Board and the relevant clinical commissioning group (the relevant Strategic Health Authority)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application does not affect the quantum of rail-served warehousing or other works to be delivered on-site and therefore does not alter the estimated number of employees during the operational phase of development. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the National Health Service Commissioning Board and the relevant clinical commissioning group arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England [Historic England]	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application does not involve demolition of a Grade I or II* Listed Building, result in impact on any battlefield, garden or park of special historic interest which is registered in accordance with section 8C of the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 or affect the site of a scheduled monument.

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
		Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to Historic England arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
The relevant police and crime commissioner / police authority (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner – Staffordshire Police HQ)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application does not affect the quantum of rail-served warehousing to be delivered on-site and therefore does not alter the estimated number of employees during the operational phase of development. It will also not cause an overall increase in traffic movements in the context of the completed authorised development Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
Relevant AONB Conservation Boards [Cannock Chase AONB Unit]	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application does not alter the maximum parameters for design of rail-served warehousing in terms of building height and massing or the location of the Development Zones and therefore does not affect long-range views in relation to Cannock Chase AONB. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
		such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Cannock Chase AONB Unit arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
The Joint Nature Conservation Committee	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – on basis of HRA Screening and the proposed NMC application does not affect Cannock Chase AONB, Four Ashes SSSI and Belvide Reservoir. The proposed NMC application does not alter the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal, is outside of any Marine Conservation Zone and does not affect any marine or other ecological designations. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Cannock Chase AONB Unit arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
The Coal Authority	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the WMI Site lies outside of its defined 'High Risk' areas and therefore the proposed NMC application does not affect the Coal Authority.
The relevant internal drainage board [Sow and Penk IDB]	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application would not result in any changes to the proposed sitewide surface water drainage strategy approved as 2018 ES Technical Appendix 16.7. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
		the Sow and Penk IDB arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
United Kingdom Health Security Agency, an executive agency of the Department of Health and Social Care (formerly Public Health England)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application will not result in any changes to, or impacts on, infectious diseases, chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear incidents and other health threats.
The Forestry Commission	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application does not change the areas of woodland to be removed or planted. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Forestry Commission arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
The Secretary of State for Defence	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the Order Limits does not include land within MoD safeguarding areas and the proposed NMC application does not introduce design changes (e.g. to quantum or scale of rail-served warehousing permitted under the Parameters Plans). Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Secretary of State for Defence arose as a result of a future

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
		planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
Civil Aviation Authority and National Air Traffic Services (NATS)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the NMC application proposals do not relate to an airport and will not affect an airport or its current or future operation. Also, the proposed NMC does not affect the quantum or location of rail-served warehousing permitted by the certified Parameters Plans. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the CAA and NATS arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.
The Environment Agency	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application does not affect the quantum or location of rail-served warehousing or other works permitted by the certified Parameters Plans. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Environment Agency arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by the local planning authority.
Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service (The relevant fire and rescue authority)	S56(2)(a) – prescribed persons	No – the proposed NMC application does not affect the quantum or location of rail-served warehousing or other works permitted by the certified Parameters Plans, including the highways arrangements to and through the site. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
		of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by the local planning authority.
Other non-prescribed organisations including: • All Local Cyclists • Blymhill and Weston Under Lizard Parish Council • Brewood Civic Society • CPRE Staffordshire • Cranford Developments Ltd • Greensforge Sailing Club • Penkridge Civic Society • Railfuture • Staffordshire Badger Conservation Group • Staffordshire Chambers of Commerce • Stop the Gailey Freight Hub • The New Hollies Limited • The Ramblers Association • The Royal Yachting Association • 1st Blackfords Sea Scouts	Non-prescribed consultee respondent to Stage 2 Consultation undertaken previously in preparing the original DCO application under Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008	No – the proposed NMC application does not affect the quantum or arrangement of rail-served warehousing or specification of the Rail Terminal (except for the potential timing of the terminal), does not impact on green infrastructure and associated mitigation, and does not alter likely overall traffic or rail movements or the estimated number of employees associated with the completed development. Whilst additional text is proposed to limit the legal risks to the implementation of the Order arising from 'slot in' type planning applications made under the TCPA (to cover the eventuality of any such applications being made at the site), if any matters relevant to the listed non-prescribed organisations arose as a result of a future planning application, they would be consulted by South Staffordshire District Council as the local planning authority.

Consultee Body	Classification under s56 of the Planning Act 2008	Summary of Reasons for Exclusion from NMC Consultation?
37th Wolverhampton Sea Scout Group		
HS2 Ltd.	Non-prescribed consultee respondent to Stage 2	No – the NMC application does not propose any amendments affecting HS2 from a safeguarding perspective nor does it affect proposed construction traffic routing.
Royal Mail Group	Statutory Undertaker pursuant to s127 of the Planning Act 2008.	No - the proposed NMC application will not affect Royal Mail's function as a statutory undertaker.

- 1.41 As stated above, should the Department for Transport wish to discuss the approach to consultees set out above or in Appendix 2 the Applicant would be happy to provide further explanation at a meeting with the Department. The Applicant again respectfully requests an urgent decision on the proposed list of consultees in light of the critical nature of the amendments being proposed by the NMC application.
- 1.42 Please do not hesitate to get in touch should the Department have any questions or require any further information.

Appendix 1: List of Persons with Interest in Land and Other Persons Likely to be affected by the Proposed Amendments

A. Persons with Interest in the Land (PILs)

- Piers Alastair Carlos Monckton, Stretton Hall, Stretton, Stafford, ST19 9LQ;
- Nathaniel Skipp, Inglewood, Stafford Road, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BN;
- June Maureen Skipp, Inglewood, Stafford Road, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BN;
- The Secretary, S I Group-UK, Limited, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BT;
- Joanna Mary Monkton, Horsebrook Hall, Horsebrook Hall Lane, Brewood, Stafford, ST19 9LP;
- Joanna Mary Monkton (as personal representative to the Estate of Alan Monkton), Horsebrook Hall, Horsebrook Hall Lane, Brewood, Stafford, ST19 9LP;
- Toby Philip Carlos Monkton, Burnt Hill House, Yattendon, Thatcham, RG18 0XF;
- Roger Frederick Holt, 2 Roundabout Cottages, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Graham Victor Alcock, Denson House, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Deborah Ellen Alcock, Denson House, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Donna Gilmartin, Selwyn Green, Croft Lane, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PY;
- The Secretary, Nationwide Building Society, nationwide House, Pipers Way, Swindon, SN38 1NW;
- The Secretary, Gravelly Way Management Limited, Seascope, 43 Beer Road, Seaton, EX12 2PH;
- Maurice Kenneth Cotton, Wharf Cottage, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Gina Alinda Rossell-Cotton, Wharf Cottage, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;

- Nazir Mohammad, 172 Cannock Road, Wolverhampton, WV10 0AL;
- Darshana Poselay, 172 Cannock Road, Wolverhampton, WV10 0AL;
- Joseph Nicholas Wilkes, Straight Mile Farm, Straight Mile, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DL;
- The Secretary, Newriver Trustee 7 Limited, IFC 5, St. Helier, Jersey, JE1 1ST;
- The Secretary, Newriver Trustee 8 Limited, IFC 5, St. Helier, Jersey, JE1 1ST;
- Timothy Gray, 179 Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Lynn Margaret Gray, 179 Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Patrick James Doocey, 98 Longwood Road, Walsall, WS9 0TD;
- Marie Teresa Doocey, 98 Longwood Road, Walsall, WS9 0TD;
- Oliver Carlos Monckton, Somerford Home Farm, Stretton Hall, Stretton, Stafford, ST19 9LQ;
- Kerrith Seymour Brown, Homestead, Wolverhampton Road, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PL;
- Ewart Anthony Campbell, Evergreen Farm, Wolverhampton Road, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PL;
- The Secretary, Marston's Pubs Limited, St Johns House, St Johns Square, Wolverhampton, WV2 4BH;
- Victor Lloyd Spillard, The Mill House, Teddesley Road, Penkridge, Stafford, ST19 5BA;
- Jean Kinnell Spillard, The Mill House, Teddesley Road, Penkridge, Stafford, ST19 5BA;
- Peter Wislon Spillard, The Mill House, Teddesley Road, Penkridge, Stafford, ST19 5BA;
- Craig Harvey Spillard, The Mill House, Teddesley Road, Penkridge, Stafford, ST19 5BA;

- Sharon Marie Therese Huskisson, Scholars Gate, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Dawn Angela Tomlinson, Flat 37, Grosvenor Court, Hallett Drive, Wolverhampton, WV3 0NU;
- The Secretary, C. Piper and Sons, The Nurseries, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Margaret June Row, Roma, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- The Secretary, Julian Hodge Bank Limited, Central Square, One Central Square, Cardiff, CF10 1FS;
- The Secretary, Lupo Limited, 10 Bricket Road, St Albans, AL1 3JX;
- Graham William Stokes, 42 Filance Lane, Penkridge, Stafford, ST19 5JT;
- Kathleen Patricia Stokes, 42 Filance Lane, Penkridge, Stafford, ST19 5JT;
- Colin Meer, Eastfield, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Eve Meer, Eastfield, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Timothy Paul Hackett, Stable Farm, Straight Mile, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DW;
- Carol Mary Morgan, Woodside, Straight Mile, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DW;
- Gary Leavesley Morgan, Woodside, Straight Mile, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DW;
- Stuart John Faulkner, Sylvestris, Straight Mile, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DW;
- The Secretary, Hoppe (UK) Limited, Gravelly Way, Standeford, Wolverhampton, WV10 7GW;
- Brian John Davies, Hammerton House, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- William Charles Jinks, St. Clare, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;

- Joan Marian Jinks, St. Clare, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Royston Brownrigg, 4 Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Jill Lorraine Brownrigg, 4 Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Mark Lee Church, 4 Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Tracey Kim Rhodes, Edelweiss, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Terence Lesley Rhodes, Edelweiss, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Amy Jane Rhodes, Edelweiss, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Rebecca Marie Windsor, Edelweiss, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- The Owner, Hollybyre, Wolverhampton Road, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PL;
- The Owner, The Cottage, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- The Secretary, Mining Remediation Authority, 200 Lichfield Lane, Mansfield, NG18 4RG;
- Christopher Best, Red Cottage, The Avenue, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PX;
- Nichola Best, Red Cottage, The Avenue, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PX;
- Helen J Follows, White Cottage, The Avenue, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PX;
- The Secretary, Mancott Limited, HSBC House, Esplanade, St. Helier, Jersey, JE1 1GT;
- The Secretary, Carver (Wolverhampton) Limited, Littles Lane, Wolverhampton, WV1 1JY;
- The Occupier, Blue Cottage, The Avenue, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PX;

- The Secretary, Tritax Acquisition 28 Limited, 26 New Street, St. Helier, Jersey, JE2 3RA;
- Camilla Monckton; Stretton Hall, Stretton, Stafford, ST19 9LQ;
- Jean Ann Lea-Jones, Croft House, Croft Lane, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PY;
- Barry Vincent Keay, The Woodlands, Stafford Road, Standeford, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BN;
- Heather Carol Keay, The Woodlands, Stafford Road, Standeford, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BN;
- Sheila Mary Holt, 3 Roundabout Cottages, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Julie J Wilkes, Straight Mile Farm, Straight Mile, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DL;
- Janet E Wilkes, Straight Mile Farm, Straight Mile, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DL;
- Marie-Theresa Sherwood, The Poplars, Watling Street, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Robert David Wooton, Leacroft, Station Drivee, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- The Secretary, Gestamp Tallent Limited, 1 Skerne Road, Aycliffe Business Park, Newton Aycliffe, DL5 6EP;
- James Joseph Packman, 10 sand Road, Kewstoke, Weston-Super-Mare, BS22 9UH;
- Sharon Packman, 10 Sand Road, Kewstoke, Weston-Super-Mare, BS22 9UH;
- Craig Andrew Trueman, 2 Kings Road, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DU;
- Sarah Ann Trueman, 2 Kings Road, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DU;
- Tina Michelle Noon, 4 Kings Road, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DU;
- Kevin Paul Noon, 4 Kings Road, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DU;

- Antonia Murphy, Croft House, Croft Lane, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PY;
- James Powell, Croft House, Croft Lane, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PY;
- The Secretary, Tritax Big Box REIT plc, 72 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 9QZ;
- The Secretary, Panattoni UK Developments Ltd, 19 – 21 Old Bond Street, London, W1S 4PU;
- The Secretary, LU UK II S.A.R.L., 22 Rue Des Bruyeres, Howald, Luxemburg, 1274;
- The Secretary, Maulotte UK Limited, Gateway 37, Gravelly Way, Penkridge, Wolverhampton, WV10 7GW;
- Mitchell Colin Tooth, Dunrobin, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Martin Clive Taylor, The Old School House, Grub Street, Stafford, ST20 0NE;
- Felicity Ruth Taylor, The Old School House, Grub Street, Stafford, ST20 0NE;
- George Samuel Taylor, The Old School House, Grub Street, Stafford, ST20 0NE;
- Alice Rackley, The Old School House, Grub Street, Stafford, ST20 0NE;
- David John Rathbone, Chase View House, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Haili Li Rathbone, Chase View House, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Nicholas Wright, The Elms, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- David Stanley Poxon, Chase View Bungalow, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Susan Elizabeth Poxon, Chase View Bungalow, Watling Street, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PR;
- Sean Eamonn Courtney, Fifth Ash, 181 Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;

- Lyndsey Dianne Fisher, Fifth Ash, 181 Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- The Secretary, CEVA Logistics Limited, Excelsior Road, Ashby De a Zouch, LE65 9BA;
- The Secretary, Bericote Group Holdings Limited, Yotta House, 8 Hamilton Terrace, Leamington Spa, CV32 4LY;
- The Secretary, Four Ashes Parak Management Company Limited, Yotta House, 8 Hamilton Terrace, Leamington Spa, CV32 4LY;
- Martin Paul Hackett, 11 Kings Road, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DU;
- Melanie Jane Bowater, Anderlea, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Steven James Tromans, Anderlea, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Robert Iain McGovern, Amadora, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- Siobhan Louise McGovern, Amadora, Station Drive, Four Ashes, Wolverhampton, WV10 7BU;
- John Neil McNeice, The Smallholding, Wolverhampton Road, Gailey, Stafford, ST19 5PL;
- Simon Foster (as Personal Representative to the Estate of Alan Monckton), Park Lodge, Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 2PT;
- Mark Hawkins (as Personal Representative to the Estate of Alan Monckton), Chetwynd Hall, Chetwynd Park, Chetwynd, Newport, TF10 8AE;
- Charles Henery Benedict Crofton Chetwynd Chetwynd-Talbot, Eal of Shrewsbury and Talbot DL (as Personal Representative to the Estate of Alan Monckton), Throstles Nest, Birdgrove Lane, Ashbourne, DE6 2BP;
- The Secretary, Lumen Technologies UK Limited, 260-266 Goswell Road, London, EC1V 7EB;
- Melvyn John Jones, The Tudors, 1 Kings Road, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DU;
- Karin Jones, The Tudors, 1 Kings Road, Calf Heath, Wolverhampton, WV10 7DU;

- John Anthony Lowe (as liquidator to Bericote four Ashes Limited), Ashcroft House, Ervington Court, Meridian Business Park, Leicester, LE19 1WL;
- Nathan Jones (as liquidator to Bericote four Ashes Limited), Ashcroft House, Ervington Court, Meridian Business Park, Leicester, LE19 1WL;
- The Secretary, National Highways Limited, Three Snowhill, Snow Hill Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA *;
- The Chief Executive, Staffordshire County Council, 1 Staffordshire Place, Stafford, ST16 2LP *;
- The Secretary, Severn Trent Water Limited, 2 St John's Street, Coventry *;
- The Secretary, Canal & River Trust, National Waterways Museum, South Pier Road, Ellesmere Port, CH65 4FW *;
- The Secretary, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, Waterloo General Office, Waterloo Station, London, SE1 8SW *;
- The Secretary, EE Limited, 1 Braham Street, London, E1 8EE *;
- The Secretary, Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited, Hive 2, 1530 Arlington Business Park, Theale, Reading, RG7 4SA *;
- The Secretary, British Telecommunications plc, 1 Braham Street, London, E1 8EE *;
- The Secretary, Sky UK Limited, Grant Way, Isleworth, TW7 5QD *;
- The Secretary, Vodafone Limited, Vodaphone House, The Connection, Newbury, RG14 2FN *;
- The Secretary, South Staffordshire Water plc, Green Lane, Walsall, WS2 7PD *;
- The Secretary, Openreach Limited, 6 Gracechurch Street, London, EC3V 0AT *;
- The Secretary, National Grid Electricity Distribution (West Midlands) plc, Avonbank, Feeder Road, Bristol, BS2 0TB *;
- The Secretary, National Gas Transmission plc, National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA *;
- The Secretary, Cadent Gas Limited, Pilot Way, Ansty, Coventry, CV7 9JU *; and

- The Secretary, Last Mile Electricity Limited, Fenick House, 1 Hamilton International Technology Park, Lister Way, Blantyre, Glasgow, G72 0FT
*.

-End-