

## Intermodal Logistics Park North – TR0510001

### Intermodal Logistics Park North Limited

## Section 51 Advice Log

**Version: 27 May 2026**

There is a statutory duty under [section 51 \(s51\) of the Planning Act 2008](#) for the Planning Inspectorate to record the advice that it gives in relation to an application or potential application, and to make this publicly available.

This document comprises a record of the advice that has been provided by the Inspectorate to the applicant (Intermodal Logistics Park North Limited) and their consultants during the pre-application stage. It will be updated by the Inspectorate after every interaction with the applicant during which s51 has been provided. The applicant will always be given the opportunity to comment on the Inspectorate's draft record of advice before it is published.

The applicant will use this Advice Log as the basis for demonstrating regard to section 51 advice within the application.

**Intermodal Logistics Park North  
s51 Advice Log - Index**

<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Meeting overview</b>
<a href="#"><u>24 October 2024</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email from the Inspectorate providing feedback on the Programme Document</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>07 January 2025</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated order limits</li> <li>• Informal Consultation</li> <li>• Scoping opinion</li> <li>• Issues Tracker</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>24 June 2025</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project and Programme Update</li> <li>• Update from informal consultation</li> <li>• Statutory Consultation Plans</li> <li>• Approach to offsite highways</li> <li>• Issues Tracker</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>09 October 2025</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project and Programme Update</li> <li>• Update on Statutory consultation</li> <li>• Approach to offsite highways</li> <li>• Issues Tracker</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>28 October 2025</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email – Pre-application Prospectus</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>29 January 2026</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of Community Consultation</li> <li>• Draft documents</li> <li>• Statutory Consultation</li> <li>• Issue Tracker</li> <li>• Land Rights and Negotiations Tracker</li> <li>• Programme Document</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>8 May 2026</u></a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update</li> <li>• Land Rights and Negotiations Tracker</li> <li>• Issue Tracker</li> <li>• Post-meeting advice on the Issues Tracker and Land Rights Tracker</li> </ul>

## Intermodal Logistics Park North -s51 Advice Library

Topic	Email date: 24 October 2024
Feedback on the Programme Document	<p>The applicant supplied the Inspectorate with its initial Programme Document in line with the Expression of Interest process after the publication of the 2024 Pre-application Prospectus. Having reviewed the document, the Inspectorate considers that it is mostly satisfactory and covers the expected content as set out in the government's pre-application guidance at paragraph 10, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the date the applicant intends to submit their application</li><li>• a comprehensive timetable of the applicant's pre-application process, the main events with dates and milestones demonstrating how the pre-application process will be completed (using the maximum target of 2 years as a benchmark)</li><li>• the applicant's view on the main issues for resolution and activities they will undertake to address those</li><li>• the applicant's proposals for engaging with statutory consultees and local authorities during the pre-application period and any intended financial support agreements, such as Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs)</li><li>• the applicant's identification of risks to achievement of the pre-application stage and the process by which these risks are tracked and managed</li></ul> <p>The Programme Document provides enough detail about the proposed development, timetable and activities for the pre-application process at this stage. However, in the next iteration, the applicant will need to cross references to the SoCC required by <a href="#">section 47 of the Planning Act</a>, which is a requirement of the Programme Document as outlined in the Pre-application Prospectus. It would also be helpful if the applicant includes the timescale for the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone.</p>
Topic	Meeting date: 07 January 2025
Scoping Opinion	<p>The applicant requested clarification on several matters raised within the Inspectorate's <a href="#">scoping opinion</a> (dated 12 December 2024). The Inspectorate advised that the scoping opinion is issued at a point in time and is based on the detail supplied in the applicant's scoping report. A scoping opinion cannot therefore be changed or reissued.</p> <p>The applicant is directed to the scoping opinion which also advises that the Inspectorate provides comments and advice</p>

	<p>on the scope of the assessment but this should not be construed as implying agreement with an approach. Where formal changes to a scoping opinion are sought, the applicant is advised that it may wish to seek a new scoping opinion.</p> <p>The Inspectorate is content however that the applicant may seek agreement with relevant consultation bodies to subsequently scope matters out of the assessment, provided further evidence is available. Where this is used to justify an approach, this should be provided in the Environmental Statement (ES).</p>
Scoping Opinion	<p>The applicant referred to section 2.0.3 of the scoping opinion and queried why minimum heights for buildings were needed to be provided, confirming that it will not be including minimum building heights in the Rochdale Envelope, only maximums, but that there may be different maximum heights across the Site and this will be reflected with a 'zoning' approach on the parameters plan. The Inspectorate advised this was to understand the parameters of the works that would be involved as there was limited detail within the applicant's scoping report. The parameters and worst case assessment should therefore be clarified in the applicant's ES.</p> <p>The Inspectorate also advised that the scoping opinion also notes some inconsistency in details of the proposed development provided in both the scoping report aspect chapters and the project description.</p>
Scoping Opinion	<p>The applicant referred to section 2.1.5 of the scoping opinion and referenced its intention to adopt the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach in relation to its design. The applicant clarified that its Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) would provide an update on the proposed development. The Inspectorate advised that it does not have a role in the PEIR, but directed the applicant to the draft document review service, which includes the option to review draft ES project description chapters.</p>
Issues Tracker	<p>The applicant enquired as to the best approach in terms of updating the issues tracker and when the Inspectorate should be notified of any changes. The Inspectorate advised the format of its issues tracker was adequate in terms of the requirements set out in the pre-application prospectus. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to flag any significant changes to the issues tracker so they could be made aware in advance of any project update meetings. The Inspectorate advised that the most efficient way was to make the</p>

	Inspectorate aware of any issues both as they arise and at specific milestones of the project.
Project Meetings	The applicant enquired when the option of six meetings per year, as part of the standard service offer, took effect from. The Inspectorate clarified that the year of service begins from the date of the inception meeting. This meeting was number two out of a potential six that the applicant could request under the standard service tier in this 12 month period.
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting date: 24 June 2025</b>
<b>Programme Update</b>	The applicant confirmed that its statutory consultation and submission of draft application documents were due to take place in Q4 of 2025. The Inspectorate noted that the applicant should avoid providing draft application documents over the Christmas period and provide adequate notice as to when this will be submitted, preferably 6 weeks notice. The Inspectorate advised that any key milestones and project update meetings should be reflected within the programme document and the expectation is to update the programme document when/if anything changes with the programme. Furthermore, any proposed project update meetings should be scheduled 6 weeks in advance with the Inspectorate.
<b>Draft Documents</b>	The applicant enquired as to whether it would be helpful for the Inspectorate (in providing more context) for additional documents to be included in their draft documents that were not compulsory eg Public Footpath Plans. The Inspectorate informed the applicant that any additional documents could potentially be useful but that there was no guarantee that these additional documents would be reviewed and provided feedback upon. The applicant was clear that it was not expecting feedback, but would be happy to provide those extra documents should it be of use to the Inspectorate.
<b>Planning Bill</b>	The applicant raised a point regarding the Planning Infrastructure Bill and whether the Inspectorate had any further information at this stage and how this may affect their project. The Inspectorate advised they were monitoring this and how it may affect the DCO applications. Any changes will be communicated to applicants in good time.
<b>Junction Amendments</b>	The Inspectorate queried whether the multiple junctions/roads identified for improvement would trigger sections within the PA2008. The applicant advised that these were mostly minor amendments that were being made, for example realignment of kerbs and reprogramming of traffic lights, but that it was aware and mindful of NSIP thresholds for highway works and whilst unlikely, it would confirm if and when the highway works did trigger them.

<b>Issues Tracker</b>	The Inspectorate highlighted the most recent rail freight interchange application (Hinckley RFI), led to the Secretary of State undertaking additional consultation on certain issues, due to lack of information provided during the Examination e.g. landscape and, visual receptors; and traffic and transport effects. The applicant is minded to ensure that the issues tracker demonstrates how these matters have and/or will be addressed. The applicant confirmed it would send copies of the Issues Tracker to PINS at key milestones to demonstrate how it is addressing issues.
<b>DAD and Design Codes</b>	In relation to the Design Approach Document (DAD) and Design codes, the Inspectorate reminded the applicant of the recent publication by the National Infrastructure Commission regarding design and principal for National Infrastructure and whether the applicant has identified a 'Design Champion' as these are matters being discussed during examination. The applicant confirmed it was aware of this.
<b>Highfield Moss SSSI</b>	The applicant advised it has been working with Natural England and Lancashire Wildlife Trust on the potential for impacts to Highfield Moss SSSI. The Inspectorate advised that the applicant also check the response from the Environment Agency in the scoping opinion as this consultation body had also provided comment on this site.
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting date: 09 October 2025</b>
<b>Programme Update</b>	<p>The applicant advised that an additional 3 areas of land had been added to the order limits of the dDCO since the last project update meeting.</p> <p>The land in question is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land to the north of the railway line.</li> <li>• Land to the east of Winwick Lane</li> <li>• Land required for potential highway interventions and mitigation (including remote highway junctions and the Lane Head South Relief Road (LHSRR))</li> </ul> <p>The applicant advised the land to the north of the railway line was added mainly for Biodiversity Net Gain and for landscape planting to create a visual barrier.</p> <p>The land to the east of Winwick Lane, is proposed to be incorporated as a soil re-use area (for the beneficial reuse of topsoil and a potential opportunity for improvement in respect of agricultural land value / classification).</p> <p>The LHSRR had been added to the order limits as it forms part of Wigan Council's emerging local plan. The applicant advised it is in the process of assessing whether the LDSRR is needed to mitigate the impacts of the project. The final</p>

	<p>package of highway interventions will be the subject of an additional targeted consultation in Q1 2026.</p> <p>The Inspectorate enquired if the applicant had been in contact with the consultation bodies in respect of these changes to the order limits and asked whether the additions had changed the views of any consultation bodies in relation to the project. The applicant confirmed it had been in consultation with Natural England and Lancashire Wildlife Trust with regards to these changes, and all host authorities had been advised of the changes along with Transport Working Group.</p> <p>The Inspectorate enquired whether in particular any concerns had been raised by Natural England in relation to Highfield Moss SSSI as a result of the additional works proposed and whether the applicant was working to resolve those. The applicant advised that the soil reuse area was largely driven by them and their desire to have a sustainable solution in terms of the deposit of topsoil within an area over which they have requisite control. In relation to the SSSI, the applicant advised this had largely been unchanged from what had previously been consulted upon and that all relevant consultees have been continually engaged on changes</p>
<p><b>Draft Documents</b></p>	<p>In respect of the final package of highway interventions / mitigation options, the applicant advised that it intended to conduct further targeted consultation in Q1 of 2026. Submission of draft DCO documents to the Planning Inspectorate will coincide with this in February 2026.</p> <p>The Inspectorate enquired if the draft documents would be submitted after the targeted consultation had taken place and if the Adequacy of Consultation would be submitted at the same time as the draft documents.</p> <p>As above, the applicant advised it would submit draft documents in parallel with the targeted highways consultation in Q1 2026.</p> <p>The Inspectorate requested that when the applicant submits draft documents that it submits them in their complete form.</p> <p>The Inspectorate asked the applicant if there would be a range of options in relation to highways mitigation when it came to submitting its draft documents or if there would be a range of options in place at this time. The applicant advised that the final package of highway interventions / mitigation options will be in place when the submission of draft DCO</p>

	documents is made to the Inspectorate. The applicant is not expecting substantial changes between the draft submission stage and the submission of the DCO application.
<b>Environmental Statement</b>	The Inspectorate advised that where these additional land form part of the proposed order limits, that the Environmental Statement should describe how the project has evolved since the EIA Scoping stage and explain how the assessment has evolved in response to those changes, including how this has been discussed and informed by the views of consultation bodies. The Inspectorate also advised that this information should be provided as a section within the ES and not through reference to other documents such as a consultation report, so that the implications for the assessment can be understood and for ease of reference.
<b>Adequacy of Consultation</b>	<p>The applicant confirmed they intended to submit their AoC Milestone 3 months before submission of the DCO application. They advised that there would likely be an overlap in submitting the AoC Milestone and the targeted highways consultation. However, the applicant advised it would have a clearer understanding of the relevant timelines once the results of the transport assessment are known.</p> <p>The Inspectorate enquired as to whether this additional work would mean the date for submission of the application would mean submission may be delayed until Q3 of 2026. The applicant responded that it was confident submission would still take place in Q2 2026, but it would advise the Inspectorate at the earliest opportunity should there be any delays. The applicant confirmed that the date of anticipated submission can be kept as May 2026.</p>
<b>Environmental Updates</b>	The applicant provided the inspectorate with an update on the environmental surveys that have / are being undertaken to support the PEIR and ES. The applicant confirmed that the survey information has enabled a good level of understanding of the site and the PEIR reflects this.
<b>Future Meetings</b>	The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that for all future meetings, they should provide the agenda 2 weeks in advance and any slide pack 1 week in advance. Any changes to the Programme Document should be provided 2 weeks in advance of any scheduled project update meeting.

<b>Case Manager</b>	The applicant requested an update on the status of the case manager for the project and when a new one will be appointed.
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Advice (Email): 28 October 2025</b>
<b>Pre-application Prospectus</b>	<p>The Inspectorate has advised that, following a six-month review, the <a href="#">Pre-application Prospectus</a> has been updated. Applicants with live projects at the pre-application stage should familiarise themselves with the revised document and consider any implications for their engagement with the Inspectorate.</p> <p>Key updates include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The establishment of land and rights negotiations tracking as a core service feature. All applicants are now expected to develop and share a tracker using one of two standard templates, regardless of service tier.</li> <li>• Clarified expectations for applicants ahead of meetings with the Inspectorate. This includes confirmation that the Inspectorate may delay or refuse service where pre-meeting requirements, such as the timely submission of an updated programme or issues tracker, are not met.</li> </ul>
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting date: 29 January 2026</b>
<b>Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)</b>	The applicant explained that they intend to carry out future consultation in accordance with the existing SoCC but can be flexible if required. The Inspectorate advised that even though the legislation might change the applicant should be consistent with the SoCC as discussed with the relevant Local Authorities. They confirmed this was its intention. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to continue engaging with the community and to follow through with the commitments they have already made, even if upcoming legislative changes alter the requirements.
<b>Draft documents</b>	The Inspectorate advised that if draft documents are being submitted then it would need 6 weeks to review them. The Inspectorate advised that sufficient time was built into the programme to allow feedback from the draft documents review to be taken into account prior to submission.
<b>Statutory Consultation</b>	The Inspectorate asked if the options for highways mitigation have been refined. The applicant responded that the highways mitigation schemes have undergone changes and the changes will be set out in a report available to inform the upcoming consultation. The Inspectorate advised that effort should be made to reduce the design options as far as

	possible at the point of submission. The applicant confirmed that the approach was not to retain options by submission.
<b>Issue Tracker</b>	<p>The Inspectorate highlighted the need for clearer RAG (Red–Amber–Green) ratings. Several issues currently marked as amber should be red, and the document should set out explicit definitions for each category for consistency and transparency. The applicant should review the list to ensure the RAG rating is applied consistently and appropriately. Clearer timescales for resolving each issue should, if possible, also be noted rather than referencing “likely to be resolved”. During an examination the Examining Authority are likely to ask when such issues will be resolved.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that it is helpful for the Issues Tracker to provide more information about how matters have been resolved, such as stating explicitly whether a party has agreed the approach or which specific matters are unresolved.</p> <p>The Inspectorate also noted that the HRA tab and EIA tab of the tracker are not aligned with each other and this will need to be corrected, with particular regard to the potential need for additional air quality studies.</p>
<b>Land Rights and Negotiations Tracker</b>	<p>The Inspectorate was content with the applicant’s approach to producing the Land Rights and Negotiations tracker during pre-application and advised that the tracker should accurately capture negotiations taking place and these do not need to be duplicated in the Issues Tracker.</p> <p>The Inspectorate further added that once the application is submitted plot numbers will need to be inserted.</p>
<b>Programme document</b>	The Inspectorate advised the applicant to ensure that future meetings are scheduled in the programme document to ensure that these can be resourced fully.
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting date: 8 May 2026</b>
<b>Programme update</b>	<p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant that this meeting was meeting 3 of 6 for the current invoicing year. The Inspectorate advised that it is up to the applicant whether they wish to use all of the allocated meetings for each invoicing year.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that the adequacy of consultation milestone (AoCM) should be submitted no later than three months before the anticipated submission of the project.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant that if the submission does slip into the next invoicing period, the applicant will be sent a pre-application invoice that should be paid in full. The Inspectorate advised that a credit note will be sent if the</p>

	<p>application is accepted for examination to reimburse the applicant for any unused pre-application months.</p>
<b>Land Rights and Negotiations Tracker</b>	<p>The Inspectorate advised that the purpose of the land and rights negotiations tracker is to provide a consolidated document containing the status of land and rights negotiations and inform the Inspectorate of the interactions that the applicant is undertaking with landowners.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that in contrast the Book of Reference (BoR) lists all the plots of land that would be directly affected by the project along with the details of each affected person who has an interest in each plot. The Inspectorate emphasised that the land and rights negotiations tracker is not just a duplication of the BoR as additional information is required to be inputted.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that the applicant is not required to use the exact land and rights negotiations tracker template provided by the Inspectorate. The applicant was advised that the template can be adapted to the project needs.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant that the land and rights negotiations tracker needs to be clear when defining the land within the tracker and the applicant should state what is being requested for each of the plots. The Inspectorate advised that a number of land and rights negotiations trackers have been published which have been through the examination process and are available to be viewed on the project webpages.</p>
<b>Issues Tracker</b>	<p>The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should ensure that the air quality information on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) tab is reflected consistently with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) tab, especially as updated information becomes available.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it is useful in the tracker to have a definition provided for each of the RAG rating colours. The Inspectorate further advised that it is useful for the applicant to provide a count of how many issues within each topic listed on the tracker are rated each of the RAG colours.</p> <p>The Inspectorate requested that all new issues that are identified within the tracker are logged in chronological order. The Inspectorate advised that all new issues should receive a new number and that reference numbers between versions of the tracker should not change. The Inspectorate advised that consistency across versions is important to allow parties to track and follow issues.</p>

**Post-meeting advice on the Issues Tracker and Land Rights Tracker**

The Inspectorate advises that the issues tracker identifies a number of outstanding matters where further discussion is required to reach agreement with relevant consultees. These include:

- the transport assessment methodology, modelling and mode shares
- the study area for assessment of railway noise, including whether it should include Halton Borough Council
- agreement on mitigation measures to avoid impacts on the Highfield Moss site of special scientific interest (SSSI)
- farmland bird mitigation
- the extent of archaeological surveys, trial trenching and subsequent mitigation
- potential improvements to the Huskisson Memorial
- waste-related matters raised by the Environment Agency
- the scope of the energy and climate change assessment and electric vehicle parking provision
- whether there is a need to undertake a quantitative health assessment or assess effects on local healthcare capacity
- habitats regulations assessment matters with Natural England

The Inspectorate advises that further discussions are undertaken with relevant consultees to seek to agree these matters prior to submission of the application.

The Inspectorate advises that early discussions take place with relevant parties on the draft Development Consent Order. This should include articles, requirements and protective provisions, noting that only limited engagement appears to have taken place to date.

The Inspectorate advises that the land and rights tracker should include further detail on meetings and negotiations for a number of plots, to demonstrate progress in engagement with affected parties.