

First to summarise events/changes during the period of the examination :-

- 1) Several spells of heavy rainfall have tested the capacity of the existing ditch/stream beds, with temporary overflows of banks at Bostock Close and the lower fields in the fishponds (crematorium) area.
- 2) At the same time overground flows have been seen into the SSSI woodland along the line of the footpath U50/1 into the clear ditch through the wood. Photos available.

These occasions have shown a) there are additional natural “run-offs” not shown in the applicant's presentation which once cut-off by the proposed ground level changes will all be channelled in the same direction b) The planned SUDS capacity to overflow appears to have been reached several times in the last few months.

I maintain the same opinion re groundwater flows and storage expressed earlier in the consultation

Later presentations by the applicant :-

There has been the possible addition of earth bunds each side of the link road down to the A47 to protect the tranquillity of Burbage Common cafe and grounds. I think there was a qualification “if feasible”. I would request this is essential and should clearly state height and length relative to the final road level.

The operational noise calculations have a mix of BS and ISO standards quoted which seems strange. We have been advised ISO 9613-2 includes a factor to account for the “downwind” effect. If this applied to all the calculations, they are then all inflated by an “unknown” (?) amount. The “downwind” effect depends on direction – in our case S-SW is the prevailing wind direction and as such for me the A47 noise is increased, but the M69 and rail noise is reduced. The proposal introduces totally new point sources of noise and therefore it will be “all new noise” in specific wind directions within Elmesthorpe and Burbage Common particularly. I would request the method used for the EM Gateway “wind effect” calculation needs to be used for this proposal.

The applicant's calculation of average noise included ignoring a night time “no train” survey period. It obviously was a real result and to a lesser degree I would suggest also applies to the A47 noise profile. I would request the examination does include these confirmed “quiet” spells when making the comparison with the 24/7 period of proposed operation.

ISO 9613-2 appears to be for “pure tone” noise calculation. I do not agree with the applicant's decision that loading/unloading containers be considered a “continuous noise”. Certainly not watching and listening to the operation at EM Gateway, with stop/start driving and frequent horn signals to the lorry drivers.