

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

**HINCKLEY NATIONAL
RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE**

**The Hinckley National Rail Freight
Interchange Development Consent Order**

Project reference TR050007

Matters that Remain Outstanding

7 February 2025

This document has been prepared in response to the Secretary of State's letter 20 December 2024 which requests that the Applicant provide a further update by 7 February 2025 on any **matters that remain outstanding**. As part of this update, the Secretary of State requests the Applicant to set out the status of negotiations and to confirm whether the Applicant is of the view that agreement with the relevant Interested Parties might be reached and, if so, when they expect to conclude such an agreement.

Interested Parties referenced in this document where there remain outstanding matters include:

- (A) National Highways (NH)**
- (B) Leicestershire County Council (LCC)**
- (C) Warwickshire County Council (WCC)**

Other interested parties include

- (D) Blaby District Council**
- (E) Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council**

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
M1 Junction 21 / M69 Junction 3			
Use of VISSIM			
<p>Applicant's Position</p> <p>The Applicant's position remains as per its submission on 10 December 2024 ("the Applicant's December Submission") (paragraphs 2.1 – 2.5).</p>	<p>The level of validation of the LinSig model was found to be acceptable by NH.</p> <p>The outcome of the completion of the modelling was confirmation that the development did not trigger a need for mitigation at the junction.</p> <p>The modelling of the junction has been completed.</p>	N/A	N/A
NH	<p>It is the Applicant's understanding that NH agree that whilst VISSIM or Paramics would have been preferable, LinSig is an appropriate model to assess the requirement for mitigation or otherwise at the junction.</p> <p>The SoCG with NH submitted on 10 December 2024 confirmed agreement to the validation and forecast of the LinSig modelling.</p> <p>The Applicant understands the output of the LinSig model, which confirms that no mitigation is required, is now agreed.</p>	N/A – agreement now reached.	N/A
LCC	<p>It is the Applicant's understanding that LCC would have preferred a VISSIM model for M1 J21 that replicates all movements impacting the operation of the junction, including on the Local Road Network (LRN).</p> <p>LCC would also have preferred an unconstrained PRTM Strategic model run to demonstrate how much development and existing traffic would use the junction should the existing capacity issues not be present.</p>	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with LCC.	N/A
M1 Junction 21 / M69 Junction 3			
Safety			
<p>Applicant's Position</p> <p>The Applicant's position remains as per the Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 2.7 – 2.11).</p>	<p>As confirmed in paragraph 2.11 of the Applicant's December Submission, the Applicant has continued to liaise with NH and provided to NH the data input and output file which comprises the supporting information to the COBALT assessment which was part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that Dft COBALT software is the most appropriate tool to forecast accidents by calculating collision rates with and without development in forecast years for environmental impact assessment.</p>	N/A	N/A

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
	<p>IEMA Guidance¹ confirms that the calculation of collision rates is considered a relevant approach to scale a road safety assessment. However, a 'collision cluster' assessment may also be requested:</p> <p><i>"3.41 The 1993 Guidelines advocated the calculation of road accident rates (collision rates in modern terminology) as an approximation of the potential for road safety impacts stating: 'From knowing the expected increase in vehicle-km on different classes of road, it will be possible to make an initial simple statistical assessment of the likely increase or decrease in the number of accidents resulting from changes in traffic flows and composition.'</i></p> <p><i>3.42 The calculation of collision rates is still considered a relevant approach to scale a road safety assessment; however, it is more common for stakeholders to request a 'collision cluster' assessment to identify potential impacts at a more detailed level."</i></p> <p>The Applicant's application submission documents included both approaches for completeness.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the age of collision data used in the COBALT assessment as being appropriate for the purposes of baseline position and the forecast with and without development in 2036.</p>		
NH	<p>NH have agreed the modelling outputs but have not yet confirmed if there are any potential safety implications which NH consider to be severe.</p> <p>NH have confirmed they are reviewing the COBALT information ahead of 7th of February. The Applicant is not aware of NH's position until this review has been completed.</p>	The Applicant cannot confirm whether agreement can be reached until it has sight of NH's response.	N/A
LCC	The Applicant understands that because LCC do not agree with the modelling approach to this junction, they will not consider or engage in the Applicant's COBALT assessment dealing with the safety position.	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached on this matter with LCC.	N/A
Road Safety in Sapcote			
<p>Applicant's Position</p> <p>The Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 2.12 – 2.17) confirmed that its original scheme considered in Examination had been through independent Road Safety Audit (RSA) which raised no matters that could not be addressed through detailed design.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this the Applicant produced an enhanced scheme which went through independent RSA which raised no matters that could not be addressed through detailed design.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the enhanced scheme can be delivered and addresses matters raised by the ExA and adequately mitigates the safety concern in Sapcote village.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the matter of Road Safety in Sapcote has been addressed and has gone through an appropriate independent RSA process. The auditor recommended that the safety issue identified in the RSA which related to the risk of oncoming vehicles could be addressed through the provision of a vehicle activated sign. The Applicant agrees with this recommendation, which can be delivered through the detailed design process under the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that comments raised by LCC can be adequately dealt with through the formal road safety audit process pursuant to the protective provisions contained within the DCO.</p>	N/A	N/A

¹ Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines: Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (July 2023).

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
LCC	<p>The Applicant has received informal comments on the enhanced scheme from LCC highlighting concerns.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that despite the scheme being subject to an independent RSA LCC believe there are highway safety concerns with the enhanced scheme and disagree with the independent auditor's view that the implementation of vehicle activated signage will address the identified issue in the RSA.</p>	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with LCC.	N/A
M69 Junction 2			
<p>Applicant's position</p> <p>As confirmed in paragraph 4.8 of the Applicant's December Submission, the Applicant has continued to liaise with NH and LCC in respect of completion of the RSA1 process in line with GG119.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the approval of separate RSA briefs is compliant with GG119 and a letter confirming the independent auditor's same view is provided with at Appendix 3 to the Applicant's covering letter dated 7 February. The Applicant does not consider that a consolidated brief is required for compliance with GG119.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that all matters concerning this junction have been agreed with NH save for completion of the RSA1 process which the Applicant understands to be outstanding only due to LCC having not yet signed off the response report due to its concerns over the GG119 process. The Applicant understands that this is derived from the Applicant's approach of separate briefs and not a consolidated brief.</p> <p>To address this the Applicant has provided a letter from the independent Road Safety Auditor confirming that the use of separate briefings is compliant with GG119 and that a consolidated brief would not alter the conclusions of the audit.</p>	N/A	N/A
NH	NH have agreed all matters relating to junction 2 save for completion of the RSA1 process as outlined above.	The Applicant considers that agreement could be reached with NH if LCC signed the RSA1 response report.	N/A
LCC	LCC will not agree to sign off the RSA1 response report because they consider that the Road Safety Audit process as set out in GG119 has not been correctly followed due to the provision of separate briefs rather than a consolidated brief.	The Applicant understands that agreement could be reached if a consolidated brief and further RSA was undertaken. The Applicant has not done this to date because it is not considered necessary and furthermore it would have resulted in further delay to the determination of the application.	N/A
Sustainable Transport Strategy (STS)			
Applicant's Position	The Applicant believes that NH, LCC and WCC's positions remain unchanged since the Examination and whilst it understands that the changes made by the Applicant in the updated STS submitted in	N/A	N/A

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
<p>The Applicant's position remains as per the Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 3.1 – 3.14).</p> <p>As explained in the Applicant's December Submission, the Applicant has included the recommendations of the ExA as set out in the recommendation report (paragraphs 3.3.425, 3.3.427, 7.4.105 and Table 11 ER) in the updated STS submitted on 10 December 2024.</p>	<p>December are supported, those parties continue to restate their previous comments which the ExA has considered and concluded that the inclusion of additional specific identified measures would make the document acceptable.</p> <p>In respect of WCC's continued commentary in relation to extended bus provision (i.e. to Rugby), the Applicant reiterates that the ExA was content with commercial bus provision (paragraph 3.3.411 ER) and with the extension of the bus pass provision to private buses that overall bus provision was acceptable.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that as the recommendations of the ExA have now been incorporated into the STS, the STS can be a certified document rather than an outline plan. It is considered that the ExA was clear in the recommendation report that should their recommendations be included in the STS then the document would be acceptable to mitigate the ExA's identified concerns (save for the passenger rail station which is dealt with in paragraphs 3.15 – 3.36 of the Applicant's December Submission and is not dealt with further in this document).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the ExA's comments on the acceptability of the walking and cycling (paragraphs 3.3.407, 3.3.413 – 3.3.415 ER) and of the commercial bus service provision (paragraph 3.3.411 ER) proposals in the STS. The Applicant believes that the commitments to both public transport and active travel, and ongoing monitoring throughout the life of the development will be effective at encouraging mode shift, including any shift change overs and staff when occupiers recruit. Overall active travel had neutral weight in the ExA's recommendation report.</p> <p>The Applicant's concern in respect of the ability to agree further detail with the authorities as explained in paragraph 3.11 of the Applicant's December Submission is firmly reiterated given LCC's continued disagreement with the updated STS notwithstanding that the Applicant has made the amendments the ExA suggested ought to be made to the document.</p>		
<p>NH</p>	<p>NH do not agree with the ExA's acceptance of the pedestrian measures and proposals for achieving aspirational measures.</p> <p>NH have concerns as to how the STS Targets will be monitored and managed with necessary measures delivered/enforced as required.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with NH and the Applicant notes the ExA was satisfied in respect of the pedestrian measures (paragraph 3.3.407 ER) and the STS DCO requirement with the inclusion of its suggested additional measures in the STS.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>LCC</p>	<p>LCC consider the document should be submitted as an 'Outline' document with a Requirement to submit in full as recommended by the ExA.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with LCC.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>WCC</p>	<p>The Applicant understands that WCC supports the amendments made to the STS by the Applicant in December.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with WCC and the Applicant notes the ExA was satisfied that</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
	WCC maintains its position raised at Deadline 8 (the end of the Examination) in respect of no identified public or private transport provision from Rugby to the site, and the restriction on the 6 month bus pass.	with the commercial bus provision (paragraph 3.3.411 ER) and the Applicant addressed the ExA's concern in relation to bus pass provision in its updated STS.	
BDC	BDC has confirmed by email that they have no further comments on the updated draft STS provided by the Applicant to BDC in November which contained the proposed amendments being made by the Applicant in response to the ExA's concerns. The version of the STS submitted on 10 December was substantially the same version subject to minor clarifications. The Applicant understands that BDC's position remains otherwise as presented in Examination.	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with BDC but considers that the updated STS addresses the ExA's concerns.	N/A
HBBC	HBBC has confirmed by email that they have no further comments on the updated draft STS provided by the Applicant to HBBC in November which contained the proposed amendments being made by the Applicant in response to the ExA's concerns. The version of the STS submitted on 10 December was substantially the same version subject to minor clarifications. The Applicant understands that HBBC's position remains otherwise as presented in Examination.	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with HBBC but considers that the updated STS addresses the ExA's concerns.	N/A
HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy (HGVRP)			
<p>Applicant's Position</p> <p>The Applicant's position remains as per the Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 3.36 – 3.42).</p> <p>The Applicant has included the recommendations of the ExA as set out in the recommendation report in the updated HGVRP submitted on 10 December 2024.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that all occupiers are required to adhere to the HGV Route Management Plan and Strategy which is secured by requirement.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that as the recommendations / comments of the ExA on the HGVRP have now been incorporated into the updated HGVRP, the HGVRP can be a certified document rather than an outline plan. It is considered that the ExA was clear in the recommendation report that should their recommendations be included in the STS then the document would be acceptable.</p> <p>The Applicant has repeatedly explained to LCC that the inclusion of the HGV Routeing Enforcement Fund as a contribution payable to LCC for their administration is an option exercisable at LCC's sole discretion and that consequently there is no obligation on LCC to administer the fund. Should LCC not wish to exercise this option, then the fund would be administered by the Applicant in accordance with the terms of the HGV Routeing Plan as required by the Unilateral Undertaking dated 8 March 2024. There is no legal basis for LCC's continued dispute on this point.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Unilateral Undertaking also allows the increase of the mitigation fund by agreement with the working group.</p> <p>The Applicant added an additional section to the HGVRP in December regarding the low bridge on the A5 (paragraphs 6.3 – 6.5) and the Applicant notes that the ExA concluded on this point at paragraph 3.3.431 of the ER that "Overall, ... consider that the use of the A47 Link Road to be a reasonable route for HGVs, provided that their routings follow the HGVRP thereafter".</p> <p>The Applicant's concern in respect of the ability to agree further detail with the authorities as explained in paragraph 3.11 of its letter dated 10 December is firmly reiterated given LCC's continued disagreement with the updated HGVRP notwithstanding that the Applicant has made the amendments the ExA suggested ought to be made to the document.</p>	N/A	N/A

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
NH	<p>The Applicant understands NH's position remains as detailed in the SoCG with NH submitted on 10 December.</p> <p>The management of high-sided vehicles and the low bridge on the A5 is not agreed. National Highways remaining concern is in regard to the bridge on the A5 and risk of high sided vehicles travelling to and from the HNRFI striking the bridge. They state that any effect on the operation of the SRN are of significant concern until the Padge Hall Farm scheme is implemented (ExA report 3.3.305 and 3.3.306), while recognising there are "limited opportunities for the Applicant to remedy the situation".</p>	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with NH.	N/A
LCC	<p>The outstanding issue related to the HGVRP of which the Applicant is aware, concerns the inclusion within the Unilateral Undertaking dated 10 December 2024 of an option for LCC to administer the HGV Routeing Enforcement Fund. LCC objects as it does not wish to take on what it perceives to be an administrative burden.</p> <p>LCC question the level of the fund.</p> <p>LCC has advised that on the basis that the Applicant has submitted the Unilateral Undertaking without deleting wording relating to LCC administering the fund as has been requested, this matter cannot be resolved.</p>	The Applicant does not consider that LCC will agree to this outstanding matter notwithstanding that the Unilateral Undertaking places no obligation on LCC whatsoever.	N/A
WCC	<p>WCC have recently raised a concern over the lack of any measures to monitor/enforce should any high sided HGV's not use a route that avoids the A5 Nutts Lane bridge.</p> <p>WCC suggest that if the document were 'Outline' it is likely that this matter could be discussed and agreed with the relevant authorities.</p>	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with WCC on this matter and the Applicant notes the ExA was satisfied in respect of routeing and monitoring (paragraphs 3.3.431 – 3.3.433 ER).	N/A
BDC	The Applicant is not aware of any outstanding issues with BDC on this matter following the amendments to the HGVRP in December.	The Applicant has not been made aware of any outstanding issues.	N/A
HBBC	The Applicant is not aware of any outstanding issues with HBBC on this matter following the amendments to the HGVRP in December.	The Applicant has not been made aware of any outstanding issues.	N/A
M69 J1			
Applicant's Position	There are no outstanding matters at this junction.	Agreement has been reached.	N/a
NH	NH have completed their review of the modelling and are content that no mitigation is necessary at the junction.	Agreement has been reached.	N/A

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
WCC	WCC have confirmed that since the VISSIM modelling for this junction has been accepted by NH this matter no longer remains outstanding.	Agreement has been reached.	N/A
Cross in Hand Roundabout			
<p>Applicant's Position</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to liaise with NH and LCC in respect of the RSA1 process and GG119 as noted in paragraph 5.18 of the Applicant's December Submission.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit process has been followed for this junction.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit process has been followed for this junction. An Interim Audit was carried out in November 2023 which raised two safety issues. While the Applicant did not agree with the auditor's views, subsequent correspondence with highway authorities led to amendments to the design prior to the full RSA 1.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that the highway authorities have not agreed the outcome of the RSA 1 process, which found no safety problems relating to the latest design of the junction, because of the provision of separate brief documents rather than a single consolidated brief. To address this, the Applicant has provided a letter (Appendix 3 of the Applicant's letter dated 7 February) from the independent Road Safety Auditor confirming that the use of separate briefs is compliant with GG119 and that a consolidated brief would not alter the conclusions of the audit. These separate briefs were agreed by the respective highway authorities and refer to the latest design information for this junction. The Applicant also understands that NH believe the correct personnel did not attend the site visit for this junction, however, while it is not a requirement for the Auditor to invite the highway authority to the site visit, the letter from the independent Road Safety Auditor confirms that a member of NH's safety team was present at the site visit.</p>	N/A	N/A
NH	<p>NH do not agree that the GG119 RSA process has been correctly followed due to the provision of separate briefs rather than a consolidated brief. They have also stated that the correct NH personnel did not attend the site visit.</p> <p>Completion of the RSA1 process in line with GG119 remains outstanding for the proposed changes to the A5 Cross in Hand roundabout.</p>	The Applicant understands that agreement could be reached if a consolidated brief and further RSA was undertaken. The Applicant has not done this to date because it is not considered necessary and furthermore it would have resulted in further delay to the determination of the application.	N/A
LCC	<p>LCC will not agree the RSA 1 report because they consider that the Road Safety Audit process as set out in GG119 has not been correctly followed due to the provision of separate briefs rather than a consolidated brief.</p> <p>In addition, LCC have made reference to problems raised at the Interim RSA1, although these problems are not raised again in the latest audit report due to updates to the design which were made following correspondence with the overseeing organisations on these points.</p>	The Applicant understands that agreement could be reached if a consolidated brief and further RSA was undertaken. The Applicant has not done this to date because it is not considered necessary and furthermore it would have resulted in further delay to the	N/A

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
		determination of the application.	
WCC	<p>WCC have indicated that their preference is for no works to be carried out on WCC's network at Cross in Hand, and therefore the Applicant believes there are no outstanding matters of disagreement, and that WCC defer to NH in respect of this junction.</p> <p>WCC's preference of there being no works at this junction is addressed through the Applicant's draft DCO (requirement 5(3)) which will enable the parties to agree that alternatives may be provided, subject to such alternatives being appropriate mitigation for the HNRFI impacts.</p> <p>Should there be works at this junction, WCC agree they will need to continue to be involved in the GG119 process.</p>	The Applicant does not consider that there is any disagreement with WCC on this matter.	N/A
Gibbet Hill Roundabout			
<p>Applicant's Position</p> <p>The Applicant's position remains as the Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 5.8 – 5.12).</p>	<p>The Applicant's scheme was designed in order to calculate the Applicant's proportionate contribution to a wider scheme which is then secured through the Unilateral Undertakings dated 8 March 2024 and 10 December 2024 and reiterates that the amount of the contribution is consistent with the amount suggested by NH during examination as confirmed in its Final Position Statement submitted at Deadline 8 [page 10 REP8-041].</p> <p>The Applicant responded to NH, LCC and WCC's comments in respect of which body the contribution should be payable to during the Examination (paragraphs 5.4 – 5.10 REP5-037, paragraphs 4.3 – 4.10 REP7-050, REP6-020 and paragraph 21 of its Final Summations REP8-027).The Applicant notes that the ExA was satisfied as to the delivery mechanism of the planning obligation, and that it would allow the relevant sum to be transferred to the appropriate body [paragraph 7.5.24 ER].</p> <p>The Applicant modelled this junction using ARCADY due to the distance of the junction from the site and the limited impact the development has on the scheme. The modelling is accepted by NH but the Applicant understands that LCC and WCC would prefer use of a VISSIM model. The ExA noted that NH consider the junction has been appropriately modelled and the Applicant notes that the ExA did not disagree with this position (paragraph 3.3.293 ER).</p> <p>The scheme design has been updated and re-costed and the Applicant considers it to be acceptable.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Stage 1 RSA unilaterally with an independent, suitably qualified RSA team, as NH stated that they had not agreed the design and were unable to sign a brief. This RSA was submitted to the Secretary of State on 10 December alongside the Applicant's December Submission. All recommendations in the RSA1 were incorporated together with recommendations received from NH on 21 November. This revised design was submitted to NH on 27 November 2024 together with a cost plan which is being reviewed by NH at present. The Applicant has continued to seek feedback but has still not received any comments.</p> <p>The Applicant has subsequently attempted to undertake a further RSA on these proposals with a brief agreed by WCC and NH.</p>	N/A	N/A

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
	The reason for this RSA process is to demonstrate that the proposed mitigation which informs the contribution value would be deliverable and safe should it ever come forward.		
NH	The Applicant has not received any feedback on the updated design or cost plan but NH's position appears to remain that they have not reviewed and agreed the design and are therefore unable to agree a brief.	The Applicant cannot confirm whether agreement can be reached until it has sight of NH's response but the Applicant reiterates that the amount of the contribution is consistent with the amount suggested by NH during examination as confirmed in its Final Position Statement submitted at Deadline 8 [page 10 REP8-041].	N/A
LCC	<p>LCC maintain that the National Highways VISSIM model should be used for the testing of the junction.</p> <p>As there are no proposed works on the LCC network as part of the HNRFI mitigation scheme at Gibbet Hill roundabout, LCC have agreed that they do not need to be party to the RSA process but would like to be kept informed as to progress and outcomes.</p> <p>LCC will not agree to the contribution level as set out in the Unilateral Undertaking on the basis that the contribution figure has not yet been verified by National Highways.</p>	The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with LCC.	N/A
WCC	<p>WCC believe this junction should be modelled using the existing VISSIM model.</p> <p>WCC await NH's confirmation that the scheme costed by the Applicant could technically be delivered notwithstanding that the scheme is intended as a theoretical design to inform the calculation of an appropriate contribution (secured by the Unilateral Undertakings dated 8 March 2024 and 10 December 2024) towards a wider scheme to be delivered by NH.</p> <p>WCC hold funds for this junction from other developers on behalf of NH but continue to restate that they do not consider they should be the recipient of the financial contribution.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that agreement can be reached with WCC in the absence of NH reviewing the design, the brief and the cost plan (as above) and notes that the ExA was satisfied that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) NH considered the junction has been appropriately modelled (paragraph 3.3.293); and b) the planning obligation in the Unilateral Undertaking would enable the relevant sum to be transferred to a delivery body (paragraph 7.5.24 ER). 	N/A
Aston Firs			
Applicant's Position	No matters outstanding.	N/A	N/A

Outstanding Matter	Status	The Applicant's view on whether agreement can be reached	Timescale to conclude the agreement
Further design work was undertaken by the Applicant for this part of the site to inform the submissions made 10 December 2024 and the Applicant's position remains as stated in the Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 2.37 – 2.50).			
BDC	Constructive discussions have taken place with BDC on this matter; the Applicant is not aware of any outstanding substantive issues with BDC on this matter which could not be addressed through detailed design.	N/A	N/A
HBBC	Constructive discussions have taken place with HBBC on this matter; the Applicant is not aware of any outstanding substantive issues with HBBC on this matter which could not be addressed through detailed design.	N/A	N/A
Narborough Level Crossing			
Applicant's Position The Applicant's position remains as per its submissions in the Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 2.29 – 2.36).	No matters outstanding.	N/A	N/A
BDC	The Applicant is not aware of any outstanding issues with BDC on this matter and understands that BDC's position remains the same as in Examination.	N/A	N/A
Submissions made by Dr Moore and Mr Moore			
Applicant's Position The Applicant's position remains as per its submissions in the Applicant's December Submission (paragraphs 3.43 – 3.48).	No matters outstanding.	N/A	N/A
BDC	Constructive discussions have taken place with BDC on this matter; the Applicant is not aware of any outstanding issues with BDC on this matter.	N/A	N/A
HBBC	Constructive discussions have taken place with HBBC on this matter; the Applicant is not aware of any outstanding issues with HBBC on this matter.	N/A	N/A