

Document DCO 1.7

Updates to Application Documentation

OCTOBER 2025

The East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
and Highway Order 202X and The East Midlands Gateway
Rail Freight and Highway (Amendment) Order 202X

CONTENTS

Section	Internal Page no.
Introduction	3
Appendix 1 – S51 Advice	4
Appendix 2 - Amended Documents	5
Appendix 3 - Response to the S51 Advice	40

Introduction

- 1 This document is provided with the application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) made by SEGRO Properties Limited (DCO Applicant) relating to a second phase at East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park (EMG1) (DCO Application).
- 2 A second application has been submitted simultaneously for a material change to the EMG1 DCO (MCO Application) by SEGRO (EMG) Limited (MCO Applicant).
- 3 The DCO Applicant and the MCO Applicant are together referred to as 'SEGRO' or 'the Applicants'.
- 4 EMG1 is a nationally significant infrastructure development comprising a rail freight terminal and warehousing. It was authorised by The East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange and Highway Order 2016 (SI 2016/17) (the EMG1 DCO) and was substantially completed in October 2024.
- 5 This second phase is referred to as 'East Midlands Gateway 2' or 'EMG2' or the 'EMG2 Project'.
- 6 The DCO Application and the MCO Application were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on 28 August 2025 but were subsequently withdrawn on 22 September 2025. This document sets out the amendments made to the documentation for the resubmission of the DCO Application.
- 7 All the points raised in the PINS Section 51 Advice dated 23 September 2025 (S51 Advice) have been addressed as appropriate. A copy of the S51 Advice is at Appendix 1 of this document for ease of reference.
- 8 The table in Appendix 2 of this document lists the documents which have been amended because of the S51 Advice or in consequence of the resubmission. It should be noted that the table sets out the substantive amendments and does not identify minor or consequential typographical updating.
- 9 The table in Appendix 3 of this document provides the DCO Applicant's response to the matters raised in the S51 Advice.

APPENDIX 1

S51 ADVICE



Planning Inspectorate

East Midlands Gateway 2 DCO application

Section 51 advice for applicant relating to documentation as to submission dated August 2025

The Planning Act 2008: Acceptance stage for NSIPs, states within the guidance that when looking at the application documents and in order to reach a decision on whether to accept an application for examination, the planning inspectorate will base such decision (not exclusively) to:

“the content and overall quality of the application in terms of the ability of the Examining Authority to be able to examine it within the maximum 6-month statutory time period.”

Items 1 to 22 below, reflects where the Inspectorate has determined that the overall quality is of such a nature that the appointed ExA would not be able to examine the application within 6-month period. We would encourage the Applicant to take note hereof, prior to resubmitting their application.

The applicant is requested to provide a ‘change log’ of any amendments if and when a revised application is submitted.

	Issue	Potential Resolution
<u>Transport Assessment</u>		
1.	Within the Transport Assessment (TA) and chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (ES) there are numerous routes/ links which are referred to. However, it is not clear the precise locations of these or the extent of the routes/ links. Examples include: • Tables 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 of the TA • Paragraph 6.6.9 of chapter 6 of the ES refers to various links, purporting to show them in a figure in Appendix 6D. However, Link 6 is said to be Long Street, Belton which is not shown. There is a link “6” in Diseworth (given there isn’t a link “9” this may be upside down). The extent of link 28 also is not clear, and Link 54 (see Table 6.8) appears to be missing from Appendix 6D, and there are two links identified as ‘Link 20’ in the key. • Tables 6.9 and 6.14 of chapter 6 of the ES. Furthermore, Tables 25 and 26 of the TA have as their first column titles ‘Counter location’ but all are times.	Provide plans based on Ordnance Survey at no greater scale than 1:10 000 showing full extent of all links referred to. This may involve redrafting documents such as chapter 6 of the ES, its appendices and the TA, to ensure all routes/ links are fully identified. Ensure tables have appropriate identifiers.
2.	Table 44 of the TA refers to the A453/ Kegworth Road dumbbell Roundabouts. This shows 3 arms to the junction. However, there are three roundabouts off this junction (even if one is to facilitate a corner).	Clarify relevant junction inputs on a plan, and ensure all inputs are resolved. It is not clear which three arms are referred to, and in any event, it would appear that traffic to and from the East Midlands Parkway station, or that to Ratcliffe on Soar has been omitted

	Issue	Potential Resolution
3.	Within the TA many junctions are referred to with a direction marker at the end, for example A453(W). It is not clear whether this is the west side of the junction, or for 'westbound' traffic, that is on the east side of the junction. The implication in the TA is that it is the west side of the junction. However, the drawings, for example Highway Plans Cross Sections Sheet 3 of 3 refers to 'westbound'.	Clarify in text how junctions have been identified and ensure a consistent approach throughout all application documentation.
4.	The information in Figures 3.9, 3.10, 3.14 and 3.15 of Appendix 70 of the TA (Part 4) is not clear.	The information should be provided as standalone drawings. These should be as if, when printed out, the wider network drawings are A1 and the inset drawings A3.
5.	Paragraph 6.8.6 states: <i>"The EMFM 2019 modelling shows that the SRN would accommodate an additional 2,067 vehicles during the peak hour periods in 2028 and 2,153 vehicles during the peak hour periods in 2038 (less in the latter because there is more traffic in the network) as a direct result of the proposed Highway Works"</i> . The latter figure (2,153) is higher than the former (2,067), and would appear to be incorrect	Ensure that information is accurate.
<u>Energy</u>		
6.	It is not clear from the application documents whether the proposed energy generation elements would constitute a NSIP in its own right.	Set out the energy generation capacity from the proposed energy production system in Megawatts (see section 15 of the Planning Act 2008). This should define both the 20% roof area coverage and the 100% coverage. If necessary, ensure compliance with the

	Issue	Potential Resolution
		Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. Once the correct energy generation capacity has been clarified that this figure should then be consistently applied to all relevant documents and/ or figures across the application documents
7.	The question of the need for the photovoltaics is not set out in detail.	Justify the need for the photovoltaic provision within the application.
<u>Environmental Statement</u>		
8.	Parameters that have been used to inform the assessment are unclear and it is difficult to understand the worst-case assessment that has been undertaken.	(i) A clear description, with reference to the units of measurement and using tables where possible, of the parameters and limits of deviation assumed for the proposed development such that a consistent worst-case scenario can be seen to have been applied to the impact assessment (ii) Cross references to all plans that show the parameters for the proposed development or inclusion of ES-specific figures (ES chapter 3 refers to the 2.5 Parameters plan, but this plan does not show all of the parameters for the proposed development). Where plans refer to parameters being either 'tightly drawn' or are 'the full extent of the works shown on this plan', the plans should be revised in line with the parameters used, any limits of deviation (LoD) and include appropriate units of measurement

	Issue	Potential Resolution
		(iii) Confirm the parameters assumed for the substation extension (see also this matter in relation to the Flood Risk Assessment) (iv) Explain what works have been assumed for the utilities proposed (ES Chapter 16)
9.	Information relevant to the assessment is not always presented in the ES project description. It isn't therefore clear whether information on the proposed development has been applied consistently across the ES, including but not limited to: • Information on piling at the A453 and Junction 24 of the M1 (as potential additional piling is identified on DCO plan 2.11 but it is unclear whether relevant aspect chapters have assessed this) • 'Timeslices' used in the noise assessment and assessment years • Cut/fill balance and its relationship to assumptions on construction traffic movements • The operational and construction data in appendices 6.7B and 6.7C	Amendments or improved cross referencing, ensure that all the information assumed for the assessment is accessible to understand the conclusions that have been reached.
10.	Aspect chapters do not present the conclusions in line with the given methodology, including ES chapters 5 (socio-economic), 10 (Landscape and visual) and 12 (cultural heritage). Examples of conclusions that are unclear:	Review and update conclusions for all aspect chapters.

	Issue	Potential Resolution
	• A 'low' sensitive receptor for cultural heritage is defined as 'archaeological sites that score less well against the SoS's criteria'. Receptors later in the chapter considered to be low sensitivity are classed as those that are of 'local importance'. • Chapter 17, population and human health is supported by baseline data in appendix 17.B although it is not easy to understand how the data presented are translated using the criteria in the chapter to reach a conclusion that the population is of low sensitivity	
<u>Energy and design</u>		
11.	There are inconsistencies in the design life and need for decommissioning of various elements of the proposed development. Paragraph 19.2.2 of chapter 19 of the Environmental Statement (ES) indicates that the decommissioning of the EMG2 project has not been assessed as it is considered to be a 'permanent development'. Paragraph 5.5.99 of Chapter 5 that in assessing the age of obsolete stock <i>"The age of obsolete stock has been assessed as either 30 or 40 years since construction or since the property was last refurbished."</i>	The design-life of the individual buildings should be set out in chapter 3 (project description), and thus whether they would, individually, be likely to be replaced. Any emissions associated with any demolitions, refurbishments and replacements should be assessed and reconciled within the document.
12.	The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) Schedule 1 includes a list of 'further works' without explanation of why these works are considered not to give rise to significant effects and thus have not been assessed in the ES.	Detailed assessments of matters that are unlikely to give rise to significant effects are not required. However, justification of why any further works have been scoped out of the assessment should be included with reference

	Issue	Potential Resolution
		to information on the scale and extent of the works and any reference to agreement with consultation bodies.
13.	The assessment of the potential photovoltaics is unclear as follows: • The glint and glare safeguarding assessment (ES appendix 20A) does not appear to consider the specifics of the proposed development and potential extent of photovoltaics in relation to glint and glare. • ES chapter 10 (landscape and visual impact) does not consider the presence of photovoltaics in its assessment.	Ensure that the proposed development is assessed in relation to appendix 20A and chapter 10 of ES and/ or provide details of where this is to be found
14.	Figure 5 of ES Appendix 14M states an overall cut and fill balance: 17,000m ³ deficit. However, para 14.5.91 of ES chapter 14 states that the deficit is 2,700m ³	Ensure that consistent figures are utilised throughout the Environmental Statement.
<u>Piling</u>		
15.	Chapter 3, paragraph 3.2.31 (fourth bullet) indicates that piles may be used for bridge works. Chapter 7 does not assess the piling of foundations in respect of either noise or vibration	Either assess piling throughout the examination or specifically ensure piling does not form part of the development proposals.
<u>Piling and flood risk</u>		
16.	ES chapter 14 ground conditions identifies that a foundation works risk assessment (FWRA) would be required if piling is needed for the M1 J24 highways works. It is not clear how this has been taken account of in the	If piling were to be a potential option for foundations, provide an assessment of piling at all locations with

	Issue	Potential Resolution
	assessment of 'negligible' effects on controlled waters. A worst-case assessment should be provided and an outline FWRA provided.	reference to a worst case where details of the nature and extent of any piling are to be confirmed at a later date'..
<u>Substation</u>		
17.	The need for the substation extension is not set out in detail. Furthermore, we cannot find any details of the parameters for the substation extension. The only references to parameters for the substation extension are in response to a previous query from PINs where it says that the parameters have been 'tightly drawn', and Works Plan 2.3C (sheet 3 of 4) states that the limits of deviation for the substation are 'the full extent of the works shown on this plan' but this does not confirm height or depth of any foundations (if relevant). The parameters plan in ES chapter 3 is referred to for the DCO works, but this plan only covers the main site.	Ensure that the need for the substation is fully addressed and parameters included within the application documentation.
<u>Draft Development Consent Order</u>		
18.	There is a lengthy list of 'further works' that has been included in the dDCO as works that might be needed for construction, but are stated to have not been assessed in the ES because they are not considered to give rise to any materially different environmental effects. There is no reference to these works in the ES project description to confirm what process has been undertaken to confirm this. Neither has the extent of what some of these works appear to be (ES chapter 18 states that the utilities diversions	(i) Clarify whether all the 'further works' have been assessed, and if not, ensure assessment. Ensure list of 'further works' is accurate.

	Issue	Potential Resolution
	have not been designed yet, so it raises the question, if that is the case, how can they be sure that there are no significant effects arising from those works). Equally, there are other works listed in 'further works' such as demolition works that the ES states will not be required and thus have not been assessed.	
<u>Flood risk assessment</u>		
19.	Information relevant to the FRA is spread across several documents – a highways works FRA screening, a main site FRA and a separate sequential test for the main site included within the Planning Statement. Further drainage strategies are provided as separate appendices to the ES chapter on flood risk.	Consolidate information for ease of reference, taking account of the additional points below on missing or unclear assessment information.
20.	Conclusions for the electricity substation are based on the works comprising 'improvements to existing infrastructure', whereas the dDCO describes Works Number 20 as a 'modified and extended' electricity substation. This review should also confirm the flood zone within which these works are located, together with the flood risk vulnerability category.	Clarify and provide an assessment or provide further explanation.
21.	The following consultation response from the Environment Agency is reported in ES table 19.3, ES chapter 19: Climate Change <i>"However, the standards do not provide for the potential future surface outfall requirements in the context of climate change resilience. Therefore, the Applicant</i>	Ensure, or clarify, how the response to the Environment Agency is specifically addressed in the ES.

	Issue	Potential Resolution
	<i>should consider designing new infrastructure or developments adjacent to the Strategic Road Network to avoid constraining the construction of new above- or below- ground surface water attenuation feature."</i> In response, the climate change chapter refers to the mitigation measures adopted by the proposed development in sections 19.5 and 19.6 but these measures are high level and so it is not possible to see how this comment specifically has been addressed. The drainage strategy for highways works does not refer to whether this potential design measure has been considered.	
22.	No assessment of downstream flood risk across the proposed development (only presented for the main site)	Review and update the assessments.

The guidance to the Acceptance stage for NSIPs, notes that an application may only be accepted if the Secretary of State concludes that, the application (including accompaniments) is of a standard that the Inspectorate (on behalf of the SoS) considers satisfactory.

Items 23 to 45 set out a number of other issues, identified during acceptance, which could usefully be addressed in relation to any resubmission. However, the cumulative issues identified by the Inspectorate, reflects that the standard of the application to be unsatisfactory. The Applicant is advised to review [the Acceptance guidance](#).

	Issue	Potential Resolution
<u>Development Consent Order and Explanatory Memorandum</u>		
23.	Schedule 1 of the dDCO set out there are 2 nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIP). However, Parts 1 & 2 identify the different 'elements' of the project and splits	Ensure drafting appropriately allocates all works. A proposal cannot be both part of an NSIP and 'associated development'. The application must be clear as to what

	Issue	Potential Resolution
	these into Commercial and Business (Works 1 to 7) and Alterations to Existing Highway (Works 8 to 12). Paragraph 1.17 of the Explanatory Memorandum explains that works within Work Nos. 8 to 12 (Schedule 1, Part 2) are a NSIP in their own right (alterations to highway) but paragraph 1.18 explains works in Work Nos. 6 and 7 are 'associated development' (which are listed under Part 1).	is being applied for and must be accurately represented. The applicant is referred to s37(3)(a) of the PA2008.
24.	The list of documents proposed for certification in Schedule 16 of the dDCO does not fully align with the list of "documents to be certified" as set out in the Guide to the Application. Notably, documents such as the Location Plan (Order Limits), A453 Bridge Plan, and Special Category Land Plans are referenced in the Guide but are not included in Schedule 16.	Ensure list of documents in Schedule 16 is accurate.
<u>Land Rights Issues</u>		
25.	There are no green shaded plots on the Land Plans, unless this is referring to the desaturated yellow 'Public highway required for highway works only (no permanent acquisition of land or rights)' in which case recommend the colour is adjusted to be clearer.	Ensure colours used on land plans (of all types) is clear.
26.	The descriptions in the Book of Reference (BoR) either give no or limited indication of what type of Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession is requested. Even though paragraph 5 'How to use this BoR' explains how the BoR and Land Plans can be read to see what powers apply to which plot.	Ensure rights sought are set out in BoR for each plot of land. For example: • Permanent acquisition of land and existing rights • Land to be used temporarily and new rights to be acquired permanently

	Issue	Potential Resolution
		- Land to be used temporarily only - Public highway required for highway works only (no permanent acquisition of land or rights)
27.	A lot of 'unknown' and 'none' entries in Part 2a and 3, column (3) Name and Address that have identified Category 1 & 2 persons in Part 1.	Set out fully what 'due diligence' measures have been undertaken to identify affected parties.
28.	The scale of Inset Plan 2A is such it is difficult to distinguish between Plots 2/17, 2/18, 2/53 and 2/54	Amend scale of this inset to clarify identified plots.
<u>Environmental Statement (generally)</u>		
29.	The Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) would benefit from a figure to show the study area and the projects within it. The chapter lists projects in each tier and says (paragraph 21.4.4) information was gathered in relation to each project but does not clarify which documents were reviewed to reach the conclusions presented.	Provide a figure showing the study area and the projects within it, and set out documents reviewed (this last item can be high level, for example, 'the planning application').
30.	Some of the aspect chapters cover CEA by project, but in some cases more potential impacts are identified in the aspect chapters than are concluded on in the CEA. Reasons aren't given for the aspects chosen to be assessed for each project in each tier (for example, some projects only assess cumulative socio-economic effects but don't explain why other aspects are not considered).	Set out reasoning for approach in CEA.

	Issue	Potential Resolution
31.	Lack of contents pages for each chapter makes them difficult to navigate.	Provide Table of Contents pages for each chapter of the ES.
32.	The following reports contain figures that are difficult to read (inappropriate scales, black and white/ indistinct mapping backgrounds): • ES appendix 6.9A: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal • ES appendix 6.9D: Bird Report • ES appendix 6.9G: Reptile Report • ES appendix 6.8D: Modelled Ecological Receptor Locations	Figures and maps used within the ES, particularly where these are embedded within text, should be reviewed for clarity and ease of understanding.
33.	Appendix 6.7A is titled 'Thematic Glossary' but the title of the document on opening is 'Noise and Vibration Terms'	Update as necessary.
34.	ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [DCO 6.9] states at paragraph 9.6.74 that as part of the mitigation for the EMG2 Project (covering both DCO and MCO schemes) the applicant would enter into a District level Licensing (DLL) agreement in respect of great crested newts (GCN). Table 9.2 states that a GCN DLL Impact Assessment & Conservation Payment Certificate (IAPC) was secured (Reference: DLL-ENQ-LEIC 00056-1). References are also made to letters of no impediment for bats and badgers in doc ref: DCO5.2 Consents and other licences required under other legislation.	The applicant is requested to provide a copy of the GCN DLL IAPC. The applicant is also requested to submit copies of any LONIs obtained in respect of bats and badgers to the examination.
<u>Landscape and visual effects</u>		

	Issue	Potential Resolution
35.	Lack of site sections and night-time photomontages	(i) Provide wire diagrams of the buildings and other structures on site sections. (ii) Provide appropriate night-time photomontages.
<u>Disclaimers</u>		
36.	Disclaimers appear in documents such as: Energy Report, GHG Assessment, Climate Change and Cultural Heritage appendices. These disclaimers contain language around liability, verification, and use of the report. While they are legally protective, they may come across as overly cautious and could obscure accountability, particularly in the context of the Examination process.	Ensure that this issue is addressed, either by removing the disclaimers or ensuring that the documents can be relied upon for the purposes of the examination.
<u>Design and parameters</u>		
37.	Various datums are shown on the drawings, which may be based on Ordnance Survey given the ground levels. However, on drawing EMG2-CH-SBR-BR-DR-CB-00024 Rev P2 (A453 Bridge Plan) it states: "All levels & Coordination are in metres relative to Project Grid". The Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure (APFP) regulation 5(2) indicates drawings should show "by reference to Ordnance Survey or Chart datum". It is not clear therefore whether it is OS or some other datum, and if some other, the base point where and what that is	Ensure a consistent, defined, datum is used across the application documentation.
38.	The dDCO and the Application Form refer to the document as the "Community Park Plan". However, the submitted document is titled "Community Park Layout Plan"	Ensure a consistent terminology is used across the application documentation.

	Issue	Potential Resolution
39.	Reference to Limits of Deviation of 1.5m upwards or downwards but no level given where this should be taken from	Ensure that the 'base' level is defined and used consistently across the application documentation.
40.	Page 67 of the Design Statement shows how car park landscaping strips may look. However, the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan and other similar plans shows parking without such landscaping. The principle of car parking of being in a green area is also referred to on page 70. In making this reconciliation, as the applicant has elsewhere committed to meeting the relevant parking standards, it should therefore be demonstrated that sufficient landscaping and parking can be made available for the quantum of development proposed within the overall individual plot layout on the illustrative drawings.	Ensure that the Design Statement and the Illustrative drawings/ parameters plans are consistent and meet the commitments relied upon.
<u>Construction Hours</u>		
41.	Table 7.5 in Chapter 7 of the ES indicates construction work core hours on Saturday of 07:00 to 13:00. However, dDCO requirement 19 and the lighting assessment states 07:00 to 16:00 hours on Saturdays. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (in the CEMP) has it as 07:00 to 15:00 hours (para 4.5).	Ensure all construction hours are reconciled, and assessment undertaken based on that unified basis.
<u>Ground conditions</u>		
42.	Paragraph 14.5.40 of Chapter 14 of the ES refers to Appendix 14E. This would appear to be a typographic error	Ensure that these matters are clarified.

	Issue	Potential Resolution
	for Appendix 14F. Assuming that this is Appendix 14F, there is reference to Appendix 2, Historical mapping. It would also appear that the Appendix 2 front sheet has been inserted in the incorrect location, in the middle of Appendix 1.	
<u>Habitats Regulations Assessment (combines both DCO and MCO)</u>		
43.	There are errors in the paragraph numbering in the report (not all paragraphs are numbered, some paragraphs have more than one).	For ease of reference, provide a document with the correct paragraph numbers applied.

MCO ISSUES

The applicant is advised to check and confirm/ amend matters raised in relation to the DCO that also could affect the MCO application.

<u>Landscape and visual effects</u>		
1.	The Visual Effects Table at R15 (Receptors Kegworth) notes that the higher parts of the gantry cranes will be visible albeit these will be sited at a lower level than the development on Plot 16. The Plot 16 building will sit relatively lower than the existing EMG1 buildings with its maximum roof height broadly comparable to the existing roof height of the mounding to the west. The MCO Explanatory Memorandum notes at 2.10 that details over and above those shown on the Parameters Plan, including, for example, the precise location and height	Ensure that these matters are clarified.

	of buildings within Plot 16 are to be approved (by the LPA) following the grant of the MCO.	
2.	The extent of the Photovoltaics proposed for the MCO are not provided in the MCO ES	Confirm details and ensure relevant assessments, including CEA, are update where necessary.
3.	The description of the proposed development for the MCO does not confirm whether new train movements are proposed	
<u>Flood risk assessment</u>		
4.	It is not clear whether the LLFA and/ or EA has commented on the SuDS strategy or long term maintenance and management.	Review and clarify.

APPENDIX 2

AMENDED DOCUMENTS

The table below lists all the DCO Application documents and identifies any amendments made to them in response to the S51 Advice or in consequence of the resubmission.

Reference	Document	Amendments
Application forms		
DCO 1.1	Application Form	Updated for resubmission.
DCO 1.2	Covering letter	Updated for resubmission.
DCO 1.3	Guide to the Application	• New paragraph 1.9 to introduce this document - Updates to Application Documentation (Document DCO 1.7). • Updates to the Table at paragraph 2.1 to include amendments to the description of development proposals consistent with amendments to Chapter 3 Project Description of the Environmental Statement (Document DCO 6.3). • Updates to paragraph 3.10 to clarify the Works Nos which are of national significance pursuant the Section 35 Direction, a highways NSIP and associated development for the purposes of the Planning Act 2008. • New paragraph 5.5.7 to explain this 'Updates to Application Documentation' (Document DCO 1.7). • Appendix A - Inserted a new definition of 'Further Works'.
DCO 1.4	Copies of newspaper notices	No amendments.

DCO 1.5	Pre-Application Programme Document	No amendments.
DCO 1.6	Section 55 Checklist	Updated for resubmission.
Plans, drawings and sections		
DCO 2.1	Location Plan (Order Limits)	No amendments.
DCO 2.1	Location Plan (Order Limits) Low Resolution	No amendments.
DCO 2.2	Land Plan Key Plan Sheet 1 of 1	No amendments.
DCO 2.2A	Land Plan Sheet 1 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 2.2B	Land Plan Sheet 2 of 4	Amended to enlarge Inset 2A to improve its readability.
DCO 2.2C	Land Plan Sheet 3 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 2.2D	Land Plan Sheet 4 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 2.3	Works Plans Key Plan	Note 2 amended to remove erroneous reference to Works No. 6 as having limits of deviation.
DCO 2.3A	Works Plans Sheet 1 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 2.3B	Works Plans Sheet 2 of 4	Note 2 amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
DCO 2.3C	Works Plans Sheet 3 of 4	Note 2 amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
DCO 2.3D	Works Plans Sheet 4 of 4	Note 2 amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
DCO 2.4	Access and Rights of Way Plans Key Plan	No amendments.

DCO 2.4A	Access and Rights of Way Plans Sheet 1 of 2	No amendments.
DCO 2.4B	Access and Rights of Way Plans Sheet 2 of 2	No amendments.
DCO 2.5	Parameters Plan	New revision including the following changes: • Amended title to clarify that the Parameters Plan relates to the EMG2 Works only. • A new location plan showing the Order limits. • A new inset to show the area for the substation (Work No. 20). • Addition of figures for limits of deviation for the new internal estate road. • Addition of figures for limits of deviation for the landscape corridor between development zones. • Amended legend to include a table showing the parameters for the bus terminal and office within zone 6, the HGV parking and amenity building within zone 7 and the substation (including number of units, maximum amount of floorspace, finished floor level and maximum ridge height).
DCO 2.6	Illustrative Landscape Masterplan – EMG2 Works	Updated to show landscaping within the proposed car parking where appropriate within the EMG2 Main Site to align it with the Design Approach Document (Document DCO 5.3).
DCO 2.7	Components Plan	Title of plan changed from "Components of the Proposed Development" to "Components Plan" (Document DCO 2.7).
DCO 2.8	Highways Plans General Arrangement Key Plan	No amendments.

DCO 2.8A	Highways Plans General Arrangement Sheet 1 of 4	- Note 1 reference to levels removed as no levels are shown on these plans. - Note 5 added to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - List of Works Nos. relevant to the works shown on each highway plans general arrangement sheet added.
DCO 2.8B	Highways Plans General Arrangement Sheet 2 of 4	- Note 1 reference to levels removed as no levels are shown on these plans. - Note 5 added to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - List of Works Nos. relevant to the works shown on each highway plans general arrangement sheet added.
DCO 2.8C	Highways Plans General Arrangement Sheet 3 of 4	- Note 1 reference to levels removed as no levels are shown on these plans. - Note 5 added to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - List of Works Nos. relevant to the works shown on each highway plans general arrangement sheet added.
DCO 2.8D	Highways Plans General Arrangement Sheet 4 of 4	- Note 1 reference to levels removed as no levels are shown on these plans. - Note 5 added to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - List of Works Nos. relevant to the works shown on each highway plans general arrangement sheet added.
DCO 2.9A	Highway Plans Cross Sections Sheet 1 of 3	- Note 1 level datum amended to refer to ordnance datum. - Note 3 amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
DCO 2.9B	Highway Plans Cross Sections Sheet 2 of 3	Note 1 level datum amended to refer to ordnance datum.

		Note 3 amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
DCO 2.9C	Highway Plans Cross Sections Sheet 3 of 3	- Note 1 level datum amended to refer to ordnance datum. - Note 3 amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
DCO 2.10A	Highway Plans Long Sections Sheet 1 M1 NB to A50 WB Interchange Link	- Notes 1 - 3 and 6 removed and other notes renumbered. - Note 4 (now note 1) amended to refer to ordnance datum. - Note 7 (now note 3) amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - Each long section now has a box stating which Works No. the long section applies to. - Where multiple Works Nos. are shown on a single long section then the Works No. boundary is annotated on the long section.
DCO 2.10B	Highway Plans Long Sections Sheet 2 A50 EB to M1 J24 Interchange Link	- Notes 1 - 3 and 6 removed and other notes renumbered. - Note 4 (now note 1) amended to refer to ordnance datum. - Note 7 (now note 3) amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - Each long section now has a box stating which Works No. the long section applies to. - Where multiple Works Nos. are shown on a single long section then the Works No. boundary is annotated on the long section.
DCO 2.10C	Highway Plans Long Sections Sheet 3 Active Travel Link L57 Footpath Upgrade and EMG2 Access	- Notes 1 - 3 and 6 removed and other notes renumbered. - Note 4 (now note 1) amended to refer to ordnance datum.

		- Note 7 (now note 3) amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - Each long section now has a box stating which Works No. the long section applies to. - Where multiple Works Nos. are shown on a single long section then the Works No. boundary is annotated on the long section.
DCO 2.10D	Highway Plans Long Sections Sheet 4 Hyams Lane	- Notes 1 - 3 and 6 removed and other notes renumbered. - Note 4 (now note 1) amended to refer to ordnance datum. - Note 7 (now note 3) amended to cross-reference Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). - Each long section now has a box stating which Works No. the long section applies to. - Where multiple Works Nos. are shown on a single long section then the Works No. boundary is annotated on the long section.
DCO 2.11	A453 Bridge Plan	Level datum amended to refer to ordnance datum.
DCO 2.12	Highway Classification Plan	No amendments.
DCO 2.13	Traffic Regulation Plan	No amendments.
DCO 2.14	Speed Limit Plan	No amendments.
DCO 2.15	Special Category Land Plan Sheet 1 of 1	No amendments.
DCO 2.16	Community Park Plan	Renamed 'Community Park Plan' omitting the word 'Layout'.
Draft DCO		

DCO 3.1	Draft DCO	• New definition of "highway plans long sections" included at article 2(1). • Article 4 (parameters of authorised development) amended to provide more details of the proposed parameters / limits of deviation. • Works descriptions in Schedule 1 (authorised development) updated. • Amending Requirement 19 to remove reference to demolition within the main site as no demolition is proposed within the main site. • Updating the plan numbers in Schedule 16 (certification of plans and documents) and providing for the highway plans long sections to be certified plans.
DCO 3.2	Draft Explanatory Memorandum relating to DCO	• Table at paragraph 1.4 (description of the EMG2 Project) updated to align with the Environmental Statement. • Paragraph 1.10 amended to clarify the statutory basis on which the DCO Application is made for the various works. • Paragraph 1.18 amended to better describe the associated development. • Paragraph 2.6 amended to clarify that the Rochdale Envelope approach has been followed for the EMG2 Works. • Paragraph 2.7.11 added to including reference to Works No. 20 (upgrade to the substation). • A new paragraph 2.8 has been inserted to reference the development parameters schedule in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3). • Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.6 has been amended to clarify the parameters of the various components of the development. • Paragraph 4.2.8 has been amended to update the names of certain plans.

		- Paragraph 5.14 amended to clarify the parameters of the various components of the development. - Paragraph 5.89 amended to clarify the scope of the Further Works.
DCO 3.3	DCO Validation Report	New report to confirm that the revised draft DCO has been validated.
Compulsory acquisition information		
DCO 4.1	Statement of Reasons	- Table at paragraph 1.4 (description of the EMG2 Project) updated to align with the Environmental Statement. - Paragraph 1.6 clarified to confirm that part of the Highway Works are an NSIP in their own right pursuant to section 22 of the PA 2008. - Paragraph 2.5 amended to insert a new definition of 'Further Works'. - Paragraph 4.6 amended to expand on the steps taken to identify the owners of unregistered land in unknown ownership.
DCO 4.2	Funding Statement	- Table at paragraph 1.4 (description of the EMG2 Project) updated to align with the Environmental Statement. - Paragraph 1.6 clarified to confirm that part of the Highway Works comprising Works Nos. 8 to 12 are an NSIP in their own right pursuant to section 22 of the PA 2008.
DCO 4.3	Book of Reference	- Table at paragraph 1.4 (description of the EMG2 Project) updated to align with the Environmental Statement. - Paragraph 1.6 clarified to confirm that part of the Highway Works comprising Works Nos. 8 to 12 are an NSIP in their own right pursuant to section 22 of the PA 2008. - Parts 1 to 5 of the Book of Reference have also been updated to reflect any changes in land ownership since 28 August 2025.

DCO 4.4	Pre-application Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker	Updated to reflect further engagement which has taken place with Hotel East Midlands Limited and Prologis since 28 August 2025.
Reports and statements		
DCO 5.1	Consultation Report	• Tables 1 and 4 (EMG Project Components) updated to align with the Environmental Statement. • Paragraph 1.28 amended to insert a new definition of 'Further Works'.
DCO 5.1A	Consultation Report Appendices 1 to 17	No amendments.
DCO 5.1B	Consultation Report Appendix 18 Part 1 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 5.1B	Consultation Report Appendix 18 Part 2 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 5.1B	Consultation Report Appendix 18 Part 3 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 5.1B	Consultation Report Appendix 18 Part 4 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 5.1C	Consultation Report Appendix 19 Part 1 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 5.1C	Consultation Report Appendix 19 Part 2 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 5.1C	Consultation Report Appendix 19 Part 3 of 4	No amendments.

DCO 5.1C	Consultation Report Appendix 19 Part 4 of 4	No amendments.
DCO 5.1D	Consultation Report Appendix 20 to 31	No amendments.
DCO 5.2	Consents and Licences Required under other legislation	- Paragraph 1.4, description of the EMG2 Project, amended to align with Chapter 3 Project Description of the Environmental Statement (Document DCO 6.3). - Minor amendments to paragraph 1.8 to confirm that part of the Highway Works are a NSIP pursuant to section 22 of the PA 2008.
DCO 5.3	Design Approach Document	- Minor amendments to the wording of paragraphs 4.17 and 4.18 to align with Chapter 3 Project Description of the Environmental Statement (Document DCO 6.3). - Replacement of the plans on pages 28 and 35 to incorporate the latest versions of the Parameters Plan (Document DCO 2.5) and the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan – EMG2 Works (Document DCO 2.6). - Replacement of the extract from the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan – EMG2 Works (Document DCO 2.6) on page 34 to incorporate the latest version.
DCO 5.3A	Appendix 1 – Highway Design Approach	No amendments.
DCO 5.4	Planning Statement	- Description of development amended to align with Chapter 3 Project Description of the Environmental Statement (Document DCO 6.3). - References to parameters and addition of clarity regarding the 'Rochdale envelope' approach, including changes to Table 3.1 relating to parameters. - Clarity regarding PV solar energy capacity proposed (and confirmation this is not an NSIP) (paragraphs 3.16 and 3.43).

		• Additional details relating to description of the 'cut and fill' earthworks (paragraph 3.22). • Clarity regarding the substation upgrade – description and location of works (paragraph 3.28). • Changes to some document references including relating to the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) and where parameters are defined, including relating to 'further works' (paragraph 3.33). • Additional text relating to flood-risk sequential test to reflect recent updated national guidance (paragraphs 5.1.93 - 94). • Amended Appendix 5 (Sequential Test) to update Table 1 (EMG2 Project Components) to align with Chapter 3 Project Description of the Environmental Statement (Document DCO 6.3).
DCO 5.5	Industrial and Logistics Need Assessment	No amendments.
DCO 5.6	Statutory Nuisance Statement	Paragraph 1.4, description of the EMG2 Project, amended to align with Chapter 3 Project Description of the Environmental Statement (Document DCO 6.3).
DCO 5.7	Potential Main Issues for Examination	No amendments.
DCO 5.8	Commitment Register	Commitment MAD1 replaced with commitments MAD1 to MAD5 and MAD2 renumbered to MAD6 to confirm the commitments proposed in respect of the safeguarding of East Midlands Airport.
Environmental statement chapters		
DCO 6.1	Chapter 1 – Introduction	• Contents page inserted and footer updated.

		• Updates to Table 1.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Update to Table 1.2 to include the additional definition of 'Further Works' from the Glossary (Document DCO 6.1A / MCO 6.1A).
DCO 6.2	Chapter 2 – Site and Surroundings	Contents page inserted and footer updated.
DCO 6.3	Chapter 3 – Project Description	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Updates to Table 3.1 to include amendments to description of development and refer to Further Works. • Section 3.1: Introduction, amended to introduce new Parameters Schedule and Table 3.5 with limits of deviation. Appropriate cross referencing to Parameters Schedule added to Chapter 3 and other chapters of the ES. • New Paragraph 3.1.7 inserted to introduce the new Parameters Schedule at Table 3.5 for the EMG2 Works and Highways Works. • New Paragraph 3.1.8 inserted to ensure appropriate cross referencing to the parameters for the MCO Application. • Paragraph 3.2.7 applies to the EMG2 Works and has been updated to cross refer to the Parameters Schedule in Table 3.5. • Paragraph 3.2.8 and Table 3.2 introduce the EMG2 Works Development Schedule and have been updated for clarity to present the parameters for the Bus Terminal, HGV parking and substation in tabular form. This amendment is also shown on the Parameters Plan for the DCO (Document DCO 2.5). • Paragraph 3.2.14 has been updated to clearly set out the generating capacity of PVs for the DCO and confirm this is below the NSIP threshold. Additional justification has been

		included for the proposed use of PV with cross-references to other documents as appropriate. • Further detail on the substation has been added to paragraph 3.2.24 with appropriate cross referencing to the Parameters Plan (Document DCO 2.5). • Paragraph 3.2.25 has been streamlined and a new paragraph 3.2.26 included to clarify that Highway Works will be carried out in accordance with the Parameters Schedule in Table 3.5 with appropriate cross referencing to supporting plans and documents. • New paragraph 3.2.29 added to clarify the 'Further Works' applied for and how such works have been assessed within the parameters for the EMG2 Works and Highways Works. • New paragraph 3.2.35 inserted to reflect the clarification on the cut and fill strategy included in Chapter 14 and Appendix 14M (Document DCO 6.14M / MCO 6.14M). • Additional detail added to paragraph 3.2.41 to clarify piling assumptions included in the assessment. • New paragraph 3.3.6 added to set out PV proposals for Plot 16 forming part of the MCO Application. • Clarification included at paragraph 3.3.8 that development will not increase the capacity of the SRFI in terms of train movements.
DCO 6.4	Chapter 4 – Alternatives	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Updates to Table 4.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments.
DCO 6.5	Chapter 5 – Socio-economic	• Contents page inserted and footer updated.

		• Paragraph 5.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 5.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Minor updates to paragraphs 5.5.84, 5.5.107, 5.5.113, 5.5.119, 5.5.121, 5.5.131, 5.5.138, 5.5.139, 5.6.18, 5.6.39, 5.6.43, 5.6.49, 5.6.60, 5.6.63, 5.6.64, 5.7.21, 5.7.44, 5.7.50, 5.7.56, 5.7.68, 5.7.71, 5.7.72, 5.8.6, 5.8.10, 5.8.14, 5.8.15, 5.8.16, 5.9.5, 5.9.6, 5.9.7, 5.9.8, 5.9.9 to clarify the sensitivity, magnitude and significance of effects. • Paragraphs 5.5.138, 5.7.71 and 5.9.1 updated to state that 'moderate minor beneficial' effects identified are not significant in EIA terms.
DCO 6.6	Chapter 6 – Traffic and Transport	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 6.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 6.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Table 6.6 and paragraph 6.6.9 amended to correct erroneous names for Links 6 and 9. • Paragraph 6.6.10 amended to refer to where the locations of all 175 Links in the core residual and cumulative scenarios are shown. • Table 6.7 amended to correct erroneous names for Links 6 and 9. • Paragraph 6.6.15 amended to correct name of Link 6. • Paragraphs 6.6.18, 6.6.26, 6.6.29, 6.6.33, 6.6.35 and 6.6.45 amended to refer to the correct location of Link 6.

		• Paragraph 6.6.46 amended to refer to the correct location of Link 9. • Paragraph 6.8.2 amended to add reference to where the links referred to in Table 6.9 for the residual scenario are shown. • Table 6.9 amended to correct erroneous names for Links 6 and 9. • Paragraph 6.8.6 amended to delete legacy wording no longer applicable. • Paragraph 6.10.1 amended to add reference to where the links referred to in Table 6.14 for the cumulative scenario are shown. • Table 6.14 amended to correct erroneous names for Links 6 and 9.
DCO 6.7	Chapter 7 – Noise and Vibration	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 7.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 7.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Updates to paragraph 7.2.10 to refer to latest construction programme and inclusion of further information on ‘timeslices’ within this paragraph and Appendix 7B (Document DCO 6.7B / MCO 6.7B). • Amendments to Table 7.5 to clarify assessed Saturday core construction hours (7am-4pm). • Updated construction programme and inclusion of piling activity/plant within Highway Works No. 9 has resulted in amendments to ‘timeslices’ with consequential changes to predictions of construction noise set out at Table 7.17, Table 7.26 and Table 7.31. • Additional text included on the assessment of vibration from piling at paragraph 7.5.27.

DCO 6.8	Chapter 8 – Air Quality	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 8.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 8.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments.
DCO 6.9	Chapter 9 – Ecology and Biodiversity	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 9.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 9.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • New paragraph 9.2.13 inserted to further clarify that extent of the ecological Study Area. • Chapter updated to address additional comments received from Natural England in August 2025 and clarify the impacts on: • Designated Sites: see Tables 9.4, 9.17, 9.18, 9.33 and 9.35; and paragraphs 9.5.67-9.5.69, 9.5.90-9.5.102, 9.7.19-9.7.21, 9.7.44-9.7.56 and 9.9.3. • Other Sites: see paragraphs 9.5.111-117, 9.7.66-72. • Semi-Natural Habitats: see Table 9.15 and 9.31. • New paragraph 9.8.4 inserted to clarify the approach to assessment of cumulative effects.
DCO 6.10	Chapter 10 – Landscape and Visual	• Contents page inserted and footer updated.

		• Paragraph 10.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 10.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Minor changes to paragraph 10.2.12 to reconcile methodology in Chapter with the methodology in Appendix 10A (Document DCO 6.10A / MCO 6.10A) with regard to duration of effects. • Changes to paragraphs 10.5.190 to clarify assessment of photovoltaics for the DCO Application. • Changes to paragraphs 10.6.88 – 10.6.92 to clarify assessment of photovoltaics for the MCO Application. • Updating of paragraph 10.9.7 to clarify the assessment of visual effects and Table 10.5. • Paragraph 10.9.8 updated to clarify the significance of effects for the EMG2 Project. • New paragraphs 10.9.19 and 10.9.20 to confirm the conclusions within the Chapter for the EMG2 Project and cumulative projects.
DCO 6.11	Chapter 11 – Lighting	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 11.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 11.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments.
DCO 6.12	Chapter 12 – Cultural Heritage	• Contents page inserted and footer updated.

		• Paragraph 12.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 12.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • New paragraphs 12.2.16 to 12.2.19 and Tables 12.4 and 12.5 to improve clarity regarding the assessment of significance of effect. Corresponding updated references to significance of effect in Sections 12.5, 12.6, 12.8 and Tables 12.8, 12.10, 12.11 and 12.12 to consistently demonstrate application of topic specific methodology. • Paragraphs 12.7.3 to 12.7.5 updated to clarify that the assessment of the EMG2 Project does not result in additional impacts or require additional mitigation.
DCO 6.13	Chapter 13 – Flood Risk and Drainage	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 13.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 13.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Updates to the list of appendices at paragraph 13.1.5 to reflect the consolidation of Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) into a single document (Document DCO 6.13G / MCO 6.13G). • Table 13.2 updated to clarify the Applicant's response to National Highways' comments. • Table 13.3 amended to include the latest updated position from LLFA • Paragraph 13.2.13 updated to improve cross referencing to appendices. • Table 13.8 expanded to provide additional clarity for screening out the works to extend the existing sub-station.

		• Paragraph 13.3.11 updated to refer to guidance on flood risk and coastal change issued in September 2025. • Paragraphs 13.3.29 to 13.3.32 deleted to remove reference to obsolete guidance. • Paragraph 13.5.99 amended to clarify assessment of downstream impacts. • Paragraphs 13.5.153 and 13.6.61 updated to improve cross referencing to Chapter 14: Ground Conditions. • Paragraph 13.6.25 updated to clarify approach to surface water drainage for the MCO Application. • The Flood Risk Assessment for each component of the EMG2 Project has been combined and consolidated into a single FRA at Appendix 13G (Document MCO 6.13G / MCO 6.13G). All subsequent appendices have been renumbered and cross references updated accordingly. • Due to the geographical distribution of works, the FRA assessment is still split into 3 broad areas which are discussed across section 3, 4 and 5 of the FRA. Figure 1.2 in the FRA identifies the area covered by each section, demonstrating that all areas have been captured in the assessment. • Flood Zone classification (Flood Zone 1) and vulnerability (essential infrastructure) of the substation has been clarified. • A statement has been added confirming that the full area for the substation works within Works No. 20 has been assessed within the FRA. • FRA expressly references the substation and cross references Table 13.8 in the Chapter which provides more clarity on the substation works. • A concluding statement has been added to the end of the single FRA summarising the impact of the EMG2 project as a whole.
--	--	--

		Reference to the recent 2025 Planning Practice Guidance update added.
DCO 6.14	Chapter 14 – Ground Conditions	- Contents page inserted and footer updated. - Paragraph 14.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. - Updates to Table 14.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. - Paragraph 14.5.92 amended to ensure consistency with Figure 5 of Appendix 14M (Document DCO 6.14M / MCO 6.14M). - Paragraph 14.5.7 updated to respond to a late issue raised by EA with regard to consideration of PFAS (Per- ad Polyfluoroalkyl Substances) as a potential off-site source of contamination within the vicinity of the EMG2 Works. - There is no typographic error at (former) paragraph 14.5.40. It refers to the correct Appendix 14E (Document DCO 6.14E / MCO 6.14E). Appropriate clarification has been provided at paragraphs 14.5.41 and 14.5.60. - New paragraph 14.5.83 inserted and paragraph 14.5.95 and Table 14.16 updated to clarify the assessment of construction piling. - Paragraph 14.5.93 amended to record updated cut and fill calculations.
DCO 6.15	Chapter 15 – Agriculture and Soils	- Contents page inserted and footer updated. - Paragraph 15.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. - Updates to Table 15.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments.

		Paragraph 15.2.5 moved to 15.2.2 to provide increased clarity of chapter methodology.
DCO 6.16	Chapter 16 – Utilities	- Contents page inserted and footer updated. - Paragraph 16.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. - Updates to Table 16.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. - Minor changes to paragraph 16.1.4 and Tables 16.5, 16.6, 16.7, 16.8 and 16.9 to remove reference to neutral and replaced with negligible for clarity.
DCO 6.17	Chapter 17 – Population and Human Health	- Contents page inserted and footer updated. - Paragraph 17.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. - Updates to Table 17.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. - Paragraph 17.2.17 updated to clarify sensitivity classification.
DCO 6.18	Chapter 18 – Materials and Waste	- Contents page inserted and footer updated. - Paragraph 18.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. - Updates to Table 18.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. - Sources of waste in paragraph 18.2.24 updated.
DCO 6.19	Chapter 19 – Climate Change	Contents page inserted and footer updated.

		• Paragraph 19.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 19.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Cross reference added within Table 19.3 to Chapter 13 to clarify that this chapter responds to comments made by National Highways. • Cross-reference added to national and local policy at paragraph 19.5.22 and within Section 19.10: References to highlight policy context and justification for inclusion of PVs. • Paragraph 19.5.67 updated to clarify PV generation capacity and cross-reference added to updated Energy Report at Appendix 19D (Document DCO 6.19D / MCO 6.19D). • New paragraph 19.6.33 to clarify generating capacity of PVs to be installed at Plot 16 and to cross-reference updated Energy Report at Appendix 19D (Document DCO 6.19D / MCO 6.19D). • The calculations in Tables 19.7, 19.8, 19.12, 19.16, 19.17, 19.19, 19.20, 19.21, 19.22, 19.23, 19.24, 19.25, 19.26, 19.27 and 19.28 and paragraphs 19.5.123, 19.5.39, 19.5.61, 19.6.20, 19.6.29, 19.6.42, 19.6.50, 19.6.51, 19.7.11, 19.7.16, 19.7.24, 19.7.32 have been updated in line with the revised Energy Report at Appendix 19D (Document DCO 6.19D / MCO 6.19D).
DCO 6.20	Chapter 20 – Major Accidents and Disasters	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 20.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 20.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Paragraphs 20.2.33 and 20.9.1 updated to clarify methodology of assessment.

DCO 6.21	Chapter 21 – Cumulative Impacts	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Paragraph 21.1.1 amended to cross refer to Chapter 3 Project Description and development parameters set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3. • Updates to Table 21.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Paragraph 21.1.4 updated to include Figure of study area and short/long-listed sites previously included within Appendix 21A, but now separated out as Appendix 21C. Further explanation added to the chapter at paragraph 21.4.5 and new Table 21.5 inserted.
DCO 6.22	Chapter 22 – Summary and Conclusions	• Contents page inserted and footer updated. • Updates to Table 22.1 to include amendments to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments. • Minor updates throughout for consistency with amended ES Chapters.
DCO 6.23	Non-Technical Summary	Minor updates throughout for consistency with amended ES Chapters.
Environmental statement appendices		
DCO 6.1A	Appendix A – Glossary	Inserted a new definition of 'Further Works'.
DCO 6.1B	Appendix B – Section 35 Direction	No amendments.
DCO 6.1C	Appendix C – Applicant's Scoping Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.1D	Appendix D – PINS Scoping Opinion	No amendments.

DCO 6.1E	Appendix E – Project Team	No amendments.
DCO 6.3A	Appendix A – CEMP (DCO only)	No amendments.
DCO 6.4A	Appendix A – Location of Alternative Sites	No amendments.
DCO 6.5A	Appendix A – Industrial and Logistics Need Assessment	No amendments.
DCO 6.6A	Appendix A – Transport Assessment Part 1 of 4	• Paragraph 1.2 and Table 9 - amendment to description of development proposals consistent with Chapter 3 amendments • Paragraph 6.8 has additional text inserted to clarify references to directional flows on the geometric design drawings • Paragraph 8.25 amended to add reference to a plan showing the location of traffic counters • Table 25 and Table 26 – heading of first column corrected to refer to Time Periods • Paragraph 8.35 has explanatory words added and refers to the new Figure 20A • Figure 20A has been inserted to show the Development Trip Distribution Routes referred to in Table 28 • Paragraph 8.39 has been amended to explicitly cross refer to the plans contained in Appendix 44 and also clarifies how ‘EB’ and WB’ should be interpreted in Table 29 • Paragraph 8.41 amended to cross refer to the new Figure 20A • Paragraph 10.2 added to clarify the role of direction markers in the junction models

		• Paragraph 10.9 and Table 44 – corrections made to refer to a single roundabout junction with cross reference to new plan in Appendix 61. • Paragraph 12.7 amended to refer to expanded Appendix 70 which now includes higher scale plans of links • Paragraph 13.55 and Table 70 amended to refer to a single roundabout junction and Paragraph 13.55 also cross refers to a plan showing the location of the roundabout junction • Appendix 61 – contains a new plan identifying the location of the roundabout referred to in Paragraphs 10.9 and 13.55 • Appendix 70 – more detailed extracts from the Stage 2A Report have been provided by Aecom and added to Appendix 70.
DCO 6.6A	Appendix A – Transport Assessment Part 2 of 4	As above.
DCO 6.6A	Appendix A – Transport Assessment Part 3 of 4	As above.
DCO 6.6A	Appendix A – Transport Assessment Part 4 of 4	As above.
DCO 6.6B	Appendix B – Sustainable Transport Strategy	No amendments.
DCO 6.6C	Appendix C – Framework Travel Plan	No amendments.

DCO 6.6D	Appendix D – ES Chapter Study Area Figure core assessment	- Plans amended to identify links 20, 54 and 28 more easily - Plans added to show sections of the network at a higher scale
DCO 6.6E	Appendix E – 2028 EMFM vc ratio plot figures (core assessment)	No amendments.
DCO 6.6F	Appendix F - 2028 EMFM vc ratio plot figures (residual assessment)	No amendments.
DCO 6.7A	Appendix A – Glossary of Noise and Vibration Terms	Renamed 'Glossary of Noise and Vibration Terms'
DCO 6.7B	Appendix B – Construction Data	No amendments.
DCO 6.7C	Appendix C – Operational Data	No amendments.
DCO 6.7D	Appendix D – Receptor Plans	No amendments.
DCO 6.7E	Appendix E – Monitoring Plans	No amendments.
DCO 6.7F	Appendix F – Monitoring Equipment	No amendments.
DCO 6.7G	Appendix G – Monitoring Results and Weather Data	No amendments.
DCO 6.8A	Appendix A – Model Verification	No amendments.
DCO 6.8B	Appendix B – Dust Risk Assessment Methodology	No amendments.

DCO 6.8C	Appendix C – Modelled Human Receptor Locations	No amendments.
DCO 6.8D	Appendix D – Modelled Ecological Receptor Locations	No amendments.
DCO 6.8E	Appendix E – Diffusion Tube Monitoring Programme	No amendments.
DCO 6.8F	Appendix F – Traffic Data	No amendments.
DCO 6.8G	Appendix G – Human Receptor Concentrations and Impacts	No amendments.
DCO 6.8H	Appendix H – Ecological Receptor Impacts	No amendments.
DCO 6.8I	Appendix I – Mitigation	No amendments.
DCO 6.9A	Appendix A – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal	No amendments.
DCO 6.9B	Appendix B – Confidential Badger Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.9C	Appendix C - Bat Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.9D	Appendix D – Bird Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.9E	Appendix E - Invertebrate Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.9F	Appendix F – Otter and Water Vole Report	No amendments.

DCO 6.9G	Appendix G - Reptile Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.9H	Appendix H - Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment sHRA	No amendments other than minor amendments to formatting.
DCO 6.9I	Appendix I – Biodiversity Net Gain Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.9J	Appendix J – Landscape and Ecological Management Plan LEMP	No amendments.
DCO 6.9K	Appendix K – Bird Strike Hazard Management Plan	No amendments.
DCO 6.9L	Appendix L – Protected Species Licences and LONIs	A new appendix providing protected species licences and letters of no impediment
DCO 6.10A	Appendix A – LVIA Criteria; inc. Visualisations and ZTV Methodologies	No amendments.
DCO 6.10B	Appendix B – LVIA Figures	No amendments.
DCO 6.10C	Appendix C –Arboricultural Assessment	No amendments.
DCO 6.10D	Appendix D – Illustrative Landscape Masterplan and Cross Sections	No amendments.
DCO 6.10E	Appendix E – Landscape Effects Table	No amendments.

DCO 6.10F	Appendix F – Visual Effects Table	No amendments.
DCO 6.11A	Appendix A – Lighting Strategy	No amendments.
DCO 6.11B	Appendix B – Lighting Baseline Assessment	No amendments.
DCO 6.11C	Appendix C – Lighting Receptor Locations	No amendments.
DCO 6.11D	Appendix D – Obtrusive Light Calculation	No amendments.
DCO 6.11E	Appendix E – Highways Lighting Strategy	No amendments.
DCO 6.12A	Appendix A – Built Heritage Statement	No amendments.
DCO 6.12B	Appendix B – Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment	No amendments.
DCO 6.12C	Appendix C – Geophysical Survey Report EMG2 Main Site	No amendments.
DCO 6.12D	Appendix D – Geoarchaeological Report EMG2 Main Site	No amendments.
DCO 6.12E	Appendix E – Fieldwalking Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.12F	Appendix F – Trial Trenching Report	No amendments.

DCO 6.12G	Appendix G – Heritage Receptors	No amendments.
DCO 6.13A	Appendix A – Flood Risk and Drainage Study Area Figure	No amendments.
DCO 6.13B	Appendix B – Surface Water Bodies Figure	No amendments.
DCO 6.13C	Appendix C – EA Flood Zones Figure	No amendments.
DCO 6.13D	Appendix D – EA Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Mapping Figure	No amendments.
DCO 6.13E	Appendix E – Lockington Brook Flood Assets	No amendments.
DCO 6.13F	Appendix F – Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening	No amendments.
DCO 6.13G	Appendix G – EMG Flood Risk Assessment	Replaced in its entirety with a combined EMG2 Flood Risk Assessment (merging documents DCO 6.13G, DCO 6.13 and DCO 6.13I into one document).
DCO 6.13H	Deleted.	Deleted.
DCO 6.13I	Deleted.	Deleted.
DCO 6.13J	Appendix H – Sustainable Drainage Statement – EMG2 Main Site	Renamed as Appendix 13H.

DCO 6.13K	Appendix I – Sustainable Drainage Statement – Highway Works	Renamed as Appendix 13I.
DCO 6.13L	Appendix J – Sustainable Drainage Statement – EMG1 Works	Renamed as Appendix 13J.
DCO 6.14A	Appendix A – Geotechnical Preliminary Risk Assessment (EMG2) Part 1 of 2	No amendments.
DCO 6.14A	Appendix A – Geotechnical Preliminary Risk Assessment (EMG2) Part 2 of 2	No amendments.
DCO 6.14B	Appendix B – Fairhurst Ground Investigation Report (EMG2)	No amendments.
DCO 6.14C	Appendix C – Fairhurst Minerals Safeguarding Assessment (EMG2)	No amendments.
DCO 6.14D	Appendix D – EMG2 Technical Note: Surface Water Sampling	No amendments.
DCO 6.14E	Appendix E – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting LCC Part 1 of 3	No amendments.
DCO 6.14E	Appendix E – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting LCC Part 2 of 3	No amendments.

DCO 6.14E	Appendix E – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting LCC Part 3 of 3	No amendments.
DCO 6.14F	Appendix F – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting National Highways Part 1 of 6	No amendments.
DCO 6.14F	Appendix F – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting National Highways Part 2 of 6	No amendments.
DCO 6.14F	Appendix F – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting National Highways Part 3 of 6	No amendments.
DCO 6.14F	Appendix F – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting National Highways Part 4 of 6	No amendments.
DCO 6.14F	Appendix F – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting National Highways Part 5 of 6	No amendments.
DCO 6.14F	Appendix F – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting National Highways Part 6 of 6	No amendments.
DCO 6.14G	Appendix G – Geotechnical Statement of Intent for Works Affecting National Highways	No amendments.

DCO 6.14H	Appendix H – Addendum Minerals Safeguarding Assessment	No amendments.
DCO 6.14I	Appendix I – EMG1 Factual Ground Investigation Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.14J	Appendix J – EMG1 Factual Preliminary Ground Investigation Interpretative Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.14K	Appendix K – Minerals Scope Out Correspondence	No amendments.
DCO 6.14L	Appendix L - Mining Remediation Authority email correspondence	No amendments.
DCO 6.14M	Appendix M – Figures	Updated with piling information and reformatted to ensure the Appendices cover sheets appear correctly
DCO 6.15A	Appendix A – Soils and Agricultural Land Quality Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.15B	Appendix B - EMG2 Main Site Land Ownership Plan	No amendments.
DCO 6.15C	Appendix C – Soil Management Plan	No amendments.
DCO 6.16A	Appendix A – Utilities Assessment Report	No amendments.
DCO 6.17A	Appendix A – Informal Scoping Exercise with LCC	No amendments.

DCO 6.17B	Appendix B – Population and Human Health Baseline	No amendments.
DCO 6.17C	Appendix C – Equality Statement	No amendments.
DCO 6.17D	Appendix D – Baseline Study Area	No amendments.
DCO 6.18A	Appendix A – Leicestershire County Council Contact Log	No amendments.
DCO 6.18B	Appendix B - Technical Note Justifying the Expanded Study Area in Consultation with LCC	No amendments.
DCO 6.18C	Appendix C - Updated Technical Note in Consultation with LCC	No amendments.
DCO 6.18D	Appendix D – Expanded Study Area Plan	No amendments.
DCO 6.18E	Appendix E – Site Waste Management and Materials Plan	No amendments.
DCO 6.19A	Appendix A – Climate Change Policy Review	No amendments.
DCO 6.19B	Appendix B – Greenhouse Gas Assessment	Updated in line with updates in Energy Report (Appendix 19D).
DCO 6.19C	Appendix C – Climate Change Risk Assessment	No amendments.
DCO 6.19D	Appendix D – Energy Report	Updated to reflect revised energy efficiency measures and PV assumptions.

DCO 6.19E	Appendix E - Carbon Management Plan	Updated in line with updates in Energy Report (Appendix 19D).
DCO 6.20A	Appendix A – Major Accidents and Disasters Long List	No amendments.
DCO 6.20B	Appendix B – ES Risk Record	No amendments.
DCO 6.20C	Appendix C – Management Strategy for Safeguarding of East Midlands Airport DCO only	No amendments.
DCO 6.21A	Appendix A – Identification of other development	No amendments.
DCO 6.21B	Appendix B – Assessment Matrix	No amendments.
DCO 6.21C	Appendix C – Figure of 'other developments' considered	A new appendix providing a figure showing other developments considered.

APPENDIX 3

RESPONSE TO S51 ADVICE

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
<u>Transport Assessment</u>			
1.	Within the Transport Assessment (TA) and chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (ES) there are numerous routes/ links which are referred to. However, it is not clear the precise locations of these or the extent of the routes/ links. Examples include: • Tables 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 of the TA • Paragraph 6.6.9 of chapter 6 of the ES refers to various links, purporting to show them in a figure in Appendix 6D. However, Link 6 is said to be Long Street, Belton which is not shown. There is a link "6" in Diseworth (given there isn't a link "9" this may be upside down). The extent of link 28 also is not clear, and Link 54 (see Table 6.8) appears to be missing from Appendix 6D, and there are two links identified as 'Link 20' in the key. • Tables 6.9 and 6.14 of chapter 6 of the ES.	Provide plans based on Ordnance Survey at no greater scale than 1:10 000 showing full extent of all links referred to. This may involve redrafting documents such as chapter 6 of the ES, its appendices and the TA, to ensure all routes/ links are fully identified. Ensure tables have appropriate identifiers.	Plans have been amended and new plans added to Appendix 6D with a higher scale to ensure the location of routes is clearer. A new Figure 20A has been added to the ES Chapter 6 identifying the routes referred to. Links 6 and 9 had become transposed and this confusion has now been corrected. Link 28 is the very short length of road at the A453 exit at Junction 24 – the plan has been amended to enhance the numbering and more clearly identify the short length. Link 20 and 54 are now also clearly identified. The numbers have been added to the routes rather than using a key which it is believed aids clarity. The headings of the first column of Tables 25 and 26 have been changed.

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	Furthermore, Tables 25 and 26 of the TA have as their first column titles 'Counter location' but all are times.		
2.	Table 44 of the TA refers to the A453/ Kegworth Road dumbbell Roundabouts. This shows 3 arms to the junction. However, there are three roundabouts off this junction (even if one is to facilitate a corner).	Clarify relevant junction inputs on a plan, and ensure all inputs are resolved. It is not clear which three arms are referred to, and in any event, it would appear that traffic to and from the East Midlands Parkway station, or that to Ratcliffe on Soar has been omitted	There is only one roundabout modelled so text has been amended to remove reference to the dumbbell roundabout. The reference to more than one roundabout is a legacy error. There are several roundabouts close together and initially it was assumed the operation of all the roundabouts would require modelling. In the event it was agreed with the relevant highway authorities that, due to lack of usage only one roundabout would require modelling however this reduction was not picked up in the text. Appendix 61 of the Transport Assessment (Document DCO 6.6A Part 4 of Part 4) includes a plan showing the location of the roundabout that has been modelled.
3.	Within the TA many junctions are referred to with a direction marker at the end, for example A453(W). It is not clear whether this is the west side of the junction, or for 'westbound' traffic, that is on the east side of the junction. The implication in the TA is that it is the west side of the junction.	Clarify in text how junctions have been identified and ensure a consistent approach throughout all application documentation.	A new paragraph has been added to the Transport Assessment (Document DCO 6.6A Part 1 of Part 4) TA to explain the role of the direction markers (Paragraph 10.2).

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	However, the drawings, for example Highway Plans Cross Sections Sheet 3 of 3 refers to 'westbound'.		Similarly, text has been added at Paragraph 6.8 of the TA to explain the references on the drawings.
4.	The information in Figures 3.9, 3.10, 3.14 and 3.15 of Appendix 70 of the TA (Part 4) is not clear.	The information should be provided as standalone drawings. These should be as if, when printed out, the wider network drawings are A1 and the inset drawings A3.	These figures have been prepared by AECOM who have provided more detailed extracts of each of the figures in their Stage 2A report, which is included within Appendix 70. Text has been added at Paragraph 12.7 of the TA explaining this.
5.	Paragraph 6.8.6 states: <i>"The EMFM 2019 modelling shows that the SRN would accommodate an additional 2,067 vehicles during the peak hour periods in 2028 and 2,153 vehicles during the peak hour periods in 2038 (less in the latter because there is more traffic in the network) as a direct result of the proposed Highway Works"</i> . The latter figure (2,153) is higher than the former (2,067), and would appear to be incorrect	Ensure that information is accurate.	The text at Paragraph 6.8.6 of the TA has been amended to delete wording included in error.
<u>Energy</u>			
6.	It is not clear from the application documents whether the proposed energy generation elements would constitute a NSIP in its own right.	Set out the energy generation capacity from the proposed energy production system in Megawatts (see section 15 of the Planning Act 2008). This should define both the 20% roof area coverage and the 100% coverage. If necessary, ensure compliance with the Infrastructure Planning (Applications:	It is proposed that, initially, roof-mounted PVs will be installed to cover 20% of the roofs of buildings (with a generating capacity of 5.8 MW). The electricity generated will supply the occupiers of the buildings. The buildings will, however, be designed to have the structural

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
		Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. Once the correct energy generation capacity has been clarified that this figure should then be consistently applied to all relevant documents and/ or figures across the application documents	capacity to support 100% PV coverage of available roof space if required giving a potential electricity generation capacity of up to 29 MW across the site. In this way the buildings will be 'future-proofed' and additional roof mounted PVs can be installed should there be additional demand for renewable energy on-site. The proposed energy generation elements of the EMG2 Project, namely installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels on the roofs of buildings is consequently significantly below the 50MW capacity set out in the PA 2008 (as amended) as constituting an NSIP in its own right. The above position is set out in paragraph 3.2.14 of Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3).
7.	The question of the need for the photovoltaics is not set out in detail.	Justify the need for the photovoltaic provision within the application.	The proposed installation of PVs forms an important element in addressing the climate change impacts of the EMG2 Project and delivering a highly sustainable development. This is further outlined in the Design Approach Document (Document DCO 5.3), Planning

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
			Statement (Document DCO 5.4), and Chapter 19 of this ES (Document DCO 6.19) and associated Energy Report (Appendix 19D, Document DCO 6.19D).
<u>Environmental Statement</u>			
8.	Parameters that have been used to inform the assessment are unclear and it is difficult to understand the worst-case assessment that has been undertaken.	(i) A clear description, with reference to the units of measurement and using tables where possible, of the parameters and limits of deviation assumed for the proposed development such that a consistent worst-case scenario can be seen to have been applied to the impact assessment (ii) Cross references to all plans that show the parameters for the proposed development or inclusion of ES-specific figures (ES chapter 3 refers to the 2.5 Parameters plan, but this plan does not show all of the parameters for the proposed development). Where plans refer to parameters being either 'tightly drawn' or are 'the full extent of the works shown on this plan', the plans should be revised in line with the parameters used, any limits of deviation (LoD) and include appropriate units of measurement	(i) Full details of the parameters for the entire EMG2 Project are set out in a new Table 3.5 in Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3). Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) has been updated and aligns with the table. The Parameters Plan (Document DCO 2.5) has further been updated to more clearly set out the proposed parameters for the EMG2 Works. (ii) The plans have been reviewed and updated as indicated in Appendix 2 of this document to more clearly show and define the parameters to accord with Table 3.5, article 4 of the draft DCO and the Parameters Plan as indicated in (i) above. (iii) Table 3.5 in Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3), article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) and the Parameters Plan (Document DCO 2.5) have been updated to

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
		(iii) Confirm the parameters assumed for the substation extension (see also this matter in relation to the Flood Risk Assessment) (iv) Explain what works have been assumed for the utilities proposed (ES Chapter 16)	confirm the parameters assumed for the substation extension. (iv) A Utilities Assessment Report accompanies the DCO Application (Document DCO 6.16A). In addition, Chapters 3 and 16 of the ES (Documents DCO 6.3 and 6.16) have been updated to provide further explanation of the works proposed. The estimated capacities for the EMG2 Project, and its component parts, have been calculated based on the Parameters Plan (Document DCO 2.5) and Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Document DCO 2.6). Each statutory undertaker has provided an assessment of the anticipated reinforcement and/or upgrades to their existing network to support the connection of the EMG2 Project. Consultation has been undertaken with the incumbent statutory undertakers (electricity, gas, potable water and telecommunications) who have identified the anticipated points of connection to supply the EMG2 Project. information on the proposed substation works is further provided by the Utilities Assessment Report including information on the required underground cable route at Figure

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
			6.2.2 at Appendix 16A (Document DCO 6.16A).
9.	Information relevant to the assessment is not always presented in the ES project description. It isn't therefore clear whether information on the proposed development has been applied consistently across the ES, including but not limited to: • Information on piling at the A453 and Junction 24 of the M1 (as potential additional piling is identified on DCO plan 2.11 but it is unclear whether relevant aspect chapters have assessed this) • 'Timeslices' used in the noise assessment and assessment years • Cut/fill balance and its relationship to assumptions on construction traffic movements • The operational and construction data in appendices 6.7B and 6.7C	Amendments or improved cross referencing, ensure that all the information assumed for the assessment is accessible to understand the conclusions that have been reached.	Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3) has been updated to provide a fuller description of the EMG2 Project, including to address the issues set out in the bullet points. Similarly, other chapters within the ES have been reviewed and updated to ensure consistency.
10.	Aspect chapters do not present the conclusions in line with the given methodology, including ES chapters 5 (socio-economic), 10 (Landscape and visual) and 12 (cultural heritage). Examples of conclusions that are unclear: • A 'low' sensitive receptor for cultural heritage is defined as 'archaeological sites that score less well against the	Review and update conclusions for all aspect chapters.	All of the aspect chapters, including Chapters 5, 10 and 12, have been reviewed and updated to ensure that conclusions are in line with the stated methodology.

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	SoS's criteria'. Receptors later in the chapter considered to be low sensitivity are classed as those that are of 'local importance'. Chapter 17, population and human health is supported by baseline data in appendix 17.B although it is not easy to understand how the data presented are translated using the criteria in the chapter to reach a conclusion that the population is of low sensitivity		
<u>Energy and design</u>			
11.	There are inconsistencies in the design life and need for decommissioning of various elements of the proposed development. Paragraph 19.2.2 of chapter 19 of the Environmental Statement (ES) indicates that the decommissioning of the EMG2 project has not been assessed as it is considered to be a 'permanent development'. Paragraph 5.5.99 of Chapter 5 that in assessing the age of obsolete stock <i>"The age of obsolete stock has been assessed as either 30 or 40 years since construction or since the property was last refurbished."</i>	The design-life of the individual buildings should be set out in chapter 3 (project description), and thus whether they would, individually, be likely to be replaced. Any emissions associated with any demolitions, refurbishments and replacements should be assessed and reconciled within the document.	The reference in Paragraph 5.5.99 of Chapter 5 (now Paragraph 5.5.100) was made in relation to the potential displacement of occupiers from older stock to EMG2. It is not a reference to design life or decommissioning.
12.	The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) Schedule 1 includes a list of 'further works' without explanation of why these works are considered not to give rise to significant effects and thus have not been assessed in the ES.	Detailed assessments of matters that are unlikely to give rise to significant effects are not required. However, justification of why any further works have been scoped out of the assessment should be included with reference to information on the scale and extent of the	All the 'further works' have been considered as part of the parameters assessed in respect of the EMG2 Works and Highway Works. The 'further works' are however constrained under the terms of the

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
		works and any reference to agreement with consultation bodies.	draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) on the basis that they must not give rise to any likely significant effects beyond those assessed in the ES. If an item of work would result in likely significant effects beyond those already assessed, then it is not permitted despite appearing on the 'further works' list.
13.	The assessment of the potential photovoltaics is unclear as follows: • The glint and glare safeguarding assessment (ES appendix 20A) does not appear to consider the specifics of the proposed development and potential extent of photovoltaics in relation to glint and glare. • ES chapter 10 (landscape and visual impact) does not consider the presence of photovoltaics in its assessment.	Ensure that the proposed development is assessed in relation to appendix 20A and chapter 10 of ES and/ or provide details of where this is to be found	In relation to the first bullet point, it is not possible to undertake a full glint and glare safeguarding assessment at this time. A full assessment can only be undertaken at detailed design stage when the orientation and levels of the buildings are known. Paragraph 1 of Part 6 of Schedule 13 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) provides that EMG2 must be carried out in accordance with the management strategy for safeguarding the airport (Document DCO 6.20A) and Paragraph 5 goes on to state that the prior approval of the airport operator must be obtained before any photovoltaics are installed within EMG2. Any request for approval must be accompanied by a full solar flare assessment and detailed risk assessment. The provisions are the same as the

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
			safeguarding provisions adopted in the EMG1 DCO. In respect of the second bullet point, Chapter 10 of the ES (Document DCO 6.10) has been updated to consider the presence of photovoltaics. See Paragraphs 10.5.190, 10.6.88 and 10.6.91.
14.	Figure 5 of ES Appendix 14M states an overall cut and fill balance: 17,000m ³ deficit. However, para 14.5.91 of ES chapter 14 states that the deficit is 2,700m ³	Ensure that consistent figures are utilised throughout the Environmental Statement.	The correct figure is 17,000m ³ . Chapter 14 of the ES (Document DCO 6.14) has been amended.
<u>Piling</u>			
15.	Chapter 3, paragraph 3.2.31 (fourth bullet) indicates that piles may be used for bridge works. Chapter 7 does not assess the piling of foundations in respect of either noise or vibration	Either assess piling throughout the examination or specifically ensure piling does not form part of the development proposals.	Piling is only proposed in connection with the bridge works required as part of the Junction 24 improvements. Chapter 7 of the ES (Document DCO 6.7) has been updated at Paragraphs 7.2.10 and 7.5.27 to address the noise and vibration impacts of the proposed piling.
<u>Piling and flood risk</u>			
16.	ES chapter 14 ground conditions identifies that a foundation works risk assessment (FWRA) would be required if piling is needed for the M1 J24 highways works. It is not clear how this has been taken account of in the assessment of 'negligible' effects on controlled waters. A worst-	If piling were to be a potential option for foundations, provide an assessment of piling at all locations with reference to a worst case where details of the nature and extent of any piling are to be confirmed at a later date'.	Chapter 14 of the ES (Document DCO 6.14) has been updated and concludes that, having considered the potential contaminative risks from bored piling methods, the overall risk to controlled waters is negligible for

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	case assessment should be provided and an outline FWRA provided.		the reasons outlined within Appendix 14F to the ES, EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting National Highways (Document DCO 6.14F). A full Foundation Works Risk Assessment will follow once intrusive ground investigation in the vicinity of the proposed piles has been completed. The DCO Applicant confirms that the contamination risk to the underlying groundwater body has not been raised as an issue by the Environment Agency or the Local Lead Flood Authority.
<u>Substation</u>			
17.	The need for the substation extension is not set out in detail. Furthermore, we cannot find any details of the parameters for the substation extension. The only references to parameters for the substation extension are in response to a previous query from PINs where it says that the parameters have been 'tightly drawn', and Works Plan 2.3C (sheet 3 of 4) states that the limits of deviation for the substation are 'the full extent of the works shown on this plan' but this does not confirm height or depth of any foundations (if relevant). The parameters plan in ES chapter 3 is referred to for the DCO works, but this plan only covers the main site.	Ensure that the need for the substation is fully addressed and parameters included within the application documentation.	Further details about the substation works are set out at Paragraph 3.2.24 of Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3). It confirms that the extension to the substation will sit on a base slab. That base slab may deviate vertically by 0.5 metres above or 2.5 metres below the level of the existing substation as set out in article 4(1)(f) of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). The Parameters Plan (Document DCO 2.5) has further been updated

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
			to include an inset which shows the parameters for the substation. The DCO Applicant confirms that the Parameters Plan (Document DCO 2.5) relates only to the EMG2 Works (the EMG2 Main Site and the substation at EMG1). The parameters for the Highway Works are now specified in article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). Further details about the parameters for the entire EMG2 Project are set out in Table 3.5 of Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3).
<u>Draft Development Consent Order</u>			
18.	There is a lengthy list of 'further works' that has been included in the dDCO as works that might be needed for construction, but are stated to have not been assessed in the ES because they are not considered to give rise to any materially different environmental effects. There is no reference to these works in the ES project description to confirm what process has been undertaken to confirm this. Neither has the extent of what some of these works appear to be (ES chapter 18 states that the utilities diversions have not been designed yet, so it raises the question, if that is the case, how can they be sure that there are no significant effects arising from those works). Equally, there are other works listed in 'further works' such as demolition works	(i) Clarify whether all the 'further works' have been assessed, and if not, ensure assessment. Ensure list of 'further works' is accurate.	The DCO Applicant confirms that all the 'further works' have been assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES). The further works are required to facilitate delivery of the main works numbers but, due to the nature of the further works, it is not possible at this time to be specific about the location of the further works and consequently it is not possible to allocate them to a specific main works number or to give them their own works number. Schedule 1 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) makes it clear that the DCO will not authorise any further works which are

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	that the ES states will not be required and thus have not been assessed.		likely to give rise to any materially different environmental effects that have not been assessed in the ES or an updated ES. The DCO Applicant has reviewed the list of 'further works'. Some have been incorporated into the main works numbers. Others, such as demolition, have been limited (a gantry is to be demolished as part of the Highway Works, but no other demolition is proposed) or deleted as appropriate. Further explanation of the 'further works' has been provided in Chapter 3 Project Description of the ES (Document DCO 6.3).
<u>Flood risk assessment</u>			
19.	Information relevant to the FRA is spread across several documents – a highways works FRA screening, a main site FRA and a separate sequential test for the main site included within the Planning Statement. Further drainage strategies are provided as separate appendices to the ES chapter on flood risk.	Consolidate information for ease of reference, taking account of the additional points below on missing or unclear assessment information.	The DCO Applicant confirms that the FRA was originally split into three geographical areas for ease of reference. PINS's advice has however been considered, and the FRA has now been consolidated into one document, Appendix G to Chapter 13 of the ES (Document DCO 6.13G).

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
20.	Conclusions for the electricity substation are based on the works comprising 'improvements to existing infrastructure', whereas the dDCO describes Works Number 20 as a 'modified and extended' electricity substation. This review should also confirm the flood zone within which these works are located, together with the flood risk vulnerability category.	Clarify and provide an assessment or provide further explanation.	Works No. 20 comprise an upgrade to the existing EMG1 substation. This will include extending and modifying the substation. A more detailed description is set out in Chapter 3 of the ES (Document DCO 6.3). The existing EMG1 substation is drained via the existing EMG1 drainage system and therefore the works to the substation have been assessed having regard to this and alongside the EMG1 Works. The substation is within Flood Zone 1. A flood risk assessment of the substation is set out in section 4.9 of the EMG2 Flood Risk Assessment (Document DCO 6.13G). Its conclusions are set out in Table 4.2 of that appendix which confirm that there is a low to no flood risk.
21.	The following consultation response from the Environment Agency is reported in ES table 19.3, ES chapter 19: Climate Change <i>"However, the standards do not provide for the potential future surface outfall requirements in the context of climate change resilience. Therefore, the Applicant should consider designing new infrastructure or developments adjacent to the Strategic Road Network to avoid constraining the</i>	Ensure, or clarify, how the response to the Environment Agency is specifically addressed in the ES.	The consultation response was made by National Highways not the Environment Agency. As well as Sections 19.5 and 19.6 of Chapter 19 (Document DCO 6.19) which sets out the climate resilience mitigation measures adopted as part of the EMG2 Project, a direct response to the quoted comment is provided within Table 13.2 of Chapter 13:

No.	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	<i>construction of new above- or below- ground surface water attenuation feature."</i> In response, the climate change chapter refers to the mitigation measures adopted by the proposed development in sections 19.5 and 19.6 but these measures are high level and so it is not possible to see how this comment specifically has been addressed. The drainage strategy for highways works does not refer to whether this potential design measure has been considered.		Flood Risk and Drainage (Document DCO 6.13).
22.	No assessment of downstream flood risk across the proposed development (only presented for the main site)	Review and update the assessments.	A flood risk assessment of the entirety of the EMG2 Project has been prepared (Document DCO 6.13G). Its conclusions confirm that no component of the EMG2 Project will have a downstream impact. The Environment Agency and Local Lead Flood Authority have confirmed that they are satisfied with the conclusions.

The guidance to the Acceptance stage for NSIPs, notes that an application may only be accepted if the Secretary of State concludes that, the application (including accompaniments) is of a standard that the Inspectorate (on behalf of the SoS) considers satisfactory.

Items 23 to 45 set out a number of other issues, identified during acceptance, which could usefully be addressed in relation to any resubmission. However, the cumulative issues identified by the Inspectorate, reflects that the standard of the application to be unsatisfactory. The Applicant is advised to review the Acceptance guidance.

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
<u>Development Consent Order and Explanatory Memorandum</u>			
23.	Schedule 1 of the dDCO set out there are 2 nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIP). However, Parts 1 & 2 identify the different 'elements' of the project and splits these into Commercial and Business (Works 1 to 7) and Alterations to Existing Highway (Works 8 to 12). Paragraph 1.17 of the Explanatory Memorandum explains that works within Work Nos. 8 to 12 (Schedule 1, Part 2) are a NSIP in their own right (alterations to highway) but paragraph 1.18 explains works in Work Nos. 6 and 7 are 'associated development' (which are listed under Part 1).	Ensure drafting appropriately allocates all works. A proposal cannot be both part of an NSIP and 'associated development'. The application must be clear as to what is being applied for and must be accurately represented. The applicant is referred to s37(3)(a) of the PA2008.	The Explanatory Memorandum to the DCO (Document DCO 3.2) has been updated to align it with the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) so that it is clear which works are Commercial and Business pursuant to the Section 35 Direction, which are highway works pursuant to section 22 of the PA 2008, and which are associated development.
24.	The list of documents proposed for certification in Schedule 16 of the dDCO does not fully align with the list of "documents to be certified" as set out in the Guide to the Application. Notably, documents such as the Location Plan (Order Limits), A453 Bridge Plan, and Special Category Land Plans are referenced in the Guide but are not included in Schedule 16.	Ensure list of documents in Schedule 16 is accurate.	The Guide to the Application (Document DCO 1.3) and the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) have been updated and are aligned.
<u>Land Rights Issues</u>			
25.	There are no green shaded plots on the Land Plans, unless this is referring to the desaturated yellow 'Public highway required for highway works only (no permanent acquisition of land or	Ensure colours used on land plans (of all types) is clear.	The DCO Applicant has reviewed the Land Plans (Document series DCO 2.2) and is satisfied that the green shaded plots are visible and identifiable.

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	rights)' in which case recommend the colour is adjusted to be clearer.		
26.	The descriptions in the Book of Reference (BoR) either give no or limited indication of what type of Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession is requested. Even though paragraph 5 'How to use this BoR' explains how the BoR and Land Plans can be read to see what powers apply to which plot.	Ensure rights sought are set out in BoR for each plot of land. For example: • Permanent acquisition of land and existing rights • Land to be used temporarily and new rights to be acquired permanently • Land to be used temporarily only • Public highway required for highway works only (no permanent acquisition of land or rights)	The BoR submitted with the DCO Application indicated in Part 1 Column (2) which plots are required temporarily, which plots are required temporarily and new rights to be acquired permanently and which plots are public highway not subject to compulsory acquisition. All other plots are required for permanent acquisition. The BoR has been updated in light of the S51 Advice to ensure that the extent of the acquisition required is clear at the start of Column (2) of Part 1.
27.	A lot of 'unknown' and 'none' entries in Part 2a and 3, column (3) Name and Address that have identified Category 1 & 2 persons in Part 1.	Set out fully what 'due diligence' measures have been undertaken to identify affected parties.	The DCO Applicant has provided further detail in Paragraph 4.6 of the Statement of Reasons (Document DCO 4.1) setting out the steps taken by their specialist land referencing team to identify the owners of unregistered land in unknown ownership. The DCO Applicant confirms that most of the unknown ownerships identified in the Book of Reference (Document DCO 4.3) are unregistered subsoil under adopted highway. It is not uncommon for such land to be unregistered and in

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
			unknown ownership. However, in each case, the team has visited the land to see if the owner can be ascertained (including by looking at neighbouring land and door knocking). Site notices have also been erected inviting any unknown owners to come forward. Searches of the index map have been undertaken and public records reviewed to see if they can provide more information about potential owners. The DCO Applicant is accordingly satisfied that diligent inquiries have been undertaken to identify unknown owners.
28.	The scale of Inset Plan 2A is such it is difficult to distinguish between Plots 2/17, 2/18, 2/53 and 2/54	Amend scale of this inset to clarify identified plots.	Document DCO 2.2A has been amended to increase the scale to make the plots easier to distinguish.
<u>Environmental Statement (generally)</u>			
29.	The Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) would benefit from a figure to show the study area and the projects within it. The chapter lists projects in each tier and says (paragraph 21.4.4) information was gathered in relation to each project but does not clarify which documents were reviewed to reach the conclusions presented.	Provide a figure showing the study area and the projects within it, and set out documents reviewed (this last item can be high level, for example, 'the planning application').	A new appendix 21C has been provided (Document DCO 6.21C) providing a figure showing the study area and other developments considered.

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
30.	Some of the aspect chapters cover CEA by project, but in some cases more potential impacts are identified in the aspect chapters than are concluded on in the CEA. Reasons aren't given for the aspects chosen to be assessed for each project in each tier (for example, some projects only assess cumulative socio-economic effects but don't explain why other aspects are not considered).	Set out reasoning for approach in CEA.	Chapter 21 of the ES (Document DCO 6.21) has been updated to include an explanation of the approach. See Paragraph 21.4.5 and Table 21.5 of that Chapter.
31.	Lack of contents pages for each chapter makes them difficult to navigate.	Provide Table of Contents pages for each chapter of the ES.	A table of contents has been inserted at the start of each chapter.
32.	The following reports contain figures that are difficult to read (inappropriate scales, black and white/ indistinct mapping backgrounds): • ES appendix 6.9A: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal • ES appendix 6.9D: Bird Report • ES appendix 6.9G: Reptile Report • ES appendix 6.8D: Modelled Ecological Receptor Locations	Figures and maps used within the ES, particularly where these are embedded within text, should be reviewed for clarity and ease of understanding.	The DCO Applicant confirms that the figures have been reviewed and updated to improve readability.
33.	Appendix 6.7A is titled 'Thematic Glossary' but the title of the document on opening is 'Noise and Vibration Terms'	Update as necessary.	The appendix has been renamed 'Glossary of Noise and Vibration Terms'.
34.	ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [DCO 6.9] states at paragraph 9.6.74 that as part of the mitigation for the EMG2 Project (covering both DCO and MCO schemes) the applicant would enter into a District level Licensing (DLL)	The applicant is requested to provide a copy of the GCN DLL IAPC.	A new appendix (Document DCO 6.9L) has been provided to Chapter 9 Ecology of the Environment Statement which provides a copy of

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	agreement in respect of great crested newts (GCN). Table 9.2 states that a GCN DLL Impact Assessment & Conservation Payment Certificate (IAPC) was secured (Reference: DLL-ENQ-LEIC 00056-1). References are also made to letters of no impediment for bats and badgers in doc ref: DCO5.2 Consents and other licences required under other legislation.	The applicant is also requested to submit copies of any LONIs obtained in respect of bats and badgers to the examination.	the GCN DLL IAPC and the LONIs which have been secured.
<u>Landscape and visual effects</u>			
35.	Lack of site sections and night-time photomontages	(i) Provide wire diagrams of the buildings and other structures on site sections. (ii) Provide appropriate night-time photomontages.	The DCO Applicant has arranged for site sections and night-time photomontages to be prepared. They will be submitted as soon as possible may be following acceptance of the application.
<u>Disclaimers</u>			
36.	Disclaimers appear in documents such as: Energy Report, GHG Assessment, Climate Change and Cultural Heritage appendices. These disclaimers contain language around liability, verification, and use of the report. While they are legally protective, they may come across as overly cautious and could obscure accountability, particularly in the context of the Examination process.	Ensure that this issue is addressed, either by removing the disclaimers or ensuring that the documents can be relied upon for the purposes of the examination.	The DCO Applicant confirms that disclaimers have been removed from relevant application documentation. It is confirmed that the documents can be relied upon for the purposes of the examination.

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
<u>Design and parameters</u>			
37.	Various datums are shown on the drawings, which may be based on Ordnance Survey given the ground levels. However, on drawing EMG2-CH-SBR-BR-DR-CB-00024 Rev P2 (A453 Bridge Plan) it states: "All levels & Coordination are in metres relative to Project Grid". The Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure (APFP) regulation 5(2) indicates drawings should show "by reference to Ordnance Survey or Chart datum". It is not clear therefore whether it is OS or some other datum, and if some other, the base point where and what that is	Ensure a consistent, defined, datum is used across the application documentation.	The drawing is based on Ordnance Survey. The notes on the drawing, and other drawings where this is an issue, have been updated to make this clear.
38.	The dDCO and the Application Form refer to the document as the "Community Park Plan". However, the submitted document is titled "Community Park Layout Plan"	Ensure a consistent terminology is used across the application documentation.	The Community Park Plan (Document DCO 2.16) has been updated to remove the word 'layout' from its title.
39.	Reference to Limits of Deviation of 1.5m upwards or downwards but no level given where this should be taken from	Ensure that the 'base' level is defined and used consistently across the application documentation.	Article 4 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) has been updated to ensure that the base level is clear. The new Table 3.5 in Chapter 3 Project Description of the Environmental Statement provides further clarification (Document DCO 6.3).
40.	Page 67 of the Design Statement shows how car park landscaping strips may look. However, the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan and other similar plans shows parking without such landscaping. The principle of car parking of	Ensure that the Design Statement and the Illustrative drawings/ parameters plans are consistent and meet the commitments relied upon.	The Design Approach Document (Document DCO 5.3) and the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan – EMG2 Works (Document DCO 2.5) have been updated and aligned with

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
	being in a green area is also referred to on page 70. In making this reconciliation, as the applicant has elsewhere committed to meeting the relevant parking standards, it should therefore be demonstrated that sufficient landscaping and parking can be made available for the quantum of development proposed within the overall individual plot layout on the illustrative drawings.		the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan now showing landscaping within the proposed car parking where appropriate.
<u>Construction Hours</u>			
41.	Table 7.5 in Chapter 7 of the ES indicates construction work core hours on Saturday of 07:00 to 13:00. However, dDCO requirement 19 and the lighting assessment states 07:00 to 16:00 hours on Saturdays. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (in the CEMP) has it as 07:00 to 15:00 hours (para 4.5).	Ensure all construction hours are reconciled, and assessment undertaken based on that unified basis.	The DCO Applicant confirms that references to the construction hours in the DCO Application documentation have been aligned to the hours set out in requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) i.e. 07:00 to 16:00 on Saturdays.
<u>Ground conditions</u>			
42.	Paragraph 14.5.40 of Chapter 14 of the ES refers to Appendix 14E. This would appear to be a typographic error for Appendix 14F. Assuming that this is Appendix 14F, there is reference to Appendix 2, Historical mapping. It would also appear that the Appendix 2 front sheet has been inserted in the incorrect location, in the middle of Appendix 1.	Ensure that these matters are clarified.	The DCO Applicant confirms that there was no typographic error in the former paragraph 14.5.40 (now paragraph 14.5.41). It refers to the correct Appendix 14E – EMG2 Preliminary Sources Study Affecting LCC Part 2 of 3 (Document DCO 6.14E).

	Issue	Potential Resolution	DCO Applicant's Response
<u>Habitats Regulations Assessment (combines both DCO and MCO)</u>			
43.	There are errors in the paragraph numbering in the report (not all paragraphs are numbered, some paragraphs have more than one).	For ease of reference, provide a document with the correct paragraph numbers applied.	The errors in the paragraph numbering have been corrected.