

# Summary of the responses to statutory consultation – main themes

April 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	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Statutory consultation	4
3. Main themes	4
4. Conclusion	4
Appendix	5

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 SEGRO Properties Limited and SEGRO (EMG) Limited (referred to as "SEGRO" or "the Applicant") are preparing to make applications to the Secretary of State for a second phase of the East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park ("EMG1") which is a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange ("SRFI") located to the north of East Midlands Airport.
- 1.2 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 is substantially complete.
- 1.3 The first application, the applicant for which is SEGRO Properties Limited, will be submitted pursuant to Part 5 of the Planning Act 2008 ("the 2008 Act") for a Development Consent Order ("DCO"). The second application, the applicant for which is SEGRO (EMG) Limited, will be submitted pursuant to Regulation 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 (the "CRDCO Regulations") for a Material Change Order to the EMG1 DCO ("MCO").
- 1.4 The proposed development for which the two applications are to be made is referred to as 'East Midlands Gateway 2' or 'EMG2' and comprises the following elements:

### Within the DCO Application

- EMG2 Main Site – a new multi-unit logistics/industrial development located south of East Midlands Airport and the A453, and west of the M1 motorway. This part of the site falls within the 'East Midlands Airport and Gateway Industrial Cluster' (EMAGIC) site, which forms part of the East Midlands Freeport designated by the Government in 2022; and
- Highways Works – works to the highway network including significant improvements at Junction 24 of the M1 (referred to as J24 Improvements) and the road network interacting with that junction. Due to the scale (and area) of the Highways Works, they represent an NSIP in their own right; and

### Within the MCO Application

- EMG1 Works – the proposals include changes within EMG1, incorporating additional warehousing on Plot 16 together with works to increase the permitted height of the cranes at the rail-freight terminal, improvements to the public transport interchange and site management building.

## **2 Statutory consultation**

- 2.1 SEGRO formally consulted on its emerging proposals for EMG2 between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025 (the "statutory consultation period")<sup>1</sup>.
- 2.2 The six (6) week statutory consultation period was completed in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation ("SoCC") published on 18 December 2024. The SoCC remains available to download on the EMG2 webpage – [www.segro.com/slpemg2](http://www.segro.com/slpemg2).
- 2.3 SEGRO is in the process of preparing an Adequacy of Consultation Milestone ("AoCM") document for submission to the Planning Inspectorate ("PINS"). The AoCM will set out the consultation activities completed by SEGRO, including informal non-statutory consultation activities and other activities undertaken by SEGRO to raise awareness and consult with statutory consultees, key stakeholders, interested parties and members of the public before and during the formal statutory consultation period. A full list of the statutory consultees will be appended to the AoCM.
- 2.4 A commitment was given in the SoCC to make available a summary of the main themes arising from the statutory consultation processes following the end of the statutory consultation period. This document has been prepared to give effect to that commitment.
- 2.5 A more formal Consultation Report is being prepared and will accompany the DCO and MCO applications in due course. That report will provide more detail on the statutory consultation responses and how the Applicant has had regard to them in preparing the DCO and MCO applications to satisfy the requirements of the 2008 Act and the CRDCO Regulations.

## **3 Main themes**

- 3.1 The main themes arising from the responses received to SEGRO's statutory consultation are summarised in the Appendix to this document.
- 3.2 Where a theme is specific to the DCO application or the MCO application then this has been identified. For clarity, references to the Environmental Statement ("ES") chapters are common to both the DCO and MCO applications as a single ES will cover both applications.

## **4 Conclusion**

- 4.1 SEGRO is considering the statutory consultation responses received and is having regard to any relevant responses in developing its proposals for EMG2 in accordance with its duty set out in section 49 of the 2008 Act. Further engagement is also being undertaken where appropriate to better understand the issues raised in the statutory consultation responses.

---

<sup>1</sup> Statutory pre-application consultation was completed pursuant to section 42 of the 2008 Act and regulation 10 of the CRDCO Regulations and press notices were given pursuant to section 48 of the 2008 Act, regulation 14 of the CRDCO Regulations and regulations 13 and 22 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

- 4.2 The responses received to the statutory consultation will be set out and a response provided to them will be set out in full in the Consultation Report when it is submitted with the DCO and MCO applications.

## APPENDIX

Summary of main theme	Update / response
<b>Principle / need for EMG2</b>	
Many, but not all, respondents do not support the principle of the scheme.	The need for the scheme arises from national, regional and local planning policy and its associated evidence base and will be set out in full in the DCO and MCO applications, together with commentary of the scale and type of jobs that it will deliver.
There is no need for more warehousing because there is a surplus of warehousing in the area, particularly vacant floor space.	
There is no need for more jobs of the type proposed. The immediate area has a high level of employment and the type of jobs which will be provided by the scheme are not what is needed. Many respondents felt the jobs on offer would only be low paid, low skilled jobs.	
<b>Location of EMG2</b>	
The location of the development is not appropriate given its greenfield status and proximity to Diseworth village. Many respondents said that the proposals should be moved to a brownfield site.	<p>The location of the proposals arises out of the regional and local planning policy and its associated evidence base, together with the strategic suitability of the location and relationship to EMG1, East Midlands Airport, , the M1 motorway, the A42 trunk road and three local population centres. Furthermore, the EMG2 Main site forms part of the East Midlands Freeport.</p> <p>The locational benefits and an assessment of alternative sites will be set out in full in the DCO and MCO applications.</p>
<b>Design</b>	

<p><b>Building Heights:</b></p> <p>Lack of understanding about the parameters plan and the building heights, with some respondents concerned that buildings heights were 86m, rather than 86 AOD.</p> <p>Queries about whether the buildings could be higher than 18m or 24m based upon the parameters (i.e. by lowering the floor level as this did not appear to be fixed).</p> <p>A few respondents raised concerns about further applications being submitted for taller heights beyond the DCO limits.</p>	<p>Further clarity on the parameters plans and the building heights will be provided in the DCO and MCO applications.</p> <p>If made, the DCO and MCO will restrict the building heights. Any increase to those heights will then require a new consent.</p>
<p>The proposed colour palette of the buildings, with some respondents suggesting the buildings should be green to blend in better with the countryside.</p>	<p>The design and colour palette of the buildings is being considered and will be determined at detailed design stage pursuant to the DCO and MCO.</p>
<p><b>Heritage</b></p>	
<p>Concerns about building near listed buildings and a conservation area.</p>	<p>As indicated above, the selection and suitability of the EMG2 Main Site will be set out in full in the DCO and MCO applications, and the impact on heritage assets will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement accompanying those applications.</p>
<p><b>Drainage and flood risk</b></p>	
<p>Concerns about the adequacy of the flood risk management and drainage strategy and whether it will make flooding in the area worse. Some respondents voiced concerns that the above ground drainage basins would not be large enough or frequent enough to reduce flood risk.</p>	<p>SEGRO is working closely with the Environment Agency and lead local flood authority to develop its drainage strategy.</p> <p>The impact on flooding and drainage will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement.</p>

<p>Concerns that the EMG1 drainage basins have previously overtopped (previous winter). Some respondents indicated that they believe this has contributed to past flooding in Lockington.</p>	<p>SEGRO is investigating these issues and has had regard to them in developing its drainage strategy.</p>
<p>Impact of existing surface water run off to properties on Clements Gate, Langley Close and Long Holden. A few respondents reported surface water sheeting off the adjacent fields towards properties on Clements Gate, Langley Close and Long Holden.</p>	
<p>Perception that very high groundwater, and other drainage basins, in the catchment area have led to increased ground water flooding to properties due to changes in local infiltration.</p>	
<p>Existing problems with surface water flooding along the A453 site frontage in storm events fronting the EMG2 Main Site.</p>	
<p><b>Visual impact and landscaping</b></p>	
<p>Concerns about the visual impact from Diseworth and the lack of a sufficient buffer.</p> <p>Many respondents were of the view that it is the wrong place/site in landscape/visual terms for this type of commercial development. Some respondents questioned if the scheme could be built lower into the ground to further mitigate visual impact.</p> <p>Some acknowledged and welcomed the consideration that had gone in to the design of the mounding and landscape buffering to Diseworth, and that this had improved by moving development further away during the design process to date, but others still felt it needed to move further to the east and away from Diseworth if it is to happen at all. Some respondents requested that the bunding be higher (like that around Lockington).</p> <p>Suggestion that the buffer planting needs to include more larger tree stock from the outset and that consideration be given to winter conditions when trees not in leaf.</p>	<p>The visual impact and landscaping of the scheme are being considered, including the form / height of the perimeter mounding.</p> <p>The landscape and visual impacts will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement</p>

<p>Concerns that the EMG1 landscaping had not delivered on its promises, and the same could happen with EMG2.</p>	<p>SEGRO is aware that some of the landscaping at EMG1 has not flourished as hoped and additional planting has been undertaken to address the issue. Lessons can be learned from EMG1 to ensure the same issues do not occur at EMG2.</p>
<p>Concerns raised over the viewpoint visualisations as to the lack of detail and the locations chosen. The credibility of the images was also questioned by some respondents.</p>	<p>More detailed visualisations from a wider range of viewpoints, including from Diseworth, are being prepared and will be made available in due course and with the DCO and MCO applications.</p>
<p>Concerns about the visual impact of Plot 16 at EMG1 from Junction 24 and Kegworth including the lack of bunding / screening to the east of the rail freight terminal.</p>	<p>The visual impact and landscaping of the plot are being considered, including the need for bunding / screening.</p>
<p><b>Traffic – add in re active travel support</b></p>	
<p>Whether traffic will stay on M1 and use the new Junction 24 direct link to the A50 or whether drivers will just keep using Junction 23A and the Finger Farm roundabout.</p> <p>Some respondents queried why the A453 at the airport / Finger Farm roundabout is not being dualled and / or no works are proposed to Finger Farm roundabout.</p>	<p>The impacts of traffic will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>SEGRO is working closely with National Highways and Leicestershire County Council to develop a scheme of works to Junction 24. That scheme is expected to provide sufficient capacity to negate the need for works to the Finger Farm roundabout.</p>
<p>Concerns about rat running through Diseworth and Long Whatton, particularly when the A453 is congested. Some respondents supported traffic calming measures in Diseworth, others did not.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling is underway which will identify any issues so that they can be mitigated if necessary.</p>

<p>Concerns that traffic at Finger Farm roundabout could be made worse (some respondents noted that there is already queuing traffic on A453).</p>	<p>As above, traffic modelling is underway which will identify any issues so that they can be mitigated.</p>
<p>Concerns that people who work at EMG2 could park in Diseworth.</p>	<p>The scheme will incorporate adequate parking for those who work at EMG2.</p>
<p>Whether the linkages to Hyam's Lane could increase parking / road safety issues if it was open to cars. Requests made that Hyam's Lane be closed to vehicular access.</p> <p>Respondents were also concerned that the retention of Hyam's Lane as a footpath / cycleway could encourage workers to park in the village and walk up Hyam's Lane to EMG2.</p>	<p>The future use of Hyam's Lane and at Long Holden is being considered.</p>
<p>Safety concerns around The Green junction, particularly how visibility is already reduced. The scheme could make matters worse if two vehicles are side by side.</p> <p>Other respondents suggested greater improvements to this junction and to the Grimes Gate junction, or not, because it will attract more traffic through Diseworth. This was also tied to rat running concerns.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling is underway which will identify whether this could be an issue.</p>
<p>Concerns about existing weaving / safety issues on the A50 heading north west from M1 Junction 24.</p>	<p>As above, traffic modelling is underway which will identify any issues so that they can be mitigated.</p>
<p>Safety concerns about entry from Derby Road (old A6) onto Junction 24 including about lane guidance and markings.</p>	
<p>Concerns that airport users are parking in Diseworth and that the scheme could make this worse.</p>	<p>SEGRO does not believe that the scheme will contribute to this issue but is considering the matter.</p>

Concerns about HGV parking in the area (in lay-bys or inappropriate locations overnight) which could be made worse by the scheme. This concern is linked to litter / human waste issues in the local area.	The scheme will make provision for HGV parking and welfare facilities which will mitigate the likelihood of this.
Concerns about the construction impact of the highways works, and how this would impact local people and businesses. There were some questions asking how long the highways works were expected to take.	The impact of the works on the road network will be managed through a traffic management plan. More detail about this will be provided in the DCO and MCO applications.
The timing of delivery of the highways works and the need to ensure that such works are fully delivered.	Traffic modelling is being undertaken to determine when the highway works are required, and this will then be secured in the DCO and MCO.
<b>Sustainable transport</b>	
Lack of a direct bus (or tram) connection from East Midlands Parkway to EMG2 and lack of bus connectivity between settlements. Whether any public transport (bus, rail, tram) measures introduced will integrate with other new / existing developments and Diseworth.	The need for and extent of any bus provision is being considered.
Support for the proposed provision of pedestrian routes through the community park to reach the airport's bus interchange (pedestrians currently walk along the road) and the new public bus interchange at EMG2 via Hyam's Lane.	Appropriate pedestrian and cycle routes will be secured in the DCO and MCO applications.
Support for the active travel link between EMG1 and EMG2 / the airport, alongside the A453.	The support for the link to be incorporated into the DCO application is noted.
Whether measures could be introduced to make cycling / walking safer along The Green and Grimes Gate. And whether more cycling / walking routes could be created including	The need for and extent of cycling / walking measures is being considered.

for instance into the proposed Isley Woodhouse site and onto Cloud trail extension to Ashby.	
<b>Ecology / biodiversity / agricultural land</b>	
Concerns about the loss of ancient hedgerows and the consequential loss of wildlife and biodiversity.	The impacts of the scheme on ancient hedgerows, wildlife and biodiversity are being actively considered and will be addressed in detail within the Environmental Statement.
Concerns about the loss of agricultural land, specifically arable land.	The impact on agricultural land is being actively considered and will be addressed in detail within the Environmental Statement.
<b>Noise</b>	
Concerns about HGV and forklift reversing alarms particularly at night and in certain weather / wind conditions. The need for night time noise control.	Operational noise from the scheme is being considered and measures will be incorporated into the DCO and MCO to manage it.
The extent of noise mitigation measures, including whether the bunding should be higher and / or fencing should be installed, and the proposed buildings are too close.	The extent of noise mitigation measures is being actively considered, and appropriate measures will be secured by the DCO and MCO, and will be addressed in detail within the Environmental Statement.
<b>Lighting</b>	
The need for lighting along the footpaths and Hyam's Lane.	The need for lighting is being considered and the scale / scope of any lighting will be addressed in the DCO and MCO applications through the Environmental Statement.

Whether there will be mounted luminaire (lights) at similar heights to that at East Midlands Airport.	The lighting at EMG2 will not be the same as at the airport. A lighting strategy is being developed which will set out the extent of any lighting.
Concerns about additional light pollution. Respondents noted that East Midlands Airport have recently installed new lighting, which is having a significant effect on Diseworth.	
<b>Community park</b>	
Concerns about security and residential amenity issues arising from the proposed community park. Some respondents do not support a community park or increased public access through the area. Other respondents see improved public access as being a positive aspect of the scheme.	The community park is an important aspect of the scheme and a significant benefit to the local area. The concerns and aspirations of local residents are noted and SEGRO proposes to engage further with them to develop the proposals for the park.
Support for the community park with respondents suggesting elements which they would wish to see incorporated into it (e.g. benches, wildlife information boards, bins, fitness trail, children's play park, accessible paths).	
<b>Other issues</b>	
Concerns about inappropriate use of Long Holden, particularly fly tipping and anti-social behaviour (drug taking and nuisance parking).	SEGRO notes the concerns and is actively considering what, if any, measures could be introduced to minimise the risk of such inappropriate uses.
The impact of the development on local resident's physical and mental health (e.g. air pollution, disruption during construction, loss of green space, and disruption of village life).	The impact of the scheme on population and human health is being actively considered.
Concerns about the loss of horse-riding routes due to the scheme and any change of use of Hyam's Lane.	The impact of the scheme on horse riders is being actively considered.