

East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2)

Document DCO 6.1/MCO 6.1

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Main Statement

Chapter 1

Introduction and Scope

August 2025

01

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

[SEGRO.COM/SLPEMG2](https://segro.com/slpemg2)

SEGRO

1. Introduction and Scope

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared to accompany applications made by SEGRO Properties Limited (DCO Applicant) and SEGRO (EMG) Limited (MCO Applicant), (together referred to in the ES as 'SEGRO' or the 'Applicant'), relating to a second phase of East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park ('EMG1').
- 1.1.2. 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.
- 1.1.3. This second phase is referred to as the EMG2 Project and the following overarching terms have the same meaning: 'East Midlands Gateway 2'; 'EMG2'; or 'the Proposed Development'. It comprises the following three main components:

Table 1.1: The EMG2 Project Components

Main Component	Details	Works Nos.
DCO Application made by the DCO Applicant for the DCO Scheme		
EMG2 Works	Logistics and advanced manufacturing development located on the EMG2 Main Site south of East Midlands Airport and the A453, and west of the M1 motorway. The development includes HGV parking and a bus interchange. Together with an upgrade to the EMG1 substation and provision of a Community Park.	DCO Works Nos. 1 to 5 as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). DCO Works Nos. 20 and 21 as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
Highway Works	Works to the highway network: the A453 EMG2 access junction works (referred to as the EMG2 Access Works); significant improvements at Junction 24 of the M1 (referred to as the J24 Improvements), works to the wider highway network including the Active Travel Link, Hyam's Lane Works, L57 Footpath Upgrade, A6 Kegworth Bypass/A453 Junction Improvements and Finger Farm Roundabout Improvements, together with other works.	DCO Works Nos. 6 to 19 as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
MCO Application made by the MCO Applicant for the MCO Scheme		
EMG1 Works	Additional warehousing development on Plot 16 together with works to increase the permitted height of the cranes at the EMG1 rail-freight terminal, improvements to the public transport interchange, site management building and the EMG1 Pedestrian Crossing.	MCO Works Nos. 3A, 3B, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A and 8A in the draft MCO (Document MCO 3.1).

- 1.1.4. The various components of EMG2 Project are shown on the Components Plan (**Document DCO 2.7/MCO 2.7**).
- 1.1.5. The approach to the consenting process is explained further in Section 1.2 below.
- 1.1.6. A full glossary of terms used in this ES is provided as **Appendix 1A** to this Chapter (**Document DCO 6.1A /MCO 6.1A**). However, some of the key terms used throughout this ES are provided below for ease of reference and understanding:

Table 1.2: Extracts from Project Glossary

Term	Meaning
Community Park	The Community Park as shown cross hatched green on the Components Plan (Document DCO 2.7) and more particularly described as Work No. 21 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
DCO	A development consent order (DCO). Introduced by the PA 2008, a DCO is the means of obtaining permission for developments categorised as a NSIP.
DCO Application	The application for a DCO for the DCO Scheme.
DCO Scheme	The development to be permitted by the DCO Application comprising the EMG2 Works and the Highway Works.
draft DCO	The draft DCO submitted with the DCO Application.
draft MCO	The draft material change order submitted with the MCO Application.
EMG1 Works	The proposed changes to that part of EMG1 shown cross hatched green on the Components Plan (Document MCO 2.7) comprising Plot 16, the EMG1 Pedestrian Crossing, and other works more particularly described as Works Nos. 3A, 3B, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A and 8A in the draft MCO (Document MCO 3.1).
EMG2 Works	The EMG2 Main Site as shown hatched red on the Components Plan (Document DCO 2.7) comprising logistics and advanced manufacturing development more particularly described as Work Nos. 1 to 5 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1), together with the Community Park (identified as Works No. 21 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO) and an upgrade to the EMG1 substation (identified as Works No. 20 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO).
EMG2 Main Site	The main site at EMG2 as shown hatched red on the Components Plan (Document DCO 2.7) comprising logistics and advanced manufacturing development more particularly described as Work Nos. 1 to 5 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).

Term	Meaning
East Midlands Gateway 2 or EMG2 or EMG2 Project or Proposed Development	Together the DCO Scheme and the MCO Scheme.
Highway Works	The highway works required to enable development of the EMG2 Works including the J24 Improvements, the EMG2 Access Works, the A6 Kegworth Bypass / A453 junction Improvements, the Finger Farm Roundabout Improvements, the Hyam's Lane Works, the Active Travel Link and the L57 Footpath Upgrade and other works as more particularly described in Works Nos. 6 to 19 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).
MCO	A material change order (MCO). Introduced by the PA 2008, an MCO is the means of obtaining permission for a material change to developments categorised as a NSIP and consented pursuant to a DCO.
MCO Application	The application for an MCO for the MCO Scheme.
MCO Scheme	The development to be permitted by the MCO Application comprising the EMG1 Works.
Plot 16	That part of the MCO Scheme, being the EMG1 Works, comprising logistics and warehousing development to be provided as part of the EMG1 Works as described in Works No. 3A of the draft MCO (Document MCO 3.1).

1.2. Consenting Process

- 1.2.1. The Applicant has made two concurrent applications for the EMG2 Project.
- 1.2.2. The first application, the applicant for which is the DCO Applicant, SEGRO Properties Limited, is for a Development Consent Order (referred to as the DCO Application) for the DCO Scheme comprising the EMG2 Works and the Highway Works.
- 1.2.3. The second application, the applicant for which is the MCO Applicant, SEGRO (EMG) Limited, is for a Material Change Order to the existing EMG1 DCO (referred to as the MCO Application) for the MCO Scheme comprising the EMG1 Works.
- 1.2.4. This approach to consenting and the assessment of all component parts of the EMG2 Project in this ES is explained in further detail below.

DCO Application/DCO Scheme (EMG2 Works and Highway Works)

- 1.2.5. The DCO Application is made pursuant to section 37 of Part 5 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) for the DCO Scheme. It is made in accordance with the direction made by the Secretary of State under section 35 of the PA 2008 and dated 21 February 2024 (the Section 35 Direction), provided as **Appendix 1B** to this Chapter (**Document DCO 6.1B/MCO 6.1B**).
- 1.2.6. In response to a request from the Applicant, provided as **Appendix 1C** to this Chapter (**Document DCO 6.1C/MCO 6.1C**), the Secretary of State adopted a Scoping Opinion on 24 September 2024 in respect of the EMG2 Project which is provided as **Appendix 1D** to this Chapter (**Document DCO 6.1D/MCO 6.1D**) (the Scoping Opinion) pursuant to Regulation 10 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations).
- 1.2.7. This ES is provided in support of the DCO Scheme and in accordance with Regulation 5(2)(a) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (2009 Regulations). As explained above the DCO Scheme is formed of two main component parts:
- EMG2 Works – The Section 35 Direction confirmed that the DCO Applicant's proposals for the EMG2 Main Site satisfied the criteria for business and commercial projects and should be treated as a development of national significance for which development consent is required. The works also comprise the Community Park and an upgrade to the EMG1 substation.
 - Highway Works – These works include substantial improvements to the strategic highways network around Junction 24 of the M1 ('the J24 Improvements'). These works qualify as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project ('NSIP') in their own right. The works also comprise other works to the highway network including the EMG2 Access Works, the Hyam's Lane Works, the Active Travel Link and other works to the wider highway network.

- 1.2.8. Following the issue of the Section 35 Direction, the DCO Applicant reviewed the scope of their proposals which have always been considered as a second phase of the highly successful EMG1 development which was developed pursuant to the EMG1 DCO. This review led to proposals for further linkages with EMG1 and additions and improvements to the EMG1 development which, although part of an overall EMG2 Project, cannot be considered as associated development as part of the DCO Application and are therefore required to be authorised by a change to the existing EMG1 DCO. The MCO Application is made by SEGRO (EMG) Limited, being the applicant for the EMG1 DCO and the entity with the right to make the MCO Application.

MCO Application/MCO Scheme (EMG1 Works)

- 1.2.9. The MCO Application is made for the MCO Scheme being the third main component of the EMG2 Project and comprising the EMG1 Works. It is made pursuant to section 153 and schedule 6 of the PA 2008 for an amendment to the EMG1 DCO.
- 1.2.10. The EMG1 DCO was supported by an environmental impact assessment (EIA) which was completed pursuant to The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 in force at the time. Those regulations have since been revoked and replaced by the EIA Regulations. **Table 1.9** at the end of this Chapter records the changes introduced by the EIA Regulations.
- 1.2.11. The MCO Scheme is a subsequent application for EIA development for the purposes of the EIA Regulations. The EMG1 Works formed part of the proposed works considered in the Scoping Opinion (**Document DCO 6.1D/MCO 6.1D**) to ensure the environmental impacts arising from the MCO Application are appropriately considered and assessed against the current EIA Regulations. This ES is prepared in support of the MCO Application and provided pursuant to Regulation 16(j) of the Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 (2011 Regulations).

1.3. Approach to ES

- 1.3.1. Notwithstanding the differentiation in terms of applications under the required consenting regimes, given the integrated nature of the EMG2 Project, all component parts have been subject to a single EIA undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations. The findings of the assessment are reported in this ES which has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 14 as informed by Schedule 4 and Regulation 22 of the EIA Regulations. It also responds to the Scoping Opinion (**Document DCO 6.1D/MCO 6.1D**) and the feedback received from PINS.
- 1.3.2. Although reported in a single ES, each Chapter of this ES includes a separate assessment of the following:
- The DCO Scheme;
 - The MCO Scheme;
 - The EMG2 Project comprising the DCO Scheme and MCO Scheme together; and
 - The EMG2 Project in combination with other planned development (i.e. the cumulative effects) using the list of projects identified in **Appendix 21B to Chapter 21: Cumulative Impacts (Document DCO 6.21B/MCO 6.21B)**.
- 1.3.3. The only exceptions to the above standard approach are Chapters 6 and 15. This is explained below.
- 1.3.4. **Chapter 6: Traffic and Transportation (Document DCO 6.6/MCO 6.6)** explains how the traffic modelling for the DCO Scheme includes the MCO Scheme traffic also. The reasons for this are set in the Chapter.
- 1.3.5. As regards **Chapter 15: Agriculture and Soils (Document DCO 6.15)** this includes no separate assessment of the MCO Scheme because it contains no agricultural land and, as such, it had been scoped out completely and therefore contains no separate assessment for the MCO.

1.4. ES Content

- 1.4.1. Regulation 14(2) of the EIA Regulations sets out the minimum requirements for an ES with further detail at Schedule 4. **Table 1.3** below sets out where the requirements of Schedule 4 are met within this ES.

Table 1.3: Schedule 4 Requirements Summary

Schedule 4 ref:	Requirement	Chapter of ES
1a	A description of the location of the development.	ES Chapter 2 (Document DCO 6.2/MCO 6.2)
1b	A description of the main physical characteristics of the whole development and the land use requirements during construction and operational phases.	ES Chapter 3 (Document DCO 6.3/MCO 6.3)
1c	A description of the main characteristics of the operational phase of the development such as energy demand, nature and quantity of materials and natural resources used.	ES Chapters 3, 18 and 19 (Document DCO 6.3, 6.18 and 6.19/MCO 6.3, 6.18 and 6.19)
1d	An estimate, by type and quantity, of the expected residues, emissions and waste produced during the construction and operational phases.	ES Chapters 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 18 and 19 (Document DCO 6.3, 6.6-6.8, 6.11, 6.13, 6.14, 6.18 and 6.19/MCO 6.3, 6.6-6.8, 6.11, 6.13, 6.14, 6.18 and 6.19)
2	A description of the reasonable and relevant alternatives considered.	ES Chapter 4 (Document DCO 6.4/MCO 6.4)
3	A description of the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment (baseline scenario).	ES Chapters 5-20 (Document DCO 6.5-6.20/MCO 6.5-6.20)
4	A description of the factors specified in Regulation 5(2) likely to be significantly affected by the development (population, human health, biodiversity, land and soils, water, air, climate, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape).	ES Chapters 5-21 (Document DCO 6.5-6.21/MCO 6.5-6.21)
5	A description of the likely significant effects on the environment deriving from both the construction and operation stages of the development including from direct, indirect and cumulative impacts.	ES Chapters 5-21 (Document DCO 6.5-6.21/MCO 6.5-6.21)

Schedule 4 ref:	Requirement	Chapter of ES
6	A description of the forecasting methods or evidence used to identify the significant effects.	ES Chapters 5-21 (Document DCO 6.5-6.21/MCO 6.5-6.21)
7	A description of the measures envisaged to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset any identified significant adverse effects (mitigation).	ES Chapters 5-21 (Document DCO 6.5-6.21/MCO 6.5-6.21)
8	A description of the expected significant adverse effects deriving from the vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters as relevant.	ES Chapter 21 (Document DCO 6.21/MCO 6.21)
9	A non-technical summary of the above.	Separate NTS provided as (Document DCO 6.23/MCO 6.23)
10	A reference list detailing the sources used for the assessments.	ES Chapters 5-21 (Document DCO 6.5-6.21/MCO 6.5-6.21)

1.5. The proposed development

- 1.5.1. The location of the DCO Scheme and the MCO Scheme is identified on the Location Plans (**Document DCO 2.1/Document MCO 2.1**).
- 1.5.2. A Components Plan is also provided (**Document DCO 2.7/MCO 2.7**) which shows how the components of the EMG2 Project interact.
- 1.5.3. The location of the EMG2 Project is further described in **Chapter 2: Site and Surroundings (Document DCO 6.2/MCO 6.2)** of this ES, again with reference to its various component parts. In brief, most of the new build development will be on the EMG2 Main Site. The remaining components of the proposals are located on land required for off-site highway improvements, and on land within EMG1.
- 1.5.4. The development proposals are described in detail within **Chapter 3: Project Description** of this ES (**Document DCO 6.3/MCO 6.3**), again with reference to its component parts. In summary, the three main components are as follows:

Within the DCO Application/DCO Scheme

- EMG2 Works – logistics and advanced manufacturing development on the EMG2 Main Site comprising a maximum of 300,000 sq.m. (approximately 3.23 million sq. ft.) (GIA) of floorspace (GIA) overall, with an additional allowance of 200,000 sq.m. in the form of internal mezzanine across the site. A new Community Park is also proposed to be provided to the west of the EMG2 Main Site. The EMG2 Main Site and the Community Park are subject to a Parameters Plan (**Document DCO 2.5**). The EMG2 Main Site is 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. An upgrade to the substation at EMG1 to provide power to the EMG2 Main Site also forms part of the EMG2 Works; and
- Highway Works – new highway infrastructure and works to the existing highways network, principally in relation to Junction 24 of the M1 (referred to as J24 Improvements). This will include a new free-flow link road from the M1 northbound at J24 to the A50 westbound, widening of the A50 eastbound link at J24 and other related works and traffic management measures. The works also comprise other works to the highway network including the EMG2 Access Works, the A6 Kegworth Bypass / A453 junction Improvements, the Hyam's Lane Works, Active Travel Link, Finger Farm Roundabout Improvements and L57 Footpath Upgrade.

Within the MCO Application/MCO Scheme

- EMG1 Works – a maximum of 26,500 sq.m (approximately 285,000 sq.ft) (GIA) of additional warehousing on Plot 16, with an additional 3,500 sq.m allowance in the form of internal mezzanine space. In addition, it is proposed to undertake freight handling and efficiency improvements at the existing rail freight terminal by way of increases to the maximum permitted height of gantry cranes by 4m to 24m overall; together with works to expand the management suite building and public transport

interchange enhancements and a pedestrian crossing. The EMG1 Works are subject to a Parameters Plan (**Document MCO 2.5**)

1.6. Description of reasonable alternatives

- 1.6.1. To satisfy the requirements of Regulation 14(2)(d) and Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, **Chapter 4: Consideration of Alternatives** of this ES (**Document DCO 6.4/MCO 6.4**) includes a description of the reasonable alternatives which have been considered by the Applicant and provides an explanation of why the EMG2 Project and its component parts have been chosen over the considered alternatives taking the effects of the proposed development on the environment into account.

1.7. Factors likely to be significantly affected by the development

- 1.7.1. In accordance with Regulation 10 of the EIA Regulations, an EIA Scoping Request which is provided as **Appendix 1C** to this Chapter (**Document DCO 6.1C/MCO 6.1C**) was submitted on 14 August 2024 to seek the Secretary of State's opinion as to the scope, and level of detail, of the information to be provided in this ES.
- 1.7.2. PINS adopted the Scoping Opinion (**Document DCO 6.1D/MCO 6.1D**) on behalf of the Secretary of State on 24 September 2024 which advised that the areas of potential significance requiring consideration in this ES are:
- Landscape and Visual (including the effects of lighting);
 - Ecology and Biodiversity;
 - Traffic and Transport;
 - Air Quality;
 - Noise and Vibration;
 - Flood Risk and Drainage;
 - Cultural Heritage;
 - Agriculture and Soils;
 - Climate Change;
 - Socio-economic;
 - Materials and Waste;
 - Population and Human Health;
 - Ground Conditions;
 - Material Assets (utilities);
 - Minerals Safeguarding; and
 - Vulnerability to Major Accidents and Disasters.
- 1.7.3. The only matter identified by PINS which has subsequently been scoped out of this assessment is minerals safeguarding. This is a result of additional consultation carried out with the minerals planning authority (Leicestershire County Council) which has resulted in agreement with that authority that all necessary information is now available to be able to conclude that the matter can be fully scoped out. The relevant correspondence is provided as **Appendix 14K** to this Chapter (**Document DCO 6.14K/MCO 6.14K**).
- 1.7.4. The remaining environmental factors have been the subject of an EIA and the findings are reported in **Chapters 5 – 21 (Documents DCO 6.5 - 6.21 / MCO 6.5 – 6.21)** of this ES.

- 1.7.5. The general approach to each Chapter is to set out the scope and methodology employed to carry out the assessment and the policy and legislative context within which the assessment has been prepared.
- 1.7.6. As already explained at Paragraph 1.3.2 above, each Chapter then includes a separate assessment of the DCO Scheme, the MCO Scheme and the EMG2 Project as a whole. The only exceptions to the above standard approach are Chapters 6 and 15 for the reasons previously explained.
- 1.7.7. Each of the assessments then takes into consideration the baseline conditions for each of the environmental factors before identifying the nature, scale and significance of the likely impacts, in terms of positive, neutral and negative (or adverse) effects. The initial assessment of effects in each Chapter takes into account any embedded mitigation included within the EMG2 Project.
- 1.7.8. In relation to negative/adverse effects, each assessment then establishes the significance of such impacts and determines what, if any, additional mitigation measures can be introduced to avoid, prevent, reduce, or offset those effects. Taking the combined embedded and additional mitigation measures into account, each assessment then identifies any residual impacts and determines their significance. These topic-based assessments satisfy the requirements of Regulation 14(2)(b) and 14(2)(c) and Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations.
- 1.7.9. The only exceptions to the general approach above is within is Chapters 6 and 17. This is explained below.
- 1.7.10. **Chapter 6: Traffic and Transportation (Document DCO 6.6/MCO 6.6)** initially excludes the Highway Works mitigation package in its assessment. This is done in order to establish and justify the mitigation that is required from the current highways baseline. The reasons for this are set in the Chapter.
- 1.7.11. As regards **Chapter 17: Population and Human Health (Document DCO 6.17/MCO 6.17)** this includes all mitigation as embedded in line with best practice in undertaking health impact assessments.

1.8. Project Team, Experience and Competence

- 1.8.1. Regulation 14(4)(a) of the EIA Regulations requires that environmental statements are prepared by competent experts and Regulation 14(4)(b) mandates an accompanying statement outlining relevant expertise and qualifications. The Applicant has appointed a team of specialists to undertake the assessment and produce this ES and the supporting technical information. This team comprises of experts in their professional fields and is summarised in **Table 1.4** below:

Table 1.4: SEGRO's Technical Team

Consultant	Discipline and Chapters	Lead Assessor/Author, position and qualifications
Delta Planning	Town Planning/EIA co-ordinators. Lead authors of Chapters 1-4, 21 and 22. NTS.	David Green, Director, BSc (Hons) MRICS MRTPI
Oxalis Planning	DCO Planning expertise. Planning Statement and Design Approach Document.	Ben Holmes, Managing Director, MA BA (Hons) MRTPI
UMC Architects	Masterplanning. Preparation of parameters and illustrative layout plans. Design Approach Document.	Matthew Salanyk, Director, RIBA
BWB	Infrastructure and civils design. Preparation of infrastructure plans and works plans.	Simon Hilditch, Director, MEng (Hons), CEng MICE MCIHT
BWB	Traffic and Transport. Author of Chapter 6 and associated appendices.	Paul Wilson, Director, MCIHT MSoRSA CMILT MInstILM
BWB	Flood risk and drainage. Author of Chapter 13 and associated appendices.	Robin Green, Associate Director, BSc (Hons)
BWB	Materials and Waste. Author of Chapter 18 and associated appendices.	Matthew Wilby, Director, MSc (Hons), BSc (Hons), CEnv, MIEMA
iTP	Sustainable travel. Author of Sustainable Travel Strategy and Framework Travel Plan (Appendices [6[x] and 6[x]])	Stephanie Meyers, Associate Director, BSc (Hons)
Vanguardia	Noise and vibration. Author of Chapter 7.	Chris Goff, Associate, MSc, MIOA
Vanguardia	Air Quality. Author of Chapter 8 and associated appendices.	Simon Grubb, Associate, BSc (Hons), MA, MEnvSc, MIAQM

Consultant	Discipline and Chapters	Lead Assessor/Author, position and qualifications
FPCR	Ecology and Biodiversity. Author of Chapter 9 and associated appendices.	Sam Arthur, Senior Director, BSc (Hons), MSc
FPCR	Landscape and Visual Impacts. Author of Chapter 10 and associated appendices.	Tim Jackson, Senior Director, BA (Hons), DipLA
DFL	Lighting. Author of Chapter 11 and associated appendices.	Daniel Spreadborough, Senior Lighting Engineer, BA (Hons), MSc
RPS	Cultural heritage. Author of Chapter 12 and associated appendices.	Chris Clarke, Senior Associate Director, BSc (Hons) MA MCIfA
RPS	Climate Change. Author of Chapter 19 and associated appendices.	Andrew Tasker, Associate Director MSc, BSc (Hons)
Fairhurst	Site investigation and ground engineering. Author of Chapter 14 and associated appendices.	Dicken Maclean, Principal Geoenvironmental Engineer, BSc, MSc, RSoBRA, CEnv.
LRA	Agricultural soils. Author of Chapter 15 and associated appendices.	Mike Palmer, Director PhD
Utility Connections	Utilities. Author of Chapter 16 and associated appendices.	Daniel Borg, Managing Director
Savills	Socio-economics. Author of Chapter 5 and associated appendices.	Mark Powney, Head of Economics
Savills	Population and human health. Author of Chapter 17 and associated appendices.	Tara Barratt, Associate Director, Environment and Infrastructure, BSc (Hons) MSc (DIC)
Savills	Major Accidents and Disasters. Author of Chapter 20 and associated appendices.	Tom McClure, Associate Director, MIEMA

1.8.2. More details about the expertise of the consultant team and the Lead Assessor/Author for each discipline can be found at **Appendix 1E** to this ES (**Document DCO 6.1E/MCO 6.1E**).

1.9. Methodology and Format of the Assessment

- 1.9.1. This ES has been structured on a topic basis with each of the assessment chapters presented in a common format.
- 1.9.2. To ensure this approach avoids any overlooking of inter-related effects and intra-project cumulative impacts, the ES has been co-ordinated and reviewed by Delta Planning and the specialist team has been closely involved in the interpretation and review of each of the other technical assessments both through joint design team meetings, specific subject workshops and through cross working and review of draft chapters where appropriate. Where such inter-related effects are identified, the matters and receptors affected are identified in the individual chapters and the effects assessed.
- 1.9.3. The EIA has, where possible, been carried out based on a consistent set of impact assessment magnitudes (as defined in **Tables 1.5-1.7** below) and with a consistent approach regarding the duration of impacts (as defined in **Table 1.8** below). Some specific disciplines have their own industry standard approaches and where this is the case it is explained within the individual chapters of this ES.
- 1.9.4. It is nevertheless broadly accepted that the significance of an effect is determined by the relationship between two factors:
- The sensitivity, importance or value of the affected resource or receptor; and
 - The actual change taking place to the environment (i.e. the magnitude or severity of an effect).
- 1.9.5. The sensitivity, importance or value of the resource or receptor is generally based on its relative importance using the scale set out at **Table 1.5** below.

Table 1.5: Methodology for Determining Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Example of Receptor
High	The receptor/resource has little ability to absorb change without fundamentally altering its present character, or is of international or national importance.
Moderate	The receptor/resource has moderate capacity to absorb change without significantly altering its present character, or is of high importance.
Low	The receptor/resource is tolerant of change without detriment to its character, or is of low or local importance

- 1.9.6. The magnitude of an effect is generally described using the terminology set out in **Table 1.6** below.

Table 1.6: Methodology for Assessing Magnitude

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria for Assessing Impact
High	Total loss of or major/substantial alteration to key elements of the baseline (pre-development) conditions such that the post development character/composition/attributes will be fundamentally changed.
Moderate	Loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features of the baseline condition such that post development character/composition/attributes of the baseline will be materially changed.
Low	A minor shift away from baseline conditions. Change arising from the loss/alteration will be discernible/detectable but not material. The underlying character/composition/attributes of the baseline condition will be similar to the pre-development circumstance/situation.
Negligible	Very little change from baseline conditions. Change barely distinguishable, approximating to a 'no change' situation.

- 1.9.7. The significance of an effect is generally determined using the matrix in **Table 1.7** below. The matrix looks at the interaction between receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude. Individual chapters will explain how this approach will be applied to the specific topic concerned and, as referenced in Paragraph 1.9.4 above, some disciplines have their own industry standard approaches as to how the distinction between effects has been applied.

Table 1.7: Effect Significance Matrix

Magnitude	Sensitivity		
	High	Moderate	Low
High	Major Adverse/Beneficial*	Major-Moderate Adverse/Beneficial*	Moderate-Minor Adverse/Beneficial
Moderate	Moderate Adverse/Beneficial*	Moderate-Minor Adverse/Beneficial	Minor Adverse/Beneficial
Low	Moderate-Minor Adverse/Beneficial	Minor Adverse/Beneficial	Minor-Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* These effects are typically considered significant for the purposes of the EIA Regulations, but some variances apply based on individual assessors' judgement as set out in individual topic chapters.

- 1.9.8. The duration of effects is generally defined as in **Table 1.8** below.

Table 1.8: Duration of Impacts

Duration	Definition
Short term	The effects would be of short duration and would not last more than 2-5 years
Medium term	The effects would take 5-15 years to be mitigated
Long term	The effects would be reasonably mitigated over a long period of time (15 years or more)

1.10. Structure of this ES

1.10.1. This ES is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2: Site and Surroundings;
- Chapter 3: Project Description;
- Chapter 4: Consideration of Alternatives;
- Chapter 5: Socio-Economic;
- Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport;
- Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration;
- Chapter 8: Air Quality;
- Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity;
- Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual;
- Chapter 11: Lighting;
- Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage;
- Chapter 13: Flood Risk and Drainage;
- Chapter 14: Ground Conditions;
- Chapter 15: Agriculture and Soils;
- Chapter 16: Utilities;
- Chapter 17: Population and Human Health;
- Chapter 18: Materials and Waste;
- Chapter 19: Climate Change;
- Chapter 20: Major Accidents and Disasters;
- Chapter 21: Cumulative Impacts; and
- Chapter 22: Summary and Conclusions.

1.10.2. The technical appendices for this ES are included as separate documents. A separate Non-Technical Summary is also provided (**Document DCO 6.23/MCO 6.23**).

Table 1.9: Changes introduced by the 2017 EIA Regulations

Revoked 2009 EIA regulation No.	EIA Regulation No.	Description of change
n/a	New Regulation 2 - Review	The Secretary of State must carry out a review of these regulations. The first review was published on 21 May 2022. Subsequent reviews must be published at intervals not exceeding 5 years.
Regulation 3 – Prohibition on granting consent without consideration of environmental information.	Regulation 4 – Prohibition on granting consent without consideration of environmental information.	The original wording in the revoked 2009 EIA regulations mandated the decision maker to take the environmental information into consideration and state in its decision that it has done so. Updated wording in the EIA Regulations prevents the Secretary of State from making an order granting development or subsequent consent unless an EIA has been carried out in respect of that application.
n/a	New Regulation 5 – Environmental impact assessment process	5(2) – The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate matter, the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on the following factors: a) Population and human health; b) Biodiversity; c) Land soil, water, air and climate; d) Material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape; e) The interaction between the factors referred to in sub-paras (a) to (d) 5(3) The EIA must include the operational effects of the proposed development on those factors 5(4) The significant effects to be assessed include, where relevant, the vulnerability of the proposed development to major accidents or disasters
Regulation 6 – Procedure for establishing whether environmental impact assessment is required	Regulation 8 – Procedure for establishing whether environmental impact assessment is required.	The updated wording requires additional information to be provided when asking the Secretary of State to adopt a screening opinion or subsequent screening opinion. 8(3) a person must provide: a. A plan identifying the land; b. A description of the development including (i) the physical characteristics of the whole development, and (ii) a description of the location of the development with particular regard to the environmental sensitivity fo geographical areas likely to be affected; c. A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected; and d. To the extent available, a description of any likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from (i) the expected residues

Revoked 2009 EIA regulation No.	EIA Regulation No.	Description of change
		and emissions and the production of waste, and (ii) the use of natural resources, in particular soil, land, water and biodiversity.
Regulation 7 – Considerations for screening decisions	Regulation 9 – Considerations for screening decisions	<p>Updated wording requires additional matters to be taken into account when deciding whether further information is required in order to determine a subsequent application including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any information provided in accordance with Regulation 8; b) The results of any relevant EU environmental assessment; c) Such of the selection criteria set out in Schedule 3 as are relevant to the development; d) Whether information that was available to the decision-maker when granting development consent has changed; e) Whether new information on the likely environmental effects of the development has become available since granting development consent; f) Whether new information referred to in (d) and (e) is material to the decision as to whether the proposed development is likely to have significant effects on the environment or the particular nature or extent of those effects.
Regulation 10 – Consultation statement requirements	Regulation 12 – Consultation statement requirements	<p>A new definition of "preliminary environmental information" was inserted, meaning information which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) has been compiled by the applicant; and b) is reasonably required for the consultation bodies to develop an informed view of the likely significant environmental effects of the development.
n/a	New Regulation 14 – Environmental Statements	<p>14(2) mandates that an Environmental Statement must as a minimum include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A description of the proposed development comprising information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the development; b) A description of the likely significant effects of the proposed development on the environment; c) A description of features or measures to avoid, prevent or reduce and, if possible, offset likely significant effects on the environment; d) A description of the reasonable alternatives studied and main reasons for the option chosen; e) A non-technical summary of the information in (a) to (d); and

Revoked 2009 EIA regulation No.	EIA Regulation No.	Description of change
		<p>f) Any additional information specified in Schedule 4 (see Table 1.3 above);</p> <p>14(3) the ES must be based on the Scoping Opinion;</p> <p>14(4) the ES must be prepared by competent experts.</p>
n/a	New Regulation 21 – Consideration of whether development consent should be granted	<p>21(1) When deciding whether to grant development consent the Secretary of State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Examine the environmental information; b) Reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment; c) Integrate that conclusion into the decision; and d) If an order is to be made, consider whether it is appropriate to impose monitoring measures. <p>21(3) when considering monitoring the Secretary of State must also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Potential remedial action; b) Take steps to ensure the parameters and duration of monitoring is proportionate; c) Avoid duplication of monitoring where existing monitoring arrangements are carried out in accordance with a separate obligation or law.
Regulation 18 – Subsequent application for EIA Development	Regulation 22 – Subsequent application for EIA Development	The changes introduced by the EIA Regulations permit an Applicant to display its updated ES free of charge on its website and extends the deadline for responses to the notice period from 28 to 30 days.
n/a	New Regulation 25 – Decision making on subsequent applications	<p>25(1) When deciding whether to grant subsequent consent the Secretary of State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Examine the environmental information; b) Reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment; c) Integrate that conclusion into the decision; and d) If subsequent consent is to be granted, consider whether it is appropriate to impose monitoring measures. <p>25(3) when considering monitoring the Secretary of State must also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Potential remedial action; b) Take steps to ensure the parameters and duration of monitoring is proportionate; c) Avoid duplication of monitoring where existing monitoring arrangements are carried out in accordance with a separate obligation or law.

Revoked 2009 EIA regulation No.	EIA Regulation No.	Description of change
n/a	New Regulation 26 – Co-ordination	The Secretary of State must, where appropriate, ensure that the Habitats Regulation Assessment and EIA are co-ordinated
n/a	New Regulation 27 – Availability of copies of environmental statements	The Secretary of State must ensure that the ES is available on the website maintained by or on behalf of the Secretary of State
n/a	New Regulation 30 – Decision notices	This regulation confirms the Secretary of State must provide reasons for the decision and notify the application of their right to challenge the validity of the decision
n/a	New Regulation 33 – Exemptions	Permits the Secretary of State to direct that a proposed development is exempt from the requirements of the EIA Regulations
n/a	New Regulation 35 – Objectivity and bias	Confirms that the Secretary of State and Examining Authority must perform their duties in an objective manner and avoid conflicts of interest