

Document DCO 5.1 / MCO 5.1

Consultation Report

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

Chapter		Page
1.	Executive Summary including Statutory Compliance Overview	6
2.	Introduction including Summary of Key Dates	18
3.	Stage 1 - Engagement/Informal Consultation	27
	Part 1 – DCO Application	27
	Part 2 – MCO Application	33
4.	Stage 2 Consultation: Statement of Community Consultation	35
	Part 1 – DCO Application	35
	Part 2 – MCO Application	40
5.	Stage 2: Duty to Notify the Secretary of State of the Proposed Application under Section 46 of the Act (DCO Application) and Regulation 12 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)	41
	Part 1 – DCO Application	41
	Part 2 – MCO Application	41
6.	Stage 2 Statutory Consultation under Section 42 of the Act (DCO Application) and Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)	43
	Part 1 – DCO Application	43
	Part 2 – MCO Application	49
7.	Stage 2 Consultation under Section 47: Duty to consult the Local Community	54
	Part 1 – DCO Application	54
	Part 2 – MCO Application	66
8.	Stage 2 Consultation: Duty to Publicise under Section 48 and Regulation 14	67
	Part 1 – DCO Application	67
	Part 2 – MCO Application	68
9.	Stage 2 Consultation: Responses received under Section 42 and Regulation 10: Duty to consult and Duty to have regard to responses under S49 and Regulation 15	71
	Part 1 – DCO Application	71
	Part 2 – MCO Application	91

10.	Stage 2 Consultation - Responses received under Section 47: Duty to consult Local Community and Duty to have regard to relevant responses under S49 and Regulation	93
	Part 1 – DCO Application	93
	Part 2 – MCO Application	104
11.	Stage 2 Consultation - Responses received under Section 48 and Regulation 14: Duty to Publicise	109
	Part 1 – DCO Application	109
	Part 2 – MCO Application	109
12.	Stage 3 Non Statutory Additional Consultation	111
13.	Stage 3: Non Statutory Additional Consultation - responses	117
	Part 1 – DCO Application	117
	Part 2 – MCO Application	131
14.	On Going Engagement	133
15.	Pre-Application Guidance – Compliance with Section 50	134
16.	Chapter 16 - Adequacy of Consultation Issues raised by Specific Consultees	166
17.	Conclusions	174
Appendices		Page
Appendix 1 - Example Email to Key Stakeholders dated 21 January 2025		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 2 – Example Email Local and County Ward councillors dated 30 January 2025		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 3 – Example Email Local and County Ward councillors dated 5 February 2025		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 4 – Example Email to Key Stakeholders dated 7 February 2025		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 5 – Draft SoCC		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 6 - Emails sending draft SoCC to NWLDC and LCC		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 7 - Response of NWLDC and LCC to draft SoCC		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 8 - Final SoCC		Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO

	5.1A
Appendix 9 - Scans of Press Notices (Section 47 Notice) publicising Final SoCC	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 10 - Section 46 and Regulation 12 Notice	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 11 - Copy of letter sent to all consultation bodies pursuant to s42, 43 and 44 and Regulation 10 dated 30 January 2025	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 12 – Scans of Press Notices (S48 and Regulation 10 and 14 etc)	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 13 - Response from Planning Inspectorate to S46 Notice	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 14 - Copy of S42 Statutory Consultee list	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 15 - List of Material Consulted upon for Statutory Consultation	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 16 – Statutory Consultation Leaflet	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 17 - List of PILs consulted	Doc DCO 5.1A/MCO 5.1A
Appendix 18 - Site Notices, Maintenance Log, Plan and Photographs	Doc DCO 5.1B/MCO 5.1B
Appendix 19 - Copies of Exhibition Boards	Doc DCO 5.1C/MCO 5.1C
Appendix 20 - Copy of Feedback form for Statutory Consultation	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 21 - Letters to NWLDC and Castle Donington Library depositing Consultation Material	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 22 - Letters to Parish Councils distributing USB sticks	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 23 - Summary of Responses to Statutory Consultation Main Themes Document	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 24 - Summary of individual public consultation responses	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 25 - Example email of 15 May 2025	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 25A – Example of email of 16 June 2025	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 26 - Example email of 26 June 2025	Doc DCO

	5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 27 – Newsletter	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 28 – SEGRO letter of 25 June 2025	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 29 – Additional Consultation Feedback Form	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 30 – List of Material Consulted upon for Additional Consultation	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D
Appendix 31 – Adequacy of Consultation Milestones Document	Doc DCO 5.1D/MCO 5.1D

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY INCLUDING STATUTORY COMPLIANCE OVERVIEW

Introduction

- 1.1 This report has been prepared on behalf of SEGRO Properties Ltd and SEGRO (EMG) Ltd (referred to as '**SEGRO**' or the '**Applicant**') relating to a second phase of East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park to fulfil the requirements of Section 37(3)(c) of the Planning Act 2008 ('the Act') and Regulation 16(2)(l) of the Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 ('2011 Regulations').
- 1.2 The second phase of East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park is referred to in this report as the 'EMG2 Project' or 'the proposed development'. For consistency, this report utilises the same terms as identified in the glossary to the Environmental Statement ('ES') which can be found in **Appendix 1A (Document DCO 6.1A/MCO 6.1A)** of the ES Chapter 1 and provides a full list of the terms used in this Report and their corresponding meanings. The components comprising the EMG2 Project are identified in **Table 4** in the main report which is re-provided in this executive summary for ease of reference:

Table 1: The EMG2 Project Components

Main Component	Summary of Component	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 including relevant Further Works as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). DCO Works Nos. 20 and 21 including relevant Further Works 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	DCO Works Nos. 6 to 19 including relevant Further Works as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).

	Improvements, together with other works.	
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).

- 1.3 A more detailed description of the EMG2 Project and its components can be found in Chapter 3 of the 'ES' submitted with the applications (**Document DCO 6.3/MCO 6.3**).

The Applications and Consultation Context

- 1.4 SEGRO has submitted two concurrent applications to the Planning Inspectorate.

The DCO Application

- 1.5 This DCO application, the applicant for which is SEGRO Properties Limited, is for a Development Consent Order for the DCO Scheme comprising the EMG2 Works and the Highway Works. The DCO Application has been made under section 37 of Part 5 of the Planning Act.
- 1.6 Section 37(3)(c) of the Act states that an application for an order granting development consent must be accompanied by the Consultation Report. This document comprises the Consultation Report for the purposes of Section 37.

The MCO Application

- 1.7 The MCO application, the applicant for which is SEGRO (EMG) Limited, is for a Material Change Order to the existing EMG1 DCO for the MCO Scheme comprising the EMG1 Works. The MCO Application has been submitted under section 153 and Schedule 6 of the Planning Act.
- 1.8 Regulation 16(2)(l) of the 2011 Regulations requires an application for a material change to be accompanied by a Consultation Report. This document comprises the Consultation Report for the purposes of Regulation 16.
- 1.9 Consultation for the MCO Application has been undertaken simultaneously for the EMG2 Project as a whole. Accordingly, this report presents the full scope of consultation activities carried out, providing a comprehensive overview of engagement that has informed both applications but, nonetheless, deals with them as separate applications.

Purpose of this Document

- 1.10 This report summarises the engagement and informal consultation activities undertaken by SEGRO, alongside a detailed account of the statutory and additional non-statutory consultations carried out in relation to the EMG2 Project. It also outlines SEGRO's consideration of, and responses to, the relevant issues and comments raised throughout these consultation stages.
- 1.11 The report demonstrates how SEGRO has fulfilled its duties under section 49 of the Act in respect of the DCO Application and regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations in respect of the MCO Application to "have regard" to consultation responses and publicity.

Consultation Undertaken

- 1.12 A wide range of local and statutory bodies, the local community, landowners, other interested parties and the relevant local planning authorities have been engaged in dialogue which has had a direct influence on the nature and form of the submitted proposals. This dialogue has taken a number of forms of consultation and engagement and has taken place over an extended period of time. This has included engagement/informal consultation about the emerging proposals with a number of bodies and groups throughout 2022-2024 (the "**Stage 1**: Engagement/Informal consultation" – see **Chapter 3** of this Report).
- 1.13 SEGRO has undertaken two 'formal' rounds of consultation, which are explained in detail in this report. In summary these were:
 - 1.13.1 **Stage 2** Statutory Consultation – 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025 (see **Chapters 5-11** of this Report);
 - 1.13.2 **Stage 3** Non-Statutory Additional Consultation – 1 July 2025 to 29 July 2025 (see **Chapters 12 and 13** of this Report).
- 1.14 The consultations were undertaken on the DCO Application and the MCO Application at the same time.
- 1.15 A Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) was drafted following consultation with North West Leicestershire District Council and Leicestershire County Council in December 2024 in advance of the formal statutory consultation process, and consultation was then carried out in accordance with the SoCC.
- 1.16 The statutory consultation with the local community was carried out in accordance with the published Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), except where deviations are identified and explained within this report. In addition, SEGRO prepared an Adequacy of Consultation Milestone report which was submitted to and published on Planning Inspectorate's project webpage on 6 May 2025.
- 1.17 All statutory consultation (under Sections 42, 47 and 48 of the Act and regulations 10 and 14 of the 2011 Regulations) has been carried out in line with the advice and guidance provided by the Planning Inspectorate and the Guidance provided by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.
- 1.18 The Stage 3, non-statutory, Additional Consultation was carried out using the same approach and methods as the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation save that it was not

necessary to place notice of the Stage 3 Non-Statutory Additional Consultation in national or local newspaper and no formal public exhibitions or webinars took place.

Consultation Outcomes

- 1.19 SEGRO's consultation has ensured that the local communities, statutory bodies, landowners and other interested parties have been made aware of and had the opportunity to be actively involved in the evolution of, the development proposals. The consultation process as a whole has made a positive contribution to the proposals, with the input and feedback received from consultees resulting in a number of alterations and modifications which directly influenced the evolution of the EMG2 Project. The process is summarised in this report with relevant detail also provided in the attached appendices.

Compliance Overview

Part 1 - DCO Application

Statutory Compliance

- 1.20 All pre-application consultation has conformed to the statutory requirements, as set out in Section 42, Section 46, Section 47 and Section 48 of the Act where applicable. The table below sets out a summary of compliance with the various statutory requirements with reference to the detail contained in the relevant chapters in this Report.

Table 2 – Statutory Requirements for the DCO Application

Planning Act 2008 (as amended)	Compliance in Consultation Report
42. Duty to consult; including 42(1)(a) prescribed consultees, 42(1)(b) local authorities and 42(1)(d) persons with an interest in the land.	Details of formal consultation under section 42 of the Act with prescribed consultees, local authorities and persons with an interest in the land can be found in Part 1 of Chapter 6, Table 10
45: Timetable for consultation under section 42 with minimum period of 28 days	Details of compliance with s.45 are set out in Part 1 of Chapter 6, Table 10
46. Duty to notify Secretary of State of proposed application (as amended by the Localism Act 2011)	Details of the notification to the Secretary of State can be found in Part 1 of Chapter 5
47. Duty to Consult the Local Community	Details of compliance with s.47 can be found in Chapters 4 and 7
48. Duty to publicise	Details of publicity under section 48 of the Act can be found in Part 1 of Chapter 8
49. Duty to take account of responses to consultation and publicity	Responses received under section 42 have been collected and the explanation of SEGRO's regard to those is contained in Part 1 of Chapter 9, Table 15 Responses received under section 47 have been collected and the explanation of

Planning Act 2008 (as amended)	Compliance in Consultation Report
	SEGRO's regard to those is contained in Part 1 of Chapter 10, Table 18 Chapter 11 of the Consultation Report explains that it is not clear whether any of the responses were sent as a result of having seen the section 48 notice. That cannot be easily ascertained, unless a respondent had decided to express that they were responding specifically as a result of having seen the section 48 notice in the newspaper. No respondent specifically referred to the section 48 notice. Accordingly, all responses have been considered in Chapters 9 and 10 of the Consultation Report
50. Duty to have regard to guidance issued under this section	Chapter 15 sets out how guidance on pre-application consultation issued by the Secretary of State has been had regard to by the Applicant Chapter 15 also sets out how the pre-application advice from the Planning Inspectorate under s.51 has been had regard to

- 1.21 In addition, **Chapter 3** sets out the early informal engagement/consultation and Chapters **12 and 13** set out the non-statutory consultation that was undertaken following the statutory consultation.

Part 2 - MCO Application

Statutory Compliance

Table 3 – Statutory Requirements for the MCO Application

Regulations 10, 11, 12 and 14 of the 2011 Regulations.	Compliance in Consultation Report
10 - Duty to Consult (a) each person who may be directly affected by the changes proposed in the application; (b) each person who has the benefit of the development consent order to which the application relates, unless that person is also the applicant; (c) any other person or authority who does not fall within paragraph (a) and is— (i) prescribed; (ii) a relevant local authority;	Details of formal consultation under Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations can be found in Part 2 of Chapter 6

Regulations 10, 11, 12 and 14 of the 2011 Regulations.	Compliance in Consultation Report
(iii) a person who is within one or more of the categories set out in section 44; (f) any other person the Secretary of State considers should be consulted.	
11 - Timetable for consultation under regulation 10 The applicant must notify the person of the deadline for the receipt of the person's response to the consultation, and the deadline must not be earlier than the end of the period of 28 days that begins with the day after the day on which the person receives the consultation documents.	The consultation carried out under Regulation 10 notified the consultees of the deadline for receipt of responses as set out in Part 2 of Chapter 6
12 - Duty to notify appropriate authority of proposed application (1) The applicant must supply the Secretary of State with such information in relation to the proposed application as the applicant would supply to the Secretary of State for the purpose of complying with regulation 10 if the applicant were required by that regulation to consult the Secretary of State about the proposed application. (2) The applicant must comply with paragraph (1) on or before commencing consultation under regulation 10.	Details of the notification to the Secretary of State can be found in Part 2 of Chapter 5
14 - Publicising a proposed application	Details of publicity under Reg 14 of the 2011 Regulations can be found in Part 2 of Chapter 8
15 - Duty to take account of responses to consultation and publicity	Responses received under Regulation 10 have been collected and the explanation of SEGRO's regard to those is contained in Part 2 of Chapter 9 Responses from the Local Community have been considered also since the MCO application was subject to the same publicity as was required under s.47 for the DCO Application. Those responses are considered in Part 2 of Chapter 10 Chapter 11 explains that it is not clear whether any of the responses were sent as a result of having seen the Regulation 14 notice. That cannot be easily ascertained, unless a responder had decided to express that they were responding specifically as a result of having seen the Regulation 14 notice in the newspaper. No responder

Regulations 10, 11, 12 and 14 of the 2011 Regulations.	Compliance in Consultation Report
	specifically referred to the Regulation 14 notice. Accordingly, all comments have been considered in Part 2 of Chapter 9 and Part 2 of Chapter 10

- 1.22 **Chapter 15** sets out how pre-application guidance issued by the Secretary of State in relation to DCO applications has been had regard to. It also sets out how Planning Inspectorate advice issued by the Planning Inspectorate under s.51, which considered both applications, has been had regard to.

Conclusion on Statutory Compliance

- 1.23 SEGRO is satisfied that the consultation undertaken has fully complied with the requirements for pre-application consultation and the duty to have regard to relevant responses pursuant to the Act and 2011 Regulations.
- 1.24 The statutory consultation undertaken was in line with the advice and guidance provided by the Planning Inspectorate and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and in accordance with the SoCC except where deviations are identified and explained within this report (the sole deviation being a postal failure which was quickly rectified).
- 1.25 The Stage 3 Non-Statutory Additional Consultation was carried out using the same approach and methods as the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation save that it was not necessary to place notice of the Stage 3 Non-Statutory Additional Consultation in national or local newspaper and no formal public exhibitions or webinars took place.
- 1.26 SEGRO is satisfied that the matters raised by consultees have been duly considered and addressed throughout the development of the proposals. The design has evolved through an iterative process, shaped by both consultation feedback and the outcomes of technical and assessment work. A wide range of local residents, landowners and representative organisations have actively participated in the consultation, and their comments have been acknowledged and are summarised within this report.

Report Structure

- 1.27 The remainder of this report is set out as follows: -

Chapter 2 - Introduction Including Summary of Key Dates

Describes the development proposals applied for under the DCO Application and the MCO Application, describes the land affected and sets out a summary of Key Dates

Chapter 3 – Stage 1: Engagement/Informal Consultation

Part 1 – DCO Application

Details the pre-consultation engagement SEGRO undertook prior to commencing statutory consultation on the DCO Application.

Part 2 - MCO Application

Comments on the pre-consultation engagement SEGRO undertook prior to commencing statutory consultation on the MCO Application.

Chapter 4 – Stage 2: Statutory Consultation: Statement of Community Consultation

Part 1 – DCO Application

Describes the process followed in developing, consulting on and publishing the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) for the Stage 2 Consultation.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Confirms that a SoCC is not a formal requirement of the MCO Application but that nonetheless the consultation on the MCO Application has been undertaken in accordance with the process set out in the SoCC published for the DCO Application.

Chapter 5 - Duty to notify the Secretary of State of the Proposed Application under Section 46 of the Act (DCO Application) and Regulation 12 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)

Part 1 – DCO Application

Details the compliance with the requirements of Section 46.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Details the compliance with the requirements of Regulation 12.

Chapter 6 – Stage 2 Statutory Consultation under Section 42 of the Act (DCO Application) and Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)

Part 1 – DCO Application

Details how consultation under Section 42 of the Act was undertaken with statutory consultees including prescribed consultees, Persons with Interest in the Land (PILs) and relevant local authorities between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Details how consultation was undertaken with the consultees required to be consulted under Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025.

Chapter 7 – Stage 2 Statutory Consultation under Section 47: Duty to Consult the Local Community

Part 1 – DCO Application

Details how consultation under section 47 of the Act was undertaken with the local community as part of the Stage 2 Consultation between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Confirms that whilst section 47 does not apply to the MCO, nonetheless the MCO was consulted upon as if it did as a means to enable consultation with the local community on the MCO application.

Chapter 8 – Stage 2 Statutory Consultation: Publicity under Section 48 of the Act (DCO Application) and Regulation 14 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)

Part 1 – DCO Application

Provides details of the publicity undertaken in respect of section 48 of the Act.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Provides details of the publicity undertaken in respect of Regulation 14 of the 2011 Regulations.

Chapter 9 – Stage 2 Statutory Consultation: Responses received under Section 42 of the Act (DCO Application) and Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application) and Duty to have regard to responses under Section 49 (DCO Application) and Regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)

Part 1 – DCO Application

Provides a summary of the representations received under section 42 of the Act and how SEGRO has had regard to these in the development of the proposed development.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Provides a summary of the representations received under Regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations and how SEGRO has had regard to these in the development of the proposed development.

Chapter 10 – Stage 2 Statutory Consultation: Responses received under Section 47 and Duty to have regard to responses under Section 49 (DCO Application) and Regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)

Part 1 – DCO Application

Provides a summary of the representations received under section 47 of the Act and how SEGRO has had regard to these in the development of the proposed development pursuant to Section 49 of the Act.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Provides a summary of the representations received relevant to the MCO Application under section 47 of the Act relevant to the MCO Application and how SEGRO has had regard to these in the development of the proposed development pursuant to Regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations.

Chapter 11 – Stage 2 Statutory Consultation: Responses received under Section 48 (DCO Application) and Regulation 14 of the 2011 Regulations (MCO Application)

Part 1 DCO Application

Refers to any representations received in response to publicity under section 48 of the Act.

Part 2 MCO Application

Refers to any representations received in response to publicity under Regulation 14.

Chapter 12 – Stage 3 Non Statutory Additional Consultation

Details the additional, non-statutory consultation between 1 July 2025 and 29 July 2025 on updated information and scheme changes following further technical work and consideration of the Stage 2 Consultation feedback. The consultation exercise applied to both the DCO Application and the MCO Application.

Chapter 13 – Stage 3 Non Statutory Additional Consultation Responses

Part 1 – DCO Application

Provides a summary of the representations received to the Stage 3 Consultation and how SEGRO has had regard to these in the development of the proposed development.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Provides a summary of any representations received to the Stage 3 Consultation which were specific to the MCO Application and how SEGRO has had regard to these.

Chapter 14 – Ongoing engagement

SEGRO has continued to engage with consultees after the statutory consultation in order to ensure all issues raised as part of the statutory consultation have been considered properly. This chapter refers to this engagement.

Chapter 15 – Pre-Application Guidance: Compliance with Sections 50 and 51 of the Act

Provides tabular summaries of:

Compliance with the pre-application guidance issued by the Secretary of State (Section 50); and

Response to advice provided by the Planning Inspectorate throughout the pre-application period (Section 51).

Chapter 16 - Adequacy of Consultation: Issues Raised by Specific Consultees

Provides a response to specific issues raised by some consultees regarding the adequacy of the consultation.

Chapter 17 – Conclusions

Part 1 – DCO Application

Concludes on the effectiveness of the consultation, in raising awareness of the DCO Scheme and securing feedback that has helped develop the DCO Application.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Concludes on the effectiveness of the consultation, in raising awareness of the MCO Scheme and securing feedback that has helped develop the MCO Application.

Defined terms

- 1.28 A full glossary of terms used in this Consultation Report is at Appendix 1 to the Guide to the Application (**Document DCO 1.3**). However, some of the key terms used throughout this Report are provided below for ease of reference and understanding:

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).

Term	Meaning
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).
Further Works	The works described as further works in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1) being works which may be required to facilitate Works Nos. 1 to 21 as set out in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO and which form part of the authorised development.
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).
LCC	Leicestershire County Council
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.
NH	National Highways
NWLDC	North West Leicestershire District Council
PILs	Persons with Interest in Land
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).

2 INTRODUCTION INCLUDING SUMMARY OF KEY DATES

Background

- 2.1 This report comprises the Consultation Reports required under Section 37 of the Act in relation to the DCO Application and Regulation 16(2)(l) of the Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 (2011 Regulations) in relation to the MCO Application.
- 2.2 For clarity and ease of reference, the DCO Application and the MCO application are dealt with separately where helpful in the relevant Chapters of this report. The applications together comprise the EMG2 Project.
- 2.3 The components of the EMG2 Project are identified in **Table 4** below (replicates Table 1 of the Executive Summary):

Table 4: The EMG2 Project Components

Main Component	Summary of Component	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 including relevant Further Works as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1). DCO Works Nos. 20 and 21 including relevant Further Works 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 including relevant Further Works 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	MCO Works Nos. 3A, 3B, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A and 8A in the draft MCO (Document MCO 3.1).

Main Component	Summary of Component	Works Nos.
	transport interchange, site management building and the EMG1 Pedestrian Crossing.	

- 2.4 A more detailed description of the EMG2 Project and its components can be found in Chapter 3 of the 'ES' submitted with the applications (**Document DCO 6.3/MCO 6.3**). The different components are also identified on the Components Plan (**Document DCO 2.7/MCO 2.7**).

DCO Application

- 2.5 The DCO Application is for the EMG2 Works and the Highway Works components, both described in **Table 4** above.
- 2.6 The DCO Application is made pursuant to section 37 of Part 5 of the Planning Act 2008 ("the Act").

MCO Application

- 2.7 The MCO Application is for the EMG1 Works component described in **Table 4** above.
- 2.8 The MCO Application is made pursuant to section 153 and schedule 6 of the PA 2008 and the 2011 Regulations.

Site Location

DCO Application Site - EMG2 works and Highways Works

EMG2 Main Site

- 2.9 The EMG2 Main Site comprises land immediately south of EMA and to the east of the village of Diseworth. It is located immediately west/north-west of J23A of the M1 motorway and approximately 3 km south of J24.
- 2.10 The EMG2 Main Site extends to approximately 87.6ha and currently comprises undeveloped, predominantly arable, land with hedgerows and trees dividing the various fields. The topography is generally sloping towards the south and overall has a significant fall of approximately 35m from its north eastern boundary to its south eastern boundary. An unclassified single track road with an unbound gravel surface, known as Hyam's Lane, bisects the EMG2 Main Site from south-west to north-east. It is bound by hedgerows to both sides. A public right of way (footpath references L45/L46) generally follows the route of Hyam's Lane. There are overhead power cables crossing the western fields in a north to south direction and there is also a drain to the south-east.
- 2.11 The EMG2 Main Site is bound to the north by Ashby Road (A453) with EMA beyond. Donington Park Motorway Services Area and a small copse of trees is located immediately adjacent to the north-east. Wooded areas and an area of mixed scrub surround the services and boundary to the east. To the south-east lies the A42 and the M1, parts of the strategic road network. To the south is Long Holden, another unclassified road which stops at the A42 boundary to the east. To the south-west is the village of Diseworth. The historic core of Diseworth is designated as a conservation area and includes individually listed buildings.

- 2.12 The surrounding context to the EMG2 Main Site is heavily influenced to the north and east by the existing commercial development including the Airport and associated infrastructure, the motorway services and Pegasus Business Park. To the south and east the context is more rural except for the urbanising influence of the A42 to the south east.

The Community Park

- 2.13 The land for the community park extends to approximately 14.3ha and currently comprises undeveloped, predominantly arable, land with hedgerows and trees dividing the various fields. It is located immediately to the west of the EMG2 Main Site and east of Diseworth.

The Sub-Station

- 2.14 The DCO Application also includes a small pocket of land of 1,576 sq. m within the existing EMG1 site which is presently occupied by a sub-station compound and adjoining amenity grassland.

Highway Works

- 2.15 The principal areas of land required for the Highways Works are:
- 2.15.1 Along a section of the M1 motorway northbound between J23A and J24, alongside the northbound off-slip to J24 and the A50 where it connects with J24. This section of the M1 comprises a dual, four lane carriageway with hard shoulders and a central reservation and adjoining areas of landscaping.
 - 2.15.2 Along the A50 / M1 southbound link to J24. This section currently provides two lanes of traffic within the weaving section to J24.
 - 2.15.3 Along the A50 westbound link from J24. This has two lanes of traffic and further north joins with the link from the M1 southbound from J24A to then form the A50 dual three lane carriageway.
- 2.16 Other areas of land affected by the Highway Works are within the existing public highway on the western side of M1 J24, around the access to the EMG2 Main Site on the A453 and the existing access to EMG1 on the A453.
- 2.17 The Highway Works are primarily focused on the strategic highway network which is managed and maintained by a Strategic Highway Company on behalf of the Secretary of State (National Highways). The Highway Works include improvements to the local highway and active travel networks managed and maintained by the Local Highway Authority (Leicestershire County Council). The full extent of the Highway Works and the breakdown between the strategic, local and active travel networks is depicted on the plan at Appendix 21 of the Transport Assessment included with the ES at **Document DCO 6.6A/MCO 6.6A**.

MCO Application Site - EMG1 Works

- 2.18 The EMG2 Project includes the EMG1 Works which are on land within part of the EMG1 site which has the benefit of the EMG1 DCO. Specifically, it includes:
- 2.18.1 Operational land within the rail-freight terminal where higher gantry cranes are proposed than those already permitted (but yet to be constructed) under the EMG1 DCO;

- 2.18.2 An area of open ground adjoining the rail freight terminal which was utilised during the construction of EMG1 for temporary surface water storage ponds whilst drainage works were completed. These became redundant once the drainage works were completed and have been removed. This area of land extends to 6.08 ha and is currently unused. It is referred to as Plot 16; and
- 2.18.3 Operational land and small areas of landscaping within and adjacent to the existing public transport interchange and site management building at the EMG1 site entrance, together with a small strip of amenity grass along the internal access road to Plot 16.

Purpose of the Report

- 2.19 In accordance with section 37(3)(c) of the Act for the DCO Application and regulation 16(2)(l) for the MCO Application, this document comprises the Consultation Report and details all pre-application consultation for the EMG2 Project.
- 2.20 This report summarises the engagement and informal consultation activities undertaken by SEGRO, alongside a detailed account of the statutory and additional non-statutory consultations carried out in relation to the EMG2 Project. It also outlines SEGRO's consideration of, and responses to, the relevant issues and comments raised throughout these consultation stages.
- 2.21 The report demonstrates how SEGRO has fulfilled its duties under section 49 of the Act in respect of the DCO Application and regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations in respect of the MCO Application to have regard to responses to consultation and publicity.

Summary of Dates

- 2.22 The table below provides a summary of key dates relating to consultation on the proposed development.

Table 5 - Consultation Undertaken on the EMG2 Project – Summary of Key Dates

Consultation Stage	Consultation	Start Date	DCO	MCO	End Date
Stage 1 – Engagement/Informal Consultation	Ongoing pre-consultation engagement with landowners and other key stakeholders including local authorities and parish councils	2020	Y	Y (2024)	2025
	NWLDC EIA Scoping Opinion issued for the EMG2 Main Site pursuant to the town and country planning process	02.12.22	Y	N/A	N/A
	Section 35 Direction pursuant to the PA 2008 confirming that the proposed development of the EMG2 Main Site as being 'a project of national significance'	21.02.24	Y	N/A	N/A
	Application made to Planning Inspectorate for an EIA Scoping Opinion	13.08.24	Y	N/A	N/A
	Planning Inspectorate EIA Scoping Opinion Issued	24.09.24	Y	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 – Statutory Consultation 3 February 2025 to 17 March 2025	Consultation with local authorities on Draft Statement of Community Consultation	18.10.24	Y	N/A	18.11.24
	Statement of Community Consultation published on website	18.12.24	Y	N/A	N/A
	S47 notice of Statement of Community Consultation published in three regional and one local newspaper:		Y	N/A	N/A
	Nottingham Post Leicester Mercury Derby Telegraph Loughborough Echo	18.12.24 18.12.24 18.12.24 25.12.24			
	Email to key stakeholders	21.01.25	Y	Y	N/A

Consultation Stage	Consultation	Start Date	DCO	MCO	End Date
	Notification to the Secretary of State under S46/Reg 12	31.01.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Leaflets issued by email to Councillors at North West Leicestershire District Council and Leicestershire County Council giving advance notice of the Public Consultation being undertaken in February and March 2025, setting out the key components of the EMG2 Project and directing readers to the further draft plans/documents on the project website and the location of hard copies of the material.	30.1.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Issue of information to consultees under s42/Reg 14	30.01.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Issue of leaflets to members of the public in the Core Consultation Area by Royal Mail	22.01.25	Y	Y	N/A
	First Notice (in local and national newspapers) publicising the proposals under Section 48: - The Times (National) London Gazette (National) Nottingham Post Leicester Mercury Derby Telegraph Loughborough Echo	31.01.25 31.01.25 31.01.25 31.01.25 31.01.25 05.02.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Site Notices erected	03.02.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Emails to Ward Councillors (District and County) informing recipients of the proposed public exhibitions on 10 February 2025 and 25 February 2025 and inviting Ward Councillors to attend the exhibitions on a private basis one hour before the exhibitions opened to enable an opportunity to view the exhibition and ask questions	05.02.25	Y	Y	N/A

Consultation Stage	Consultation	Start Date	DCO	MCO	End Date
	of SEGRO and its consultant team.				
	Email to additional key stakeholders	07.02.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Second Notice (in local newspapers) publicising the proposals under Section 48: - Nottingham Post Leicester Mercury Derby Telegraph Loughborough Echo	07.02.25 07.02.25 07.02.25 12.02.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Site Notices checked/maintained	11.02.25, 18.02.25, 25.02.25, 03.03.25, 11.03.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Exhibitions held at the following locations and following times: 10 February 2025:- Diseworth Village Hall, Hall Gate, Diseworth, DE74 2QJ, 3-7pm 25 February 2025: - Hilton East Midlands Airport, M1, Junction 24, Derby Road, Derby, DE74 2YZ, 3-7pm	10.2.25	Y	Y	25.2.25
	4 March 2025: Webinar 6-7.30pm	04.03.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Deadline for the receipt of responses to Stage 2 Consultation under Section 42, 47 and 48 of Act and Reg 10	17.03.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Consultation Main Themes Document published on	01.05.25	Y	Y	N/A

Consultation Stage	Consultation	Start Date	DCO	MCO	End Date
	SEGRO's website				
	Adequacy of Consultation Milestones Published/sent to the Planning Inspectorate	06.05.25	Y	Y	N/A
Stage 3 – Additional Consultation 1 July 2025 to 29 July 2025	Emails to key stakeholders advising of the decision to hold the Non-Statutory Additional Consultation (with precise dates to be advised).	15.05.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Emails to key stakeholders advising of the dates of the Non-Statutory Additional Consultation	16.06.25			
	Follow up emails to District, County and Parish Councillors and Protect in a form identical to the 16 June email reiterating the dates of the Non-Statutory Additional Consultation.	26.06.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Site Notices Erected	27.06.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Newsletter Including project update and advertising additional consultation on scheme changes and further technical information posted on website and sent to landowners in book of reference and Statutory Consultees.	30.06.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Issue of newsletter to members of the public in the Core Consultation Area by Royal Mail	24.06.25	Y	Y	N/A
	Stage 3 Consultation Period	01.07.25	Y	Y	29.07.25
	Site Notices Checked/Maintained	07.07.25	Y	Y	N/A
Ongoing Engagement	SEGRO meetings with key stakeholders and local community	Ongoing	Y	Y	N/A

Consultation Stage	Consultation	Start Date	DCO	MCO	End Date
	SEGRO Consultants liaising with statutory consultees and other parties				

3 STAGE 1 – ENGAGEMENT/INFORMAL CONSULTATION

Part 1 – DCO Application

Introduction and Overview

- 3.1 SEGRO engaged with local and statutory groups and bodies from an early stage, which has had a direct influence on the nature and form of the submitted proposals. This dialogue has taken several forms and has taken place over an extended period. It commenced with some interested parties, such as the main landowners, in 2020 and with other key stakeholders, such as local authorities, in 2022.
- 3.2 Pre-statutory informal engagement and consultation was initially conducted in anticipation of a conventional planning application for the EMG2 Main Site. However, as the planning strategy and scope and scale of the scheme evolved, SEGRO was keen to ensure that it could acquire the necessary powers to enable swift delivery of the scheme following authorisation and also to achieve certainty on timeframes. This was particularly important in view of the designation of the site as a Freeport in 2022 and the subsequent establishment of the Freeport Board.
- 3.3 Accordingly, on 22 January 2024, SEGRO applied to the Secretary of State for a Section 35 Direction to establish whether the proposal centred around the EMG2 Main Site could be treated as a project of national significance and authorised by a Development Consent Order. The Secretary of State made the Section 35 Direction in February 2024.
- 3.4 In March 2022 a Transport Working Group was established with National Highways and Local Highway Authorities which has met on a monthly basis since April 2022. At a relatively early stage it became apparent that the highway mitigation for the s.35 proposal would meet the criteria in s.22 of the Planning Act 2008 and would require to be authorised by a DCO. Accordingly, the DCO Application includes both the proposals subject to the s.35 Direction and a Highway NSIP.
- 3.5 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 scheme, cannot be considered as associated development as part of the DCO Application and are required to be authorised by a change to the existing EMG1 DCO. This gave rise to the need for an application for a material change to the EMG1 DCO.
- 3.6 The engagement has continued on the EMG2 Project as a whole, but with the component parts of the two applications (DCO and MCO) being separately identified. The MCO Application is submitted on behalf of Segro (EMG) Ltd, being the undertaker for the EMG1 DCO with the right to make the application. The DCO is submitted on behalf of Segro Properties Limited who applied for the s.35 Direction.

Early Engagement

- 3.7 As advised above, initially the proposals were being promoted as a planning application under the Town and Country planning regime. At that stage the proposals focused on the land now identified as the EMG2 Main Site, the Community Park and highways local to the site. Informal engagement and consultation on those proposals began with

landowners in 2020 and other key stakeholders in early 2022. **Table 6** and text below provides details of that early engagement.

- 3.8 The early informal dialogue and engagement with various bodies was explicitly in the context of a potential allocation in the emerging Local Plan and the Freeport designation of the land comprising the EMG2 Main Site and Community Park, and the opportunity (if not an imperative) this created for the EMG2 Main Site to be brought forward for development. North West Leicestershire District Council, within whose district the proposals are situate, have been progressing a new Local Plan during this period. SEGRO made representations in response to consultation on early versions of that Local Plan, some jointly with Manchester Airport Group (East Midlands Airport) with regard to the allocation of the site for development.
- 3.9 Following early dialogue, and as an early action in beginning to prepare a planning application, in May 2022 SEGRO requested a formal Environmental Impact Assessment ('EIA') Scoping Opinion from NWLDC. SEGRO later sought formal pre-application consultation and advice from NWLDC by email on 14 June 2022.
- 3.10 An EIA Scoping Opinion was provided by NWLDC in December 2022 having consulted with a wide range of consultees (statutory and local consultees and interested bodies). Following that Scoping Opinion, SEGRO team continued to progress the draft proposals, with ongoing pre-application dialogue with NWLDC, and with all relevant other consultees as they progressed work to undertake the EIA.
- 3.11 As referred to above, a Transport Working Group ('TWG') commenced work in April 2022 in the context of the anticipated planning application. The TWG has met monthly since its inception and comprises local and national highways bodies and their consultants (National Highways, Leicestershire CC, Nottinghamshire CC, Derbyshire CC, Leicester City Council, Nottingham City Council and Derby City Council).
- 3.12 The TWG was initially set up to provide technical input and scrutiny of the work to prepare a Transport Assessment ('TA') as part of a planning application. It has been a key source of engagement on technical highways matters including methodology, data and assumptions to underpin the TA which forms part of the DCO and MCO applications.
- 3.13 Informal pre-application dialogue and engagement continued after the issue of the s.35 Direction, as did the dialogue with NWLDC who remain an important consultee, and source of direction and information regarding local issues, concerns and priorities.
- 3.14 The awareness generated, and feedback received, together with the technical work undertaken to progress the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Transport Assessment (TA) for the then envisaged planning application, played a key role in shaping the current proposals. This process provided a clear understanding of several important local issues and community concerns regarding the potential impacts of development at this location, which directly informed the evolution of the EMG2 Project, as set out later in this chapter.
- 3.15 A request for a Scoping Opinion was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in August 2024. As part of that process, consultees were consulted again and provided comments to the Planning Inspectorate to inform its Scoping Opinion. The Scoping Opinion was issued on 24 September 2024.
- 3.16 **Table 6**, and the text which follows it, provides a summary of the engagement prior to statutory consultation and the consequent evolution of the proposals. Reference is

made only to the principal meetings and actions. Some of the meetings were by Teams. In addition, there was informal contact and liaison with the stakeholders referred to and a wider range of other parties by way of email exchanges and telephone calls.

Table 6 – Summary of Engagement 2020 - January 2025

Party engaged with	Action	Date
Local Authorities		
North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC)	Meetings with Officers	2022 25 February 10 March 27 April 25 November 2023 5 April 2024 9 August 8 September 13 December
NWLDC	Meetings with individual District Councillors	April 2022
NWLDC	Planning Performance Agreement completed	18 September 2024
Leicestershire County Council (LCC)	Meetings with officers (in addition to TWG meetings)	2022 22 April 5 May 6 May 9 August 2024 11 November 2024
LCC	Planning Performance Agreement completed	11 December 2024
Transport Working Group	Meetings	Every month since April 2022
Persons with Interest in the Land		
Manchester Airport Group (MAG) - owners of part of the EMG2 Main Site	Discussions began with MAG in February of 2020 and progressed with detailed discussions on a regular basis and it was thought were proceeding to a satisfactory conclusion until August 2024 when MAG advised SEGRO that it had decided to proceed with development on its land with another development partner,	2020 ongoing

Party engaged with	Action	Date
	Prologis Developments Ltd (Prologis). SEGRO have pursued engagement with MAG regarding other land affected and protective provisions in respect of EMA	
Messrs Jarrom – then owners of part of the EMG2 Main Site	Discussions began with Messrs Jarrom in early 2020 and were progressing. Segro were then advised on 30 October 2024 by Messrs Jarrom that they had sold their land to Prologis.	September 2020 to October 2024
Prologis – now owner of part of the land to the north of Hyam's Lane in the EMG2 Main Site (previously Messrs Jarrom) and have the benefit of an option over the part of the land to the north of Hyam's Lane in the EMG2 Main Site owned by MAG.	Prologis acquired its interests in the EMG2 Main Site in October 2024. SEGRO approached Prologis to discuss its interest in November 2024 and has pursued discussions with Prologis on a regular basis since that date. Discussions have taken place and are ongoing.	November 2024 ongoing.
Messrs Aldridge – owners of land to the south of Hyam's Lane in the EMG2 Main Site of the land affected by the proposed development	Discussions began with Messrs Aldridge in 2019 and were progressed with initial agreement being reached in 2020 with a subsequent variation agreed in 2023.	2019 - 2023
Moto – owner of part of the land on the EMG2 Main Site	Discussions began with Moto in 2024 and are ongoing.	2024, ongoing
Engagement with Parish Councils		
Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council	Meetings to discuss issues of concern as requested.	March 2024
Castle Donington Parish Council	Ongoing discussions regarding the upgrading of Footpath L57	Since 2023
Statutory Bodies		
Liaison with statutory consultees on technical matters as identified in the Environmental Statement (in addition to the TWG)	The Applicant's consultants liaised with technical bodies on a regular basis to inform their assessment of, and input into, the evolution of the proposals.	From 2022 and ongoing

Party engaged with	Action	Date
Other Stakeholders		
EMG1 Community Liaison Group	This group meets regularly following the approval of the EMG1 DCO in 2016. It includes representatives from local authorities, Parish Councils (including Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council and Castle Donington Parish Council) and occupiers of EMG1. The group has been briefed from time to time at its meetings regarding the EMG2 proposals.	Ongoing
Protect Diseworth	Briefing by SEGRO Meeting to discuss consultation comments and issues	19 November 2024 Ongoing
Long Whatton and Diseworth Flood Working Group	Meeting between SEGRO's Drainage and Flood Risk Consultant to discuss the work to date and emerging drainage strategy and mitigation including local effects and betterment opportunities	31 January 2025
Engagement with occupiers of nearby EMG1	Occupiers have been apprised off and kept up to date regarding the proposals on an ongoing basis	Ongoing
Maritime (operators of the EMG1 Rail Terminal)	Regular meetings	Ongoing
Bus Operators (Trenchbarton, Kinchbus, Diamond Bus and Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts Bus))	SEGRO's consultants have had regular engagement with Bus Operators. Meetings with individual operators	2022 onwards 24 June 2022 25 April 2024 28 June 2024 7 August 2024 9 August 2024
Freeport – the Freeport Board became fully operational in March 2023	There has been regular engagement with the Freeport Board over the progress of the proposals and the applications which is ongoing.	Ongoing
East Midlands Development Co	Briefing	10 May 2022
Midlands Engine	Briefing and visit to site	24 May 2022

Party engaged with	Action	Date
	Follow up meeting	30 June 2022
Members of Parliament		
Amanda Hack MP for North West Leicestershire	Briefing	12 March 2024
Lillian Greenwood MP Minister for Future of Roads	Briefing	25 July 2024
Mayor for East Midlands		
Claire Ward	Briefing	Summer 2024

Scheme evolution during and in response to informal engagement

- 3.17 The engagement which took place over the several years prior to the formal statutory consultation influenced the evolution of the scheme. This is particularly the case in respect of the proposals for the EMG2 Main Site and the Highway Works.
- 3.18 The Design Approach Document (DAD) (**Document DCO 5.3**) explains the evolution of the proposals for the EMG2 Main Site in Section 3. It includes the different versions of the proposals for the EMG Main Site, including the first Original Concept Masterplan in 2019 and further iterations in 2022, 2023, 2024 and the version consulted upon in the 2025 statutory consultation.
- 3.19 The DAD explains the iterations of the Masterplan, and this includes changes to the proposals which were influenced by the informal engagement which had taken place. The main changes as a result of the informal consultation were:
- 3.19.1 the early introduction of a bus interchange in the north-east of the site to replicate the success of such a terminal at EMG1 in a location which would maximise use by bus operators
 - 3.19.2 the widening of the buffer space at the western edge of the site and reduction of adjacent development zones to reduce the impact on Diseworth. The buffer space was progressively widened and floorspace reduced in successive plans in response to the concerns of Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council and Protect Diseworth
 - 3.19.3 the introduction in 2024 of an HGV parking area in response to concerns from consultees regarding existing problems of HGV parking in the area
 - 3.19.4 the introduction of no build zones within plots
 - 3.19.5 the addition of an amenity building within the HGV parking area.
- 3.20 The highway proposals evolved in response to discussions with National Highways. As a result of those discussions it became clear that there was an opportunity, as part of appropriately mitigating the traffic impact from the EMG2 Main Site, for that mitigation to be a helpful contribution to addressing long standing issues concerning the operation of J24 of the M1 and the need for that junction to accommodate further planned growth in the vicinity of it. This is with any further improvements by other parties to

accommodate further growth being additional to, not in replacement of, that provided for the EMG2 Main Site.

- 3.21 The highway proposals have been subject to input from the TWG throughout their evolution and that input is ongoing, as detailed in the Transport Assessment (**Document DCO 6.6A/MCO 6.6A**). The Highway Works Design Approach Document (Appendix 1 to the DAD (**Document DCO 5.3A**)) also sets out the various influences on the highway design.

Advance notice of statutory consultation

- 3.22 Prior to the formal Stage 2 statutory consultation, and formal notice of it, emails dated 21 January 2025 were sent to key stakeholders including Parish Clerks, landowners, occupiers of EMG1, the East Midlands Freeport, NWLDC, LCC, the Mayor of the East Midlands and local MP's giving details of dates and other details (website and exhibition venues) in relation to the impending statutory consultation. An example copy of the email is appended at **Appendix 1**.
- 3.23 On 30 January 2025, an email was sent to the Local and County ward councillors giving details of dates and other details (website and exhibition venues) in relation to the impending statutory consultation. An example copy of the email is attached at **Appendix 2**.
- 3.24 On 5 February 2025, a further email was sent to Local and County Ward Councillors informing recipients of the proposed public exhibitions on 10 February 2025 and 25 February 2025 and inviting Ward Councillors to attend the exhibitions one hour before the exhibitions opened to the public to provide an opportunity to view the exhibitions and ask questions of SEGRO and its consultant team. An example copy of the email is attached at **Appendix 3**.
- 3.25 A further email was sent to Midlands Engine and Midlands Connect on 7 February 2025. An example copy of the email is attached at **Appendix 4**.

Part 2 – MCO Application

- 3.26 As set out above, 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 (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 scheme, 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.
- 3.27 It was therefore determined that the overall scheme would include both a DCO Application and an MCO Application and that the entire scheme be subject to the extensive consultation required by the DCO rather than the more limited consultation an MCO would require.
- 3.28 Those parts of **Table 6** above which relate to engagement after February 2024, and the advance notice referred to in paragraphs 3.22 – 3.25, also apply to the MCO Application.
- 3.29 The informal engagement prior to submission was primarily focused on the EMG2 Main Site and the Highway Works however in respect of Plot 16 of the EMG1 Works there were some changes made to the parking, drainage and position of the office component

of the warehouse, as is referenced in the Design Approach Document (DAD) (**Document MCO 5.3**).

4 STAGE 2 CONSULTATION: STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Part 1 – DCO Application

Introduction

- 4.1 This chapter includes the details of how the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) was prepared, consulted on and published following the process set out in Section 47 of the Act.

Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)

- 4.2 Section 47 states:

- (1) The Applicant must prepare a statement setting out how the Applicant proposes to consult, about the proposed Application, people living in the vicinity of the land.*
- (2) Before preparing the statement, the Applicant must consult each local authority that is within section 43(1) about what is to be in the statement.*
- (3) The deadline for the receipt by the Applicant of a local authority's response to consultation under subsection (2) is the end of the period of 28 days that begins with the day after the day on which the local authority receives the consultation documents.*
- (4) In subsection (3) "the consultation documents" means the documents supplied to the local authority by the Applicant for the purpose of consulting the local authority under subsection (2).*
- (5) In preparing the statement, the Applicant must have regard to any response to consultation under subsection (2) that is received by the Applicant before the deadline imposed by subsection (3).*
- (6) Once the Applicant has prepared the statement, the Applicant must —*
 - a) make the statement available for inspection by the public in a way that is reasonably convenient for people living in the vicinity of the land;*
 - b) publish in a newspaper circulating in the vicinity of the land a notice stating where and when the statement can be inspected, and*
 - c) publish the statement in such manner as may be prescribed.*
- (7) The Applicant must carry out consultation in accordance with the proposals set out in the statement.*

SoCC Process

- 4.3 The primary goal of the SoCC was to set out how SEGRO proposes to publicise and consult people living in the vicinity of the land about the proposed DCO Application (and the proposed MCO Application).

Consultation on the draft SoCC

- 4.4 It is noted that SEGRO is not required by the regulations to agree a SoCC with the local authorities but is required to consult them and consider their comments in preparing a SoCC.
- 4.5 A draft SoCC was submitted to North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) and Leicestershire County Council (LCC), the relevant Section 43(1) Local Authorities, on 18 October 2024 (**Appendix 5**). It was requested that the local authorities respond to it by 18 November 2024.
- 4.6 Copies of the emails that were sent to the local authorities are included at **Appendix 6**.
- 4.7 NWLDC responded to the consultation on 6 November 2025 and LCC responded on 11 November 2025. Copies of the letters can be found at **Appendix 7**.
- 4.8 The local authorities' comments on the draft SoCC and SEGROs response to them are set out in **Tables 7 and 8** below.

Table 7 – NWLDC Response to Draft SOCC and Applicant Response

North West Leicestershire District Council Comment	Applicant Response
In Figure 2 (Route Map to DCO Application) on Page 9 within the 'Early Engagement' section it refers to a briefing with 'Members'. We are not aware of any briefing being undertaken with Members (with the exception of Chris advising the Planning Portfolio Holder of the application) so is there a timeframe for when the briefing with Members would occur?	The draft SoCC anticipated briefings to members, and this has been consistently offered to NWLDC by SEGRO. Recent discussions indicate that a briefing may take place soon.
Figure 3 (Proposed Core Consultation Area) and Paragraph 3.9 on Page 10 identifies that the 'Core Area' includes all or part of the communities (parishes) of Long Whatton and Diseworth, Lockington-Hemington, and Isley-cum-Langley (Parish Meeting). When accounting for the red line on Figure 1 (Site Location Plan) on Page 4 it is considered that the 'Core Area' should be expanded to include the parishes of Castle Donington, Kegworth, Breedon on the Hill as well as potentially such parishes outside of the district (i.e. Melbourne).	The Core Consultation Area was expanded to ensure that communities likely to have an interest in the Highways Works around M1 Junction 24 would receive direct communication regarding the proposals and statutory consultation process, as requested.
As with point 1) above, Paragraph 3.11 again refers to the briefings with Members	As above
Table 1 (Summary of planned summary stage 1 engagement and consultation activities) refers to the EMG2 project webpage but when clicking the link, it takes you to a website that is not operational. When is the website becoming operational? (Please note this applies to all areas where the link is referenced)	The text of the draft SoCC was written in anticipation of the website which was in the course of being set up when the draft SoCC was being consulted upon. The website was operational from 24 November 2024 prior to the SoCC being published.
Paragraph 3.20 on Page 13 refers to public exhibitions but we would need to know the times, dates, and locations of the in-person meetings. This was the case with the SoCC associated with EMG1.	Amendments were made to ensure the SoCC was clear regarding the ways in which people could engage with the consultation process, with additional specific details included regarding the proposed consultation methods and timing.
Paragraph 3.32 on Page 14 refers to the reference to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) being Paragraph 2.10 but this is actually Paragraph 2.9.	Noted.

North West Leicestershire District Council Comment	Applicant Response
In terms of Paragraph 3.33 on Page 15 this refers to the 'existing baseline', if the document is to be presented to Members of the public then it is considered that this should be rephrased to be in 'plain English' so that it can be understood.	No amendment was considered necessary since the paragraph concerned already referred to existing site characteristics.
In Paragraph 3.35 on Page 16 it outlines that a newspaper notice will be published in the Leicester Mercury, but it is considered that such newspaper notices should also be published in the Derby Evening Telegraph, Loughborough Echo and Nottingham Evening Post given the extent of the application site and the location of the site within the district. It is noted that the SoCC associated with EMG1 included press notices in the Derby Evening Telegraph and Loughborough Echo.	The additional local newspapers requested were included on the list for publication of statutory notices regarding the SoCC and for providing details about future consultation events, ensuring a wider coverage into parts of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire as well as Leicestershire.
Paragraph 3.35 on Page 16 also refers to site notices and it is considered that it would be worthwhile discussing the locations where such notices would be displayed which should be included in the SoCC.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.41 on Page 17 has an incorrect address for the Customer Service Centre which should be: North West Leicestershire District Council Customer Centre, Belvoir Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, LE67 3XF.	Amended.
At Paragraph 3.41 on Page 17 it refers to hard copies of the documents being at Castle Donington Library but the previous SoCC for EMG1 also had the documents displayed at Kegworth Library, Sutton Bonnington Library and Melbourne Library. Given the extent of the proposed development such libraries should also be included.	The regulations have changed since the EMG1 DCO, as referred to by LCC in their comments on the SoCC. There is no requirement to provide hard copies; however, it was felt helpful to do so. Although Diseworth is the closest village to the EMG2 Main Site, it does not have a formal library. Castle Donington Library was used for the EMG1 DCO application and, given the EMG2 Project includes the MCO Application to amend the EMG1 DCO, this library was selected.
Paragraph 3.42 on Page 18 refers to the district not identifying any groups with protected characteristics, however for this to be confirmed it would be advised that you liaise with Emma Trahearn within the Council's Community Focus Team. Emma can be contacted via email at emma.trahearn@nwleicestershire.gov.uk .	This was discussed with the planners at NWLDC who did not advise of any hard-to-reach groups.

Table 8 LCC Response to Draft SOCC and Applicant Response

Leicestershire County Council Comment	Applicant Response
The proposed core consultation area does not appear to reflect the proposed development on the EMG1 site, nor the extent of potential highway and rail impact and associated mitigation. We suggest this should be expanded to include Castle Donington and Kegworth parishes.	Core Consultation Area expanded to ensure that communities likely to have an interest in the Highways Works around M1 Junction 24 (but with a less direct relationship with the EMG2 Main Site) would receive a direct communication regarding the proposals and statutory consultation process.
Para 3.4 it is accepted that documents will be presented in draft form. However, it should be made clear that documents are subject to change through the process, particularly in respect of highway mitigation which is yet to be determined.	The paragraph (now 3.35) was changed to reflect this comment.
Para 3.35 appears to be missing MP's.	MP's were included.
Para 3.41 we understand that the Infrastructure Planning (Publication and Notification of Applications etc) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 has removed the requirement for applicants to provide hard copies of documents in public places for applications for a Development Consent Order. If hard copies are to be provided, we suggest these are provided within the local area only and not at County Hall which is a significant distance for local residents to travel.	The number of venues to accommodate hard copies of consultation materials was reduced to 2 from a proposed 3 (removing the suggestion of posting a set at LCC County Hall).

Publicity under Section 47

- 4.9 The final SoCC which took account of the comments received from both local authorities was published on 18 December 2024. A copy is attached at **Appendix 8**. In accordance with Section 47 of the Act, the SoCC was made available on the project website and for review at North West Leicestershire District Council's offices and at Castle Donington Library. Although Diseworth is the closest village to the EMG2 Main Site, it does not have a formal library. Castle Donington Library was used for the EMG1 DCO application and, given the EMG2 Project includes the MCO Application to amend the EMG1 DCO, this library was selected.
- 4.10 In order to publicise the SoCC and where it could be accessed, notices pursuant to section 47 of the Act were placed in three regional papers, Leicester Mercury (18 December 2024), Derby Evening Telegraph (18 December 2024), Nottingham Post (18 December 2024) and a local paper, the Loughborough Echo (25 December 2024)). Scans of the section 47 notice can be found at **Appendix 9**. The SoCC was therefore published well in advance of the 6 week statutory consultation period held between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025.

Table 9 – Locations and times where the SoCC was on display

Location	Address	Opening Times
North West Leicestershire District Council	Customer Centre, Belvoir Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, LE67 3XF	(Mon, Tues, Wed & Fri 09:00 - 17:00, Thurs 09.00 - 16.00, Sat & Sun closed).
Castle Donington Library	101 Bondgate, Castle Donington, Derbyshire, DE74 2LJ	(Mon 10.00-16.00, Tues, Wed, Thurs 10:00-14:00, Fri 10.00-16.00, Sat 10.00-13.00, Sun: closed).

Part 2 – MCO Application

- 4.11 A SoCC is not required as part of the MCO Application, however the SoCC anticipated consultation upon the entire EMG2 Project and, indeed the SoCC Core Consultation Area was widened in response to a request from Leicestershire County Council to ensure the local community in the vicinity of the Highway Works and the works on EMG1 were consulted (see **Table 8** above).

5 STAGE 2: DUTY TO NOTIFY THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE PROPOSED APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE ACT (DCO APPLICATION) AND REGULATION 12 OF THE 2011 REGULATIONS (MCO APPLICATION)

Introduction

- 5.1 This Chapter details the steps undertaken by the Applicant to comply with the requirements of Section 46 in relation to the DCO Application and Regulation 12 of the 2011 Regulations in relation to the MCO Application.

Part 1 - DCO Application

Section 46 notification

- 5.2 SEGRO is required to notify the Secretary of State of the application under section 46 of the Act. This must be done on or before starting consultation under section 42. The Secretary of State must be supplied with the same information as is used for section 42 consultation.
- 5.3 SEGRO wrote to the Planning Inspectorate on 31 January 2025 setting out its intention under section 46 to submit an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO). **Appendix 10** contains a copy of the notification to the Secretary of State.
- 5.4 The letter enclosed copies of the letter sent to all consultation bodies pursuant to sections 42, 43 and 44 of the Act (**Appendix 11**) and the section 48 notice (scanned copies of which are contained in **Appendix 12**).
- 5.5 An acknowledgement of receipt was provided by the Planning Inspectorate dated 3 February 2025. This can be found in **Appendix 13**. The Planning Inspectorate's letter acknowledges that SEGRO has notified it in relation to: -
- 5.5.1 The proposed application for an Order granting development consent for the purposes of section 46 of the Planning Act 2008 and supplied the information for consultation under section 42.
- 5.5.2 The proposed order for a material change to an existing development consent order for the construction, operation and maintenance of EMG2 and highway works for the purposes of regulation 12 and supplied the information for consultation under regulation 10.

Part 2 - MCO Application

Regulation 12 notification

- 5.6 SEGRO is required to notify the Secretary of State of the application under regulation 12 of the 2011 Regulations. This must be done on or before starting consultation under regulation 10. The Secretary of State must be supplied with the same information as is used for the regulation 10 consultation.
- 5.7 SEGRO wrote to the Planning Inspectorate on 31 January 2025 setting out its intention under regulation 12 to submit an application for a Material Change Order (MCO). **Appendix 10** contains a copy of the notification to the Secretary of State.
- 5.8 The letter enclosed copies of the letter sent to all consultation bodies pursuant to regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations (**Appendix 11**), and regulation 14 notice (scanned copies of which are contained in **Appendix 12**).

5.9 An acknowledgement of receipt was provided by the Planning Inspectorate dated 3 February 2025. This can be found in **Appendix 13**. The Planning Inspectorate's letter acknowledges that SEGRO has notified it in relation to: -

5.9.1 The proposed application for an Order granting development consent for the purposes of section 46 of the Planning Act 2008 and supplied the information for consultation under section 42.

5.9.2 The proposed order for a material change to an existing development consent order for the construction, operation and maintenance of EMG2 and highway works for the purposes of regulation 12 and supplied the information for consultation under regulation 10.

Conclusion

5.10 SEGRO complied with its requirements to issue notices in respect of Section 46 and Regulation 12.

6 STAGE 2 STATUTORY CONSULTATION UNDER SECTION 42 OF THE ACT (DCO APPLICATION) AND REGULATION 10 OF THE 2011 REGULATIONS (MCO APPLICATION)

Introduction

- 6.1 This Chapter provides details of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation with statutory consultees carried out between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025 (6 weeks).
- 6.2 The activities carried out to fulfil the requirements of section 42 of the Act in relation to the DCO Application are detailed in Part 1 of this Chapter.
- 6.3 The activities carried out to fulfil the requirements of Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations in relation to the MCO Application are detailed in Part 2 of this Chapter.

Part 1 – DCO Application

Statutory Provisions

- 6.4 This part of this Chapter details the Stage 2 consultation with consultees carried out in accordance with section 42 of the Act between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025 (6 weeks). This Chapter, in combination with Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, provides the information required under section 37(7)a of the Act.

Duty to Consult under Section 42

- 6.5 The table below sets out the requirements of Section 42, demonstrates how SEGRO identified the Consultees and details how SEGRO complied with the obligation.

Table 10 - S42 and S45 Requirements and Compliance

Relevant Provisions	Identification of Consultee	Action
Section 42(1): Duty to consult: The Applicant must consult the following about the proposed application— A copy of the S42 consultees list is appended at Appendix 14.		
(a) such persons as may be prescribed	The persons prescribed are those listed in column 1 of the table in Schedule 1 to the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (the APFP Regulations). SEGRO compiled a list of statutory consultees which was principally derived from the prescribed consultees listed in column 1 of the table in Schedule 1 to the APFP Regulations (and the 2011 Regulations). The prescribed persons are all included in the list of s42 consultees. The Marine Management Organisation and the Greater London Authority were not consulted on the basis that those organisations are not relevant to the proposed development.	All statutory consultees (S42 and S44) were written to on 30 January 2025 inviting comments on the proposed development under section 42 of the Act. The letters stated that consultation opened on 3 February 2025 and that responses needed to be returned by 17 March 2025. A copy of the letter is attached at Appendix 11. A copy of the section 48 notice was included which covered the requirements of Regulation 4 of the APFP Regulations, and Regulations 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the "EIA Regulations") (Appendix 12). The letter is clear that the consultation exercise relates to the DCO Application for the EMG2 Main Site and the Highway Works.
(b) each local authority that is within section 43	There are "A", "B", "C" and "D" category local authorities. The EMG2 Project is located within the administrative area of North West Leicestershire District Council – this is the "B" authority for the purposes of section 43. The following councils share a boundary with North West Leicestershire District Council and are therefore "A" authorities for the purposes of section 43: • Charnwood Borough Council • Erewash Borough Council	Letters were issued by First Class Royal Mail post. The letter included direction to the website, where all the consultation documents were available and provides details of where hard copies could be viewed. In this regard the letter states that: <i>"There is a large amount of information available to be viewed or downloaded from the project</i>

Relevant Provisions	Identification of Consultee	Action
	- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council - Lichfield District Council - North Warwickshire Borough Council - Rushcliffe Borough Council - South Derbyshire District Council The upper-tier county council (the “C” authority for the purposes of section 43) for the EMG2 Project is Leicestershire County Council. The following councils are unitary or upper tier county councils which share a boundary with Leicestershire County Council, and are therefore “D” authorities for the purposes of section 43: - Derbyshire County Council - Lincolnshire County Council - Nottinghamshire County Council - Staffordshire County Council - Warwickshire County Council - Rutland County Council - North Northamptonshire Council - West Northamptonshire Council The Parish Council which covers the vast majority of the area of the DCO Application is Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council with only the substation and Footpath L57 which form part of the DCO Application falling within the area of Castle Donington Parish Council. Both Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council and Castle Donington Parish Council are included in the list of section 42 consultees.	website, www.segro.com/slpemg2. This includes drafts of documents which will be submitted as part of the applications including the following: - Preliminary environmental information in the form of advanced draft chapters of the Environmental Statement; - The proposed Development Consent Order; - The proposed Explanatory Memorandum; - The proposed Material Change Order; - Location Plan; - Components Plan; - Works Plans; - Land Plans; - Access and Rights of Way Plans; - Statement of Reasons; - Parameters Plan; - Illustrative Masterplan; - Design Approach Document; and - Planning Statement. Hard copies of this information are available to view at the following locations: - North West Leicestershire District Council, Customer Centre, Belvoir Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, LE67 3XF (Monday / Tuesday / Wednesday / Friday 09.00-17.00, Thursday 09.00-16.00, Saturday / Sunday closed).

Relevant Provisions	Identification of Consultee	Action
	In addition, the following parish councils were also consulted: • Kegworth Parish Council • Lockington-Hemington Parish Council • Isley cum Langley Parish Meeting • Breedon on the Hill Parish Council • Belton Parish Council • Shepshed Town Council • Hathern Parish Council • Breaston Parish Council • Sawley Parish Council • Aston-on-Trent Parish Council • Shardlow & Great Wilne Parish Council • Weston-on-Trent Parish Council • Melbourne Parish Council • Thrumpton Parish Meeting • Ratcliffe-on Soar Parish Meeting • Kingston-on-Soar Parish Council • Sutton Bonnington Parish Council • Stonebow Village Parish Council	2 <i>Castle Donington Library, 101 Bondgate, Castle Donington, Derbyshire DE74 2LJ (Monday 10.00-16.00, Tuesday / Wednesday / Thursday 10.00-14.00, Friday 10.00-16.00, Saturday 10.00-13.00, Sunday closed)".</i> The letter and enclosures constituted the section 42 'consultation documents' referred to in section 45(3) of the Act. In accordance with section 45(1) and (2) of the Act the letter gave a deadline of 17 March 2025 (being six weeks, greater than the minimum 28 day period required under section 45(2)) for the receipt of comments on the consultation. A list of the material consulted upon can be found in Appendix 15. In addition, on 22 January 2025 leaflets were posted out widely within the area including to Section 42 consultees. A copy of the leaflet is included in Appendix 16
(d) each person who is within one or more of the categories set out in section 44	Persons within section 44 of the Act are: (1) owners, lessees, tenants or occupiers of the land to which the proposed development relates (Category 1 persons); (2) those persons who are interested in the land or have power to sell and convey the land or to release the land (Category 2 persons); and (3) those persons who might be entitled to make a relevant claim if the Order sought were to be made and fully implemented (referred to as Category 3	

Relevant Provisions	Identification of Consultee	Action
	persons) Persons within section 44 of the Act are commonly described as 'Persons with an Interest in the Land' (PILs). Whilst SEGRO had been engaging with principal landowners since early 2020, as set out in Chapter 3 above, in order to establish the identity of all PILs, SEGRO appointed a specialist land referencing company to undertake detailed land interest investigations including service of land information questionnaires (refer to Statement of Reasons). All PILs identified during land referencing were notified as part of the Section 42 consultation Appendix 17 contains the full list of PILs. The Book of Reference (Document DCO 4.3) submitted as part of the application sets out the persons/bodies which fall within the categories defined in section 44 for the DCO Application. On 3 February 2025 SEGRO erected a number of site notices around the EMG2 Main Site and the area affected by the DCO Application. An example of the notices along with a plan, the maintenance log and photographs of the notices in situ can be found in Appendix 18. These interests are noted in the Book of Reference.	
Discretionary Organisations	Whilst not s.42 statutory consultees SEGRO also consulted other organisations that were consulted under the EMG1 DCO for consistency with the consultation approach deployed for EMG1. The additional organisations which SEGRO consulted as part of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation can be found at	

Relevant Provisions	Identification of Consultee	Action
	the end of the list of section 42 consultees (Appendix 14). In addition, Protect Diseworth and the Long Whatton & Diseworth Flood Working Group were consulted, as local interest groups had taken a keen interest in the proposals.	
Section 45 Timetable for Consultation under Section 42		
There is a duty on the applicant, when consulting a person under Section 42, to notify them of the deadline for receipt of comments to the consultation. This must be a minimum of 28 days, commencing on the day after the day on which the person receives the consultation documents.		The letter and enclosures set out above constituted the section 42 'consultation documents'. The letter gave a deadline of 17 March 2025 (being six weeks, greater than the minimum 28 day period required under section 45(2)) for the receipt of comments on the consultation.

Conclusion in relation to the DCO Application

- 6.6 The above table details the steps SEGRO has taken to comply with the statutory requirements for consultation under Section 42 of the Act and confirms that SEGRO has complied with the statutory requirements.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Statutory Provisions

- 6.7 This part of this Chapter details the Stage 2 consultation with consultees carried out in accordance with Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations between 3 February 2025 and 17 March 2025 (6 weeks). This Chapter in combination with Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 provides the information required under Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations.

Duty to Consult under Regulation 10

- 6.8 The table and text below set out the requirements of Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations and demonstrates how SEGRO identified the Consultees and details how SEGRO complied with the obligations.
- 6.9 The list of prescribed consultees for a material change order under the APFP Regulations and the 2011 Regulations includes 'Relevant Statutory Undertakers'. The prescribed consultees are included in the list of consultees at **Appendix 14** and the relevant Persons with interest in land are included in the list in **Appendix 17**.

Table 11 Regulation 10 Requirements and Compliance

Relevant Provision	Identification of Consultee	Action/Consultation Activity
10. Duty to Consult		
(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the applicant must consult the following about a proposed application—		
(a) <i>each person who may be directly affected by the changes proposed in the application;</i>	For the purposes of Regulation 10(1)(a), those persons who were originally consulted on the EMG1 DCO were identified, save for any updating where entities had changed or were no longer in existence.	All statutory consultees under Regulation 10 were written to on 30 January 2025 inviting comments on the proposed development under Regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations. This included those persons who were originally consulted on the EMG1 DCO as indicated and the owners and occupiers of EMG1.
(b) each person who has the benefit of the development consent order to which the application relates, unless that person is also the applicant;	Regulation 10(1)(b) applies to occupiers of EMG1 who were consulted.	The Greater London Authority and the Marine Management Organisation were not consulted on the basis that those organisations are not relevant to the proposed development. In addition, the Secretary of State did not consider any other organisations should be consulted and Regulation 10(2) and (3) are not relevant.
(c) any other person or authority who does not fall within paragraph (a) and is— (i) <i>listed in column 1 of the table in Schedule 1 to these Regulations, who must be consulted in the circumstances specified in relation to each such person in column 2 of that table;</i> (ii) <i>an authority which, in relation to the proposed application, is a relevant local authority;</i>	For Regulation 10(1)(c)(i), the entities listed in Schedule 1 mirrored the entities in Schedule 1 of the APFP regulations.	The letters stated that consultation opened on 3 February 2025 and that responses needed to be returned by 17 March 2025. A copy of the letter is attached at Appendix 11 . A copy of the notice was included which covered the requirements of Regulation 14 of the APFP Regulations, and Regulation 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the "EIA Regulations") (see Appendix 12). The letter is clear that the consultation exercise relates to the MCO for the EMG1 Works in addition to the DCO Application for the EMG2 Main Site and the Highway Works The letters were issued by First Class Royal Mail post and included direction to the website, where all the consultation documents were

Relevant Provision	Identification of Consultee	Action/Consultation Activity
(iii) a person who is within one or more of the categories set out in section 44		available and provides details of where hard copies could be viewed. In this regard the letter states that: <i>"There is a large amount of information available to be viewed or downloaded from the project website, www.segro.com/slpemg2. This includes drafts of documents which will be submitted as part of the applications including the following:</i> <i>• Preliminary environmental information in the form of advanced draft chapters of the Environmental Statement;</i> <i>• The proposed Development Consent Order;</i> <i>• The proposed Explanatory Memorandum;</i> <i>• The proposed Material Change Order;</i> <i>• Location Plan;</i> <i>• Components Plan;</i> <i>• Works Plans;</i> <i>• Land Plans;</i> <i>• Access and Rights of Way Plans;</i> <i>• Statement of Reasons;</i> <i>• Parameters Plan;</i> <i>• Illustrative Masterplan;</i> <i>• Design Approach Document; and</i> <i>• Planning Statement.</i> <i>Hard copies of this information are available to view at the following locations:</i> 3 North West Leicestershire District Council, Customer Centre, Belvoir Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, LE67 3XF (Monday / Tuesday / Wednesday / Friday 09.00-17.00, Thursday 09.00-16.00, Saturday / Sunday closed). 4 Castle Donington Library, 101 Bondgate, Castle Donington, Derbyshire DE74 2LJ (Monday 10.00-16.00, Tuesday /

Relevant Provision	Identification of Consultee	Action/Consultation Activity
		<i>Wednesday / Thursday 10.00-14.00, Friday 10.00-16.00, Saturday 10.00-13.00, Sunday closed)".</i> The letter and enclosures constituted the ‘consultation documents’ referred to in Regulation 11(3) of the 2011 Regulations. In accordance with Regulations 11(1) and 11(2), the letter gave a deadline of 17 March 2025 (being six weeks, greater than the minimum 28 day period required under regulation 11(2)) for the receipt of comments on the consultation. A list of the material consulted upon can be found in Appendix 15. In addition, leaflets were posted out widely within the area on 22 January 2025 including to statutory consultees. A copy of the leaflet is included in Appendix 16.

Conclusion in relation to the DCO Application

- 6.10 The above details the steps SEGRO has taken to comply with the statutory requirements for consultation under Regulation 10 and confirms that SEGRO has complied with the statutory requirements.

7 STAGE 2 CONSULTATION UNDER SECTION 47: DUTY TO CONSULT LOCAL COMMUNITY

Part 1 – DCO Application

Introduction

- 7.1 Consultation was carried out in line with the published Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (**Appendix 8**). Information as to how the activities carried out comply with the SoCC can be found in the SoCC Summary of Key Elements and Adherence Table at paragraph 3.26 of the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone Report ("AoCMR") (**Appendix 31**).
- 7.2 In addition, a more detailed table setting out adherence to the SoCC is set out in **Table 12** below.

Table 12 - Compliance with the SoCC

Section	Commitment	Response
3.10	Within the Core Area, individual properties will receive an awareness raising leaflet regarding the consultation process.	Within the Core Consultation Area, individual properties received by post an awareness raising leaflet regarding the consultation process. During the course of consultation upon the SoCC, and at the request of the local authorities, the Core Consultation Area was expanded to ensure it included communities closest to the Highway Works and the proposals on EMG1 which are the subject of the MCO Application. More than 7,350 newsletters were distributed to all residential and business premises within the Core Consultation Area on 22 January 2025 using Royal Mail. A copy of the leaflet can be found at Appendix 16. Following local reports that some streets in Diseworth (including Page Lane and Lady Gate), had been missed by the Royal Mail deliveries, newsletters were delivered by hand by the Applicant's team to approximately 70 properties on 3 February 2025 as soon as notification was received of the failure. The Applicant was grateful to have had the apparent localised issue (with some addresses having been initially missed) drawn to its attention.
3.10	Consultation events (exhibitions) will also be located within the Core Area.	Public Exhibitions were held: - on 10 February 2025 at Diseworth Village Hall (15.00 – 19.00) – attended by 198 people

Section	Commitment	Response
		- on 25 February 2025 at Hilton Hotel East Midlands Airport (15.00-19.00) – attended by 68 people. Webinar was held on 4 March 2025 (18.00 – 19.30).
3.10	In non Core Areas there will be other engagement and awareness raising via Parish Councils and other measures	Awareness was raised by Press Notices, Site Notices and contact with Parish Councils and other stakeholders outside of the Core Area as detailed in Chapter 3 (paragraphs 3.24 – 3.28).
3.11	The Applicant will keep local elected officials—including District, County, and Parish Councillors within the Core Area—informed about progress toward the application by offering and providing updates and briefings via email.	There has been regular contact with the local authorities and Parish Councils.
3.11	Electronic copies of the posted leaflet distributed by the Applicant to Parish Clerks.	Electronic copies of the leaflet were sent to the clerks of all Parish Councils. This applied to Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council; Lockington-Hemington; Isley cum Langley; Kegworth and Breedon on the Hill.
3.16	The Applicant will maintain and expand the content and information shared via the EMG2 webpage to provide further details about the proposals. This will include access to emerging masterplans and other draft application material, when available, as the Scheme evolves. This will also include clear details about when and how to comment on the proposals as part of the statutory consultation process.	Information on the proposals has been updated on the Applicant's website since it was live in November 2024. The website included information on when and how to comment on proposals including providing a feedback form. A copy of the feedback form can be found at Appendix 20.
3.17	The second stage of the consultation process (the statutory consultation) will commence with a 6 week period of statutory consultation commencing in February 2025.	Consultation took place between 3 February and 17 March 2025.
3.17	An extensive 6 week statutory consultation period starting in February 2025 structured around exhibiting Scheme information at 'in person' events as well as an	See responses to 3.10 and 3.17 above.

Section	Commitment	Response
	online event.	
3.17	The intention is to hold in-person exhibitions a few weeks apart during the consultation period, and an online event towards the end of the consultation period to maximise opportunities for interested persons to engage and contribute. The material displayed at the in-person exhibition (in the form of display boards) will also be available on the EMG2 webpage throughout the consultation period.	See response to 3.10 above. All consultation materials were available on the EMG2 website throughout the consultation period. This included electronic copies of exhibition boards.
3.18	The EMG2 webpage will be kept up to date with information about the proposals in general, including details about the statutory consultation process (including dates and venues) once confirmed.	The EMG2 website was kept up to date and included details of the consultation process.
3.19	All material used as part of the statutory consultation process will be available via the EMG2 webpage from the beginning of that formal consultation period and maintained throughout the period until the deadline for responses expires. Specifically, this will include electronic copies of the exhibition boards used at in-person and virtual events.	See response to 3.17 above.
3.19	It will be possible to submit comments via the webpage, and so those unable to attend the in-person event will be able to both see the same consultation material and comment on it online.	The webpage facilitated the submission of comments and included the same material as was available at the exhibitions.
3.20	During the consultation period, members of the public and all consultees will be able to use the comments form on the webpage (www.segro.com/emg2) to leave comments or ask questions – this form will replicate the same hard copy form made available during the in-person exhibition events.	See response to 3.19. The online comments form was the same as the comment form available at the exhibition.
3.21	The Applicant plans to hold two in-person public exhibitions, and the intention is for these to be held a few weeks apart during the consultation period.	See response to 3.10 above.
3.22	Two public exhibitions are being arranged, with dates and venues to be confirmed. The intention is to hold one exhibition in Diseworth, chosen for its proximity to the EMG2 main site, making it convenient for the closest local community and another exhibition at a nearby hotel, selected for its larger capacity and central location,	See response to 3.10 above.

Section	Commitment	Response
	aiming to accommodate residents from surrounding villages.	
3.24	Subject to venue availability, the exhibitions will run during the afternoon and through to the early evening, typically for around 6 hours – for example, 1.30pm until 7.30pm.	See response to 3.10 above.
3.24	The exhibitions will not be held during school holidays or public holidays. Any event held on a Saturday is likely to start and finish earlier than those during the working week.	No exhibition was held during the school holidays or on a Saturday.
3.25	The exhibitions will provide an opportunity for people to see details of the emerging proposals, ask questions from representatives of the Applicant's professional team, and provide comments and feedback.	The Applicant had representatives and consultants in attendance at the exhibitions who were able to be questioned. Comment/feedback forms were available.
3.25	Exhibition material will be prepared and displayed on large-scale boards at each public exhibition and will include draft plans and drawings required as part of the DCO process.	The exhibition material was displayed on many large-scale boards including draft plans and drawings. Copies of the Exhibition Boards 1 – 12 and the Exhibition Viewpoint and Map Boards are included at Appendix 19 .
3.26	Representatives of the Applicant's professional team will be available to answer questions.	See response to 3.25 above.
3.26	People will be asked to leave written comments and suggestions at the exhibitions via paper feedback forms or provide comments afterwards by letter or via the comments form on the webpage. They will be asked to respond within the consultation timeframe which will extend to 6 weeks.	People were able to leave comments at the exhibition on a paper feedback form or submit comments later or submit comments using the online facility on the webpage.
3.27	Applicant will organise an online 'webinar' session. A registration link for the webinar session will be provided on the EMG2 webpage, and the Community Awareness Leaflet will explain and direct residents to the EMG2 webpage in order for them to register to participate in the webinar session in advance.	A webinar was held on 4 March with a registration facility.

Section	Commitment	Response
3.28	The total number of webinars will, in part, be informed by the levels of demand and interest in attending, but a minimum of one is proposed and expected to last approximately 1.30-2 hours. It is proposed that the webinar will be held in the second half of the consultation period for those who were unable to attend an in-person event.	One webinar was held in the second half of the consultation period. There was no evidence of any demand/wish for a further webinar.
3.29	The webinar session will use a format which is expected to include the following: A weblink or similar that the local community can use to register in advance for the webinar; The Scheme email address and EMG2 webpage where questions in advance of the webinar can be submitted by members of the public; An email link will be sent to registrants in order to access the webinar; A brief presentation on key elements of the proposals by representatives of the Applicant's professional team from a range of disciplines; Questions posed prior to the webinar will then be answered by the Applicant's professional team; Webinar participants will be provided the opportunity to ask further questions of the Applicant's professional team during the webinar, most likely via a written "question and answer" function during the event. These comments will be recorded and reported on in the Consultation Report submitted to the Secretary of State as part of the DCO; A recoding of the webinar or summary Question and Answer (Q&A) of the event will be posted on the EMG2 webpage for review within 1 week of the webinar session. This summary is provided for those unable to attend the events and could be used by residents to inform their comments.	Six people registered in advance for the webinar however only one person attended. The webinar lasted approximately one hour and comprised lengthy presentation from SEGRO and responses to questions posed in the chat. A recording of the webinar was posted on the project website.

Section	Commitment	Response
3.30	If there is significant interest in attending the webinar, to keep numbers manageable, the number of webinars will be increased.	There was insufficient interest.
3.31	Webinars are currently expected to feature on a weekday late during the 6 week consultation period in an early evening slot to avoid normal working hours (e.g., between 18:00-19:30).	The webinar was held between 18.00 – 19.30 on 4 March, in the second half of the consultation period.
3.33	The statutory consultation will include updated and further progressed information about the proposed development. This will include a range of draft plans, reports and other documentation, including the latest draft ES documents comprising the preliminary environmental information.	The statutory consultation included material which reflected the then current environmental information and up-to-date evolution of the proposals upon which views were sought.
3.34	The draft ES documents, will provide an overview of the site characteristics and findings regarding the existing 'baseline', and set out the ongoing range and scope of works being undertaken and planned to inform the ES in due course. The material will be prepared in the context of the EIA Scoping Opinion provided by PINS, and the comments provided by consultees. The ES will be based on the work undertaken to date at that stage and is intended to provide a sound overview of the baseline conditions, enable some early judgements about the most likely potential effects, and initial descriptions of likely or emerging mitigation measures, as well as early indications, where available, of potential effects.	The draft ES documents (Preliminary Environmental Information) reflected the assessment undertaken by that stage upon which views were sought to inform the evolution of the proposals.
3.35 Table 3	Documents set out in Table 3 were to be available for consultation.	These documents were all made available.
3.36	List of means of advertising awareness of consultation.	All the actions set out below and in the bullet points in paragraph 3.36 were undertaken: - Issuing a community awareness raising leaflet Writing to all MP's, county, District and Parish Councillors within the Core Consultation Area Writing to all S42 Statutory Consultees and publishing required notices

Section	Commitment	Response
		Publishing required newspaper notices Site Notices Posts on social media and other on line platforms Information on webpage. This included contacting a wide range of consultees and interested parties and an email to all District and County Councillors giving advance notice of the consultation. Copies of example emails dated 21 January, 30 January, 5 February and 7 February are included in Appendices 1, 2, 3 and 4.
3.39	Respondee will be able to submit representations and comments via: By hand (or post – see below) via a printed comments form available at the public exhibitions; Online via the comments form on the EMG2 webpage: www.segro.com/slpemg2 By post to a PO Box to be established for the statutory consultation period; By telephone: 02475 529730; In person at the public exhibitions described above; During the online webinar.	All the means of submitting responses to consultation referred to in 3.39 were facilitated. During consultation, feedback was invited through a range of channels: <i>Online Feedback Form – could be completed on the website www.segro.co.uk/slpemg2;</i> <i>Freepost – the Feedback Form, or any other feedback, could be posted to EMG2, PO Box 11382, Nottingham, NG2 9AU</i> <i>In person at the consultation exhibition – verbally and by completing the hard copy of the Feedback Form which was available at each venue.</i> A bespoke Feedback Form was provided via the "Contact Us" tab and at the exhibitions. A copy of the form is included in Appendix 20. The

Section	Commitment	Response
		Consultation Form set out the following questions:- How would you describe your interest in the scheme? (Please tick all that apply) [Options given....] Are you generally supportive of the principle of the scheme? Please give reasons for your answer. Do you agree with the strategic context and justification for the scheme (including proximity to the EMG1 interchange, and the Freeport designation)? Please give reasons for your answer. Are there any elements of the scheme that you would like to see changed? Do you have any comments on the preliminary environmental information provided? Do you have any comments on the proposed retention of Hyam's Lane within the scheme as a footpath and cycleway? The scheme includes a new community park area, with proposed public access to that area. Do you have any ideas or suggestions of what features that area should include? Please give reasons for your answer. Do you think the proposed approach to landscaping and earthworks are appropriate, including use of the bunding to help screen the scheme from outside views? Please give reasons for your answer.

Section	Commitment	Response
		Please provide any additional comments that you would like to make on the scheme or on the consultation materials. In addition, although not identified in the SoCC, feedback was also accepted through direct contact between members of the Applicant team and local consultees and groups, some queries or comments or requests for further information were emailed direct to the Applicant or their representatives.
3.40-3.41	In advance of the start of the statutory consultation period, a community awareness leaflet will be delivered to every residential and business address within the Core Area. The leaflet will provide a summary of the development proposals and give details of where documents and information can be viewed. The leaflet will also include the webpage address as well as a phone number and email address for residents who wish to contact the Applicant's team with any queries. In addition, copies of the community awareness leaflet will be made available at the public exhibitions.	See response to 3.10 above. The leaflet contains the information referred to and was available at the exhibitions in addition to being posted to the Core Consultation Area. A copy of the leaflet can be found at Appendix 16.
3.42	Copies of the leaflet will also be shared with the Parish Councils inside and outside the Core Area both in hard copy and electronically, to ensure wider awareness of the consultation process in other communities.	See response to 3.11 above.
3.43 a)	Hard copies of documents, including the SoCC, will be available at NWLDC customer centre and Castle Donington Library, which is the nearest library to the site	All consultation materials and the SoCC were available at: NWLDC Customer Centre Belvoir Road Coalville Leicestershire LE67 3XF Castle Donington Library 101 Bondgate Castle Donington Derbyshire DE74 2LJ A copy of the letters dated 3 February 2025 issuing

Section	Commitment	Response
		the material to the above venues are included at Appendix 21 .
3.43 b)	5 USB sticks containing all the consultation documents will also be provided to each of the Parish Councils in the Core Area both for use by the Parish Council, but also with a view to them being made available to the local community at the Parish Council's office or at a village hall where practical to do so. More USBs can be made available to Parish Councils on request. USB sticks will also be available on request at the public consultation events.	The USB were distributed/available as stated in 3.43(b). An example of the letter sent to the Parish Councils with the USB sticks is included at Appendix 22 .
3.43 c)	If requested, consultation documents can be provided by the Applicant via a suitable file sharing webpage link. If there are particular issues with downloading, printing documents or viewing online, hard copies of any specific documents requested can be made available subject to a small printing charge.	Consultation documents were available on request.
3.44	The Applicant will work with the local authorities and Parish Councils to ensure all documentation (including the Community Awareness Leaflet) is accessible to any identified harder-to-reach groups within the Core Area. This may include the provision of documents being made available in other formats as required, such as hard copies for those without computer access, large text format, or in braille. No hard-to-reach groups have been identified by the District or County Councils.	No hard-to-reach groups were identified by the local authorities.
3.45	The Applicant will utilise its corporate social media platforms (X and LinkedIn) to raise awareness of key milestones and engagement events in the local community and allow a wider audience beyond the Core Area to be accessed.	Posts were placed on social media via a series of posts on Facebook and Instagram. Data captured from the campaign shows the posts reached over 260,000 people with the average person seeing the posts twice. A total of 409 people clicked on the link from the posts to access the project website which contained more information about the project and consultation process. This is considered to have made a meaningful contribution to the overall dissemination of information and awareness raising.

Section	Commitment	Response
3.47	Where appropriate opportunities arise, the Applicant will attend local meetings to discuss the proposals, particularly where this would supplement the consultation exhibitions and further enhance engagement and awareness of the proposals	The Applicant has attended local meetings when requested and has met or otherwise communicated regularly with Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council and Protect Diseworth.
3.52	Further comments and representations received through the statutory consultation stage will be properly recorded and considered by the Applicant to inform the evolution of the Scheme.	Please see Chapter 10 of this report.

Conclusion

- 7.3 The Stage 2 statutory consultation under s.47 was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), except where deviations are identified and explained within this report. The sole deviation was a limited postal failure which was remedied immediately and did not undermine the overall integrity of the consultation process.

Part 2 – MCO Application

- 7.4 Consultation in accordance with a SoCC is not required as part of pre-application on the MCO Application. Nonetheless, the MCO was consulted upon as if the SoCC applied to it, as a means to ensure widespread consultation with the local community on the MCO application.
- 7.5 Accordingly, whilst there was no obligation to do so the MCO Application was subject to the same consultation exercise as described in Part 1 above.

8 STAGE 2 CONSULTATION: DUTY TO PUBLICISE UNDER SECTION 48 AND REGULATION 14

Introduction

- 8.1 This Chapter of the report sets out how SEGRO fulfilled the requirements to publicise the proposed application under section 48 of the Act and Regulation 14 of the 2011 Regulations.

Part 1 – DCO Application

Section 48 Notice

- 8.2 For the DCO Application, Section 48 states:

Duty to publicise

- (1) *The Applicant must publicise the proposed application in the prescribed manner.*
- (2) *Regulations made for the purposes of subsection (1) must, in particular, make provision for publicity under subsection (1) to include a deadline for receipt by the Applicant of responses to the publicity.*

- 8.3 A copy of the published combined section 48 and regulation 14 notice can be found in **Appendix 12**.
- 8.4 Publicity under section 48 occurred in parallel to statutory consultation under sections 42 and 47 of the Act. The start of consultation and deadline for the receipt of comments on the application were consistent across sections 42, 47 and 48.
- 8.5 SEGRO decided to use the same local newspapers for the DCO and MCO Applications that were used for the EMG1 DCO, for consistency of approach.
- 8.6 As per the requirements of Regulation 4 of the APFP Regulations and Regulation 14(1)(a) the section 48 was published as set out in the table below. The publication dates for the Loughborough Echo are later because it is a local paper which is only published weekly rather than daily.

Table 13 - Details of the Section 48 Notice Published

Section 48 Requirement	Publication	Date
(b) once in a national newspaper	The Times (national)	31 January 2025
(c) once in the London Gazette	London Gazette (national)	31 January 2025
(a) For at least two successive weeks in one or more local newspapers circulating in the vicinity in which the proposed	Leicester Mercury (local)	31 January 2025 7 February 2025
	Derby Telegraph (local)	31 January 2025 7 February 2025
	Nottingham Post (local)	31 January 2025

Section 48 Requirement	Publication	Date
development would be situated		7 February 2025
	Loughborough Echo (local)	5 February 2025 12 February 2025

- 8.7 A copy of the section 48 and regulation 14 notice was issued to all consultees consulted pursuant to section 42.

Conclusions

- 8.8 Part 1 of this Chapter confirms that SEGRO complied with the statutory requirements in respect of Section 48 of the Act with regard to the DCO Application.

Part 2 – MCO Application

Regulation 14

- 8.9 For the MCO Application, Regulation 14 stipulates:

Publicising a proposed application

- (1) *The applicant must publish a notice, which must include the matters prescribed by paragraph (2) of this regulation of the proposed application—*
 - (a) *for at least two successive weeks in one or more local newspapers circulating in the vicinity in which the land is situated;*
 - (b) *[Revoked]*
 - (c) *once in the London Gazette and, if land in Scotland is affected, the Edinburgh Gazette; and*
 - (d) *where the proposed application relates to offshore development—*
 - (i) *once in Lloyd's List; and*
 - (ii) *once in an appropriate fishing trade journal.*
- (2) *The matters which the notice must include are—*
 - (a) *the name and address of the applicant;*
 - (b) *a statement that the applicant intends to make an application to the Secretary of State;*
 - (c) *a summary of the main elements of the proposed application;*
 - (d) *a statement as to whether the proposed application involves EIA development;*
 - (e) *a statement that the documents, plans and maps showing the nature and location of the land are available for inspection free of charge on a website maintained by or on behalf of the applicant;*

- (ea) *the address of the website where the documents, plans and maps may be inspected;*
- (eb) *the place on the website where the documents, plans and maps may be inspected;*
- (ec) *a telephone number which can be used to contact the applicant for enquiries in relation to the documents, plans and maps;*
- (f) *the latest date on which those documents, plans and maps will be available for inspection [on the website] (being a date not earlier than the deadline in subparagraph (i));*
- (g) *whether a charge will be made for copies of any of the documents, plans or maps and the amount of any charge;*
- (h) *details of how to respond to the publicity; and*
- (i) *a deadline for receipt of those responses by the applicant, being not less than 28 days following the date when the notice is last published.*
- (3) *The applicant must arrange for a notice of the proposed application, which must include the matters specified in paragraph (2) of this regulation, to be displayed at, or as close as reasonably practicable to, the land at a place accessible to the public.*
- (4) *Where the change in the proposed application consists of, or includes, works with a route or alignment exceeding 5 kilometres in length the notice, which must include the matters specified in paragraph (2) of this regulation, must be—*
 - (a) *displayed at intervals of not more than 5 kilometres along the whole proposed route or alignment of the works described in the application, except where this is impracticable due to the land in question being covered in water; and*
 - (b) *be published for at least 2 successive weeks in one or more local newspapers circulating in the vicinity of the land along the route or alignment of the works described in the application.*
- (5) *The applicant need not publish, or arrange for, a notice of a proposed application in the manner specified in paragraph (4), if they have obtained the written consent of the Secretary of State.*
- (6) *If the Secretary of State exercises its discretion under paragraph (5) it must publish its reasons for doing so on its website.*

8.10 A copy of the published combined section 48 and regulation 14 notice can be found in **Appendix 12**.

8.11 Publicity under regulation 14 occurred in parallel to statutory consultation under regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations. The start of consultation and deadline for the receipt of comments on the application were consistent across regulations 10 and 14.

8.12 As explained in paragraph 8.6 above, SEGRO decided to use the same local newspapers for the DCO and MCO Applications that were used for the EMG1 DCO, for consistency of approach.

- 8.13 As per the requirements of Regulation 4 of the APFP Regulations and Regulation 14(1)(a) the regulation 14 notice was published as set out in the table below. The publication dates for the Loughborough Echo are later because it is a local paper which is only published weekly rather than daily.

Table 14 - Details of the Regulation 14 Notice Published

Regulation 14 Requirement	Publication	Date
(b) once in a national newspaper	The Times (national)	31 January 2025
(c) once in the London Gazette	London Gazette (national)	31 January 2025
(a) For at least two successive weeks in one or more local newspapers circulating in the vicinity in which the proposed development would be situated	Leicester Mercury (local)	31 January 2025 7 February 2025
	Derby Telegraph (local)	31 January 2025 7 February 2025
	Nottingham Post (local)	31 January 2025 7 February 2025
	Loughborough Echo (local)	5 February 2025 12 February 2025

- 8.14 A copy of the regulation 14 notice was issued to all consultees.

Conclusions

- 8.15 Part 2 of this Chapter confirms that SEGRO complied with the statutory requirements in respect of Regulation 14 of the 2011 Regulations with regard to the MCO Application.

9 STAGE 2 CONSULTATION – RESPONSES RECEIVED UNDER SECTION 42 AND REGULATION 10: DUTY TO CONSULT AND DUTY TO HAVE REGARD TO RESPONSES UNDER S49 AND REGULATION 15

Introduction

- 9.1 This Chapter reports the responses to the Stage 2 consultation by statutory consultees, as well as SEGRO's consideration of the issues raised in those responses.

Part 1 – DCO Application

- 9.2 Section 49(2) of the Act requires SEGRO to have regard to relevant responses to the consultation and publicity undertaken under sections 42, 47 and 48 of the Act. A relevant response for the purpose of section 42 is defined in section 49(3)(a) as a response from a person consulted under section 42 that is received by SEGRO before the deadline imposed. The deadline set for these purposes was 17 March 2025, however, any late responses received were accepted and considered as if they had been submitted by the deadline.
- 9.3 In total 30 responses to the statutory consultation were received from s.42 statutory consultees.
- 9.4 All responses to the section 42 consultation are reported on in this Chapter. Responses received under section 47 are considered in **Chapter 10**.
- 9.5 **Table 15** below comprises a summary of the principal issues raised by each s.42 consultee. The Table includes SEGRO's response at that time along with confirmation of whether the consideration of issues raised by SEGRO led to a change in the proposed development.

Table 15 - Summary of Responses Received from S.42 Consultees and SEGRO's Response

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
National Agencies				
NA1	National Highways	National Highways is supportive of the proposed development in principle and acknowledges that mitigation in the area of M1 J24 will be required. However, the response states that it is not currently possible to express support for the specific mitigation proposals contained as the modelling evidence is yet to be completed, nor is it possible to be certain that mitigation at other SRN locations will not be required. The response notes that there is an absence of data to support the Traffic and Transport Chapter of the Draft ES as well as other chapters reliant on traffic data such as Air Quality and Noise and that it hopes to be in a position to agree the modelling outputs and proposed mitigation. The response also makes specific comments in relation to the draft DCO requesting protective provisions and the EMG2 Design Approach Document, where National Highways observed that Units 7a and b could not be accessed internally instead relying on a separate access via the A453. National Highways requested that vehicular access is provided internally within the site itself. It also requests that the public transport hub is relocated closer to the main site and that consideration is given to employees using rail services. In addition, the response states that National Highways is opposed to compulsory acquisition of its land required to construct the proposed highway works.	SEGRO welcomed the support of National Highways of the proposed development in principle. The environmental information consulted upon is being further progressed (including highway mitigation). SEGRO intends to continue to work positively with National Highways on the detail of the proposal, principally through the Transport Working Group which meets monthly. The comment regarding absence of data will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work and TA are further advanced. SEGRO intends to include protective provisions in the draft DCO for the protection of the SRN and will liaise with NH on those protective provisions. There is no intention to seek compulsory purchase powers in respect of land owned by NH.	YES Details of mitigation evolving - ongoing discussions on traffic impact and highway mitigation.

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		The response also comments on the draft planning statement, exhibition viewpoint and map boards stating that it welcomes a collaborative approach to M1 J24 improvements but that there are still matters to be resolved and also noting that it is premature to refer to modelling outcomes since the modelling has not yet been completed and agreed. In terms of the Highways Plans General Arrangement drawings, the response notes that the plans show a design of limited maturity and that further work/detail is required. Detailed specific comments are noted in relation to draft Chapter 6 of the ES. These note that sections of the draft ES are currently incomplete, that no supporting traffic modelling nor a Transport Assessment has been provided and that further details will be required before the impacts of the proposed development on the SRN is known. National Highways requests that all associated traffic modelling assumptions and inputs should be agreed with it prior to the undertaking of traffic impact assessments on the SRN, further recommendations as to the procedure to be followed are set out. In addition, further comments are provided in relation to air quality, ecology and biodiversity, lighting, climate change, the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan and the Construction Traffic Management Plan, sustainable travel and general operational matters.		
NA2	Environment Agency	Comments apply only to the EMG2 proposals and suggest that pre-application advise for the MCO should be directed to another team within the Environment Agency. The response notes that	Comment regarding a different team is noted. The comment regarding absence of data	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		several figures and appendices are missing from the ES and identifies the key issues as lack of information to assess risk to groundwater, ongoing work in relation to the flood risk assessment, inconsistencies in groundwater flow direction and a lack of consideration to pollution risks from firewater. The Environment Agency noted no significant issues with the draft DCO and that it would consider the draft order further when further information is available. However, the response does provide comments on Requirements. The response also requests engagement with the Environment Agency on the technical information set out before the DCO submission along with providing specific comments on the draft ES which are largely focused on risks to groundwater.	will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced. The comments on requirements are noted and will be considered in the next draft of the DCO. Ongoing engagement is intended.	
NA3	Natural England	Natural England's response provides guidance as to how the following should be approached: - Internationally Designated Sites, Nationally Designated Sites, Agriculture and Soils, Ancient Woodland and Connecting People with Nature. The response also notes where it welcomes the approach being taken by SEGRO and where it has worked with SEGRO during the pre-consultation stage. The response notes where further information is required in order for it to assess the scheme.	The comment regarding further information is noted and will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced. Ongoing engagement is intended.	NO
NA4	Forestry Commission	The Forestry Commission neither supports nor objects to the proposed development but notes that no details have been provided on any protection measures that will be used to protect existing trees and woodland and that veteran trees which are	SEGRO intends to have further engagement with the Forestry Commission to provide the information requested.	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		proposed for removal are irreplaceable habitat despite being retained for biodiversity. The response notes that without full details of the woodland and tree loss, it is hard to consider any compensation measures. The Forestry Commissions requests further information on woodland planting and notes that the planting plans appear to create good connectivity. The response also comments on the species of trees and woodland to be created and recommends a management plan to ensure the long term management and maintenance of new and existing woodlands.	Ongoing engagement is intended.	
NA5	UK Health and Security Agency	The UK Health Security Agency replies on its behalf and on behalf of the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. The response focuses Environmental Public Health, Electromagnetic Fields, Population and Human Health, noting that insufficient information is currently available to enable it to comment, Noise and Public Health (noting that a scoping consultation was held between 15 August 2024 and 12 September 2024 which is not currently referenced in the Environmental Statement and recommending its comments are acknowledged), Noise and Public Health, Amenity Space and Tranquillity and mitigation measures (where further recommendations are made).	The comment regarding further information is noted and will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced.	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
Local Authorities				
LA1	North West Leicestershire District Council	North West Leicestershire District Council responded by reserving its position on the proposed development until all of the details of the scheme are fully known. In addition, North West Leicestershire District Council's response highlights that SEGRO should ensure that the development meets its own needs in terms of facilities and overnight lorry parking, and the Council further encourages use of the lorry park to contribution towards need within the District for additional HGV services. The response also agrees the structure of proposed ES chapters relating to ES Chapter 7 (noise and vibration and agrees the content of the ES Chapter relating to Air Quality and Lighting. The response also provides advice to SEGRO on the contents of ES Chapter 14 – Ground Conditions and the Planning Statement and highlighted that SEGRO ought to take into account comments raised by Leicestershire County Council in relation to traffic and transport, ecology and biodiversity, cultural heritage (archaeology) and flood risk and drainage.	SEGRO intends to retain the dedicated HGV parking within the proposal to ensure that the development meets its own needs. It will give consideration to the management of the HGV parking. The other comments are noted. Regular engagement is intended to continue.	YES Addition of driver welfare facilities within HGV parking area
LA2	Leicestershire County Council	Leicestershire County Council responded by expressing its disappointment in relation to the exhibition materials being misleading especially in relation to highways and transport matters where it says the material suggests that highways improvements and mitigation measures have been modelled and measures would provide significant relief, but detailed proposals and modelling have not been shared with the Council. The County	SEGRO does not agree with the criticisms of LCC regarding the exhibition material. The environmental information consulted upon is being further progressed (including highway mitigation). SEGRO intends to continue to work positively with LCC on the detail of the proposal, principally through the Transport Working Group which meets	YES Details of mitigation evolving - ongoing discussions on traffic impact and highway mitigation.

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		Council also identifies gaps in the highways and transport modelling evidence. The response also raises concerns in relation to the County Council's role as Lead Local Flood Authority and the minimal wording of the requirements in this regard. Revised wording is suggested. In relation to Materials and Waste and public health, detailed comments are provided on the respective Draft Environmental Statement Chapters dealing with these matters. The response concludes by stating that there are significant gaps in the draft Environmental Statement and that it is unlikely the County Council will be able to support the application if it is submitted with an incomplete evidence base, assessment and mitigation strategy.	monthly. Comments on the draft environmental statement chapters and drainage requirements are noted. The gaps in data referred to will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced. It appears however that LCC expected to be formally consulted when all the assessment work had been completed and the scheme finalised rather than during the process of scheme evolution in order that consultation could inform that evolution.	
LA3	Charnwood Borough Council	The Borough Council responded by completing the Website Enquiry form stating that it is generally supportive of the principle of the scheme, recognising the importance of logistics and manufacturing and job creation, but reserving the right to review its position as the impacts are further assessed. The Borough Council's response indicates that it agrees with the strategic context and justification for the scheme stating that the development reflects the Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan as recognised by its Local Plan.	SEGRO welcomes these comments.	NO
LA4	Derby City Council	In its response to the consultation, Derby City Council recognises the potential economic benefits of the project. The response recommends that a proportion of new jobs be reserved for local workers in collaboration with Derby-based institutions and raises concerns about the potential	SEGRO notes the position of Derby City Council but does not consider it feasible or desirable to reserve jobs for local people, however it does intend to put measures in place to target employment opportunities to	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		impact on local traffic in Derby at specific locations recommending additional traffic impact assessments. The response also requests a detailed environmental mitigation strategy outlining how concerns on air quality, pollution, noise pollution and biodiversity will be addressed along with suggesting that community engagement is proactively managed.	local people. With regard to traffic impacts SEGRO intends to continue to work positively with the local highway authorities and National Highways on the detail of the proposal, principally through the Transport Working Group which meets monthly, of which Derby City Council is a member.	
LA5	Leicester City Council	Leicester City Council's recognises the need to balance impacts against benefits. The Council wish to understand the impact on the wider highway network and the nature of mitigation. The response notes that the consultation documents do not include a Transport Assessment, Sustainable Transport Strategy or Travel Plan Framework and so it is difficult to assess the traffic impacts albeit it is noted that the City Council has been part of the Transport Working Group. The Council also seeks appropriate mitigation on the highway and transport network suggesting that a sustainable transport approach is required.	The environmental information consulted upon is being further progressed (including highway mitigation). SEGRO intends to continue to work positively with the local highway authorities and National Highways on the detail of the proposal, principally through the Transport Working Group which meets monthly, of which Leicester City Council is a member. The comment regarding absence of data will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work and TA are further advanced.	NO
LA6	Lichfield District Council	Lichfield District Council response does not express a view on the proposed development.	Noted.	NO
LA7	South Derbyshire District Council	The District Council considers that the proposal would not have a direct impact on its residents. However, the response expresses a concern in relation to additional pressure on the A50 and the highway network near the site. The response notes	SEGRO notes the response and will continue to work positively with the local highway authorities and National Highways on the detail of the proposal, principally through the Transport Working Group	YES Details of mitigation evolving - ongoing discussions on traffic

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		that the bus interchange is welcomed and asks that discussions regarding future bus routes are held with Derbyshire County Council.	which meets monthly. SEGRO is advised by ITP who in consultation with Bus Operators has devised a Sustainable Transport Strategy for the proposal similar to that which is so successful at EMG1. The request to liaise with DCC is noted.	impact and highway mitigation.
Parish Councils				
PC1	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed development. In particular, it objects to the Freeport designation which it says adds to the unacceptable cumulative effect of industrialisation of the area, stating that there needs to be an acceptable separation between Diseworth and any development in terms of distance, visual impact and noise and light pollution and that the designation of the Freeport has no relevance to the application. In terms of the Local Plan, Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council's response states that employment need can be met by allocating alternative sites. In terms of the Long Whatton & Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council notes that the plan directs large scale employment development to those parts of the countryside that are less sensitive. In addition, the Parish Council has commissioned its own study on Landscape characteristics surrounding Long Whatton & Diseworth, which concludes that the landscape's value is derived from the separation and protection it affords the settlement from nearby large scale development. The study also refers to	The objection in principle is noted. The proposals for the main site have evolved iteratively and the impact on Diseworth has been a key consideration. The landscape buffer between Diseworth and the built development has been increased and floorspace decreased as the proposals have evolved. Further consideration will be given to the treatment of the area between the proposed built development and Diseworth, in particular the details of the Community Park. It is intended that the environmental statement submitted with the applications will provide full details of impacts on Diseworth and accompanying mitigation to ensure that such impacts are acceptable.	YES The height of the landscaping bund along the western boundary of the main site will be increased to provide further screening to Diseworth. A detailed drawing of the Community Park will be discussed with the Parish Council and Protect Diseworth and will be included in the application submission as a commitment.

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		the land's strong role in the setting of the settlement concluding that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on landscape. The Parish Council's response also raises concerns in relation to heritage including concerns on the setting of the Conservation Area and various listed buildings, concerns in relation to residential amenity including adverse impacts on noise, light pollution and impacts on human health, concerns in relation to drainage, flooding and water quality, concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on both the local and the strategic road network (the Council requests sight of a traffic impact study and asks that a full strategic highway review is undertaken without delay) and concerns in relating to parking. The response concludes by requesting that any loss of amenity must be mitigated against and suitable compensation agreed.		
PC2	Castle Donington Parish Council	The Parish Council responded by completing the Website Enquiry form stating that it is generally supportive of the principle of the scheme and requesting that the Parish Council and residents are involved in all stages of the application, including the Community Liaison Group (as for EMG 1). The Council's response indicated that it is concerned about the traffic along the A453, that it welcomed the proposed retention of Hyam's Lane as a footpath and cycleway and that it would like the community park to be fully accessible to all groups and ages, have suitable parking and be dog friendly. The Parish Council also stated that it considers the proposed approach to landscaping	SEGRO welcomes support for the proposals. SEGRO intends to establish a Community Liaison Group as for EMG1 and notes the Parish Council's interest in that. The landscaping, heights of bunds and heights of buildings will be controlled by the parameters plans and would require a further authorization if a change was required in the future.	YES A detailed drawing of the Community Park will be discussed with Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council and Protect Diseworth and will be included in the application submission as a commitment

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		and earthworks are acceptable, commenting that the heights of the facilities should [not] be able to be changed at later stages to avoid negating the approach to bunding and landscaping.		
PC3	Kegworth Parish Council	Keyworth Parish Council objects to the proposals. The response sets out the reasons for Keyworth Parish Council's position including querying whether the use is the best use of a valuable Freeport site given the low paid logistics jobs that will be created, concerns about the visual and rural impact of the proposed development and the loss of rural walks along ancient footpaths and the loss of environmental diversity, adverse impacts on the A453, lack of measures to improve the M1 J23A roundabout and other travel concerns, a lack of integrated transport solutions for pedestrians and cyclists and in connection with the tramway extension from Clifton, concerns in relation to the impact on the strategic highway including concerns on impacts to M1 J24. The Parish Council also expresses concerns about provisions for "truckers" and urges proper provision of facilities. In addition, there is also concern in relation to the DCO process itself stating that it is bias in favour of development.	SEGRO believes there is a need for the development and employment that this proposal will secure and would contest the suggestion that they will be low paid jobs. SEGRO believes that the technical work undertaken in conjunction with the TWG will ensure that the highway impacts of the development will be appropriately mitigated. SEGRO's consultants, ITP, have develop a Sustainable Transport Strategy which will ensure appropriate active travel and public transport. SEGRO confirms its commitment to the inclusion of an HGV park in its proposals.	YES Addition of driver welfare facilities within HGV parking area
PC4	Breedon on the Hill Parish Council	The Parish Council raised objections in relation to landscape and heritage and in particular the effect of the proposed development on The Bulwarks Scheduled Monument, the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary and St Hardulph and the Breedon Hill SSI. The Parish Council also raised concerns in	The assessment of the impact on heritage assets undertaken thus has not indicated that any impacts will be unacceptable. This will be kept under review as the assessment is finalised.	NO - but impact on Main Street to be specifically

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		relation to transport on the basis that the site is poorly served by public transport and traffic in relation to the impact of additional commuter traffic within significant traffic calming measures and risk along Main Street and the crossing by the Primary School. The Parish Council requested sight of the Traffic Impact Study and asked for a full Strategic Highway Review to be undertaken for the proposal.	SEGRO believes that the technical work undertaken in conjunction with the TWG will ensure with the highway impacts of the development will be appropriately mitigated but note is taken of the particular concern regarding Main Street. SEGRO's consultants, ITP, have developed a Sustainable Transport Strategy which will ensure appropriate active travel and public transport.	considered in the TA
PC5	Weston on Trent Parish Council	Weston-on-Trent Parish Council responded by completing the website Enquiry form stating that it is generally not supportive of the principle of the scheme and that it has no strong view on the development of increased warehouse capacity but is concerned about traffic/transport matters and increased CO2 emissions. The Council also expresses the view that Hyam's Lane and other onsite footpaths should be dedicated public rights of way and for users to be segregated. The Council agrees with the proposed approach to landscaping and earthworks.	SEGRO believes that the technical work undertaken in conjunction with the TWG will ensure that the highway impacts of the development will be appropriately mitigated. The intention is that further consideration of the Community Park proposals will include consideration of all public access and PROW	YES A detailed drawing of the Community Park will be discussed with Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council, Protect Diseworth and other interested parties and will be included in the application submission as a commitment.
Persons with Interest in Land				
PIL 1	Manchester Airport Group (EMA)	In its response to the consultation, East Midlands Airport sets out its land interests in the vicinity of the site and notes that the works initially proposed in the S35 request have changed materially to the proposed development subject to the consultation. The response expresses the airport's view that little	The environmental information consulted upon is being further progressed (including highway mitigation). SEGRO intends to continue to work positively with all the highway authorities on the detail of the proposal, principally through the Transport	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		information has been provided, and very limited engagement undertaken which is contradictory to government guidance and that the consultation exercise is unacceptable partly due to large parts of the ES being incomplete (particularly the draft Transport chapter) and only including baseline material. The response objects to SEGRO using CPO powers to acquire land not currently within its ownership (including land owned/controlled by the airport some of which is subject to an option with Prologis). The response objects to the lack of a draft Transport Assessment and/or a scope for the same and/or modelling and suggests that as a consequence it is not possible for SEGRO to set out the potential highway impacts or for the consultees to provide a meaningful comment. The response also comments on the necessity to ensure aerodrome safeguarding and safety of aviation operations. In addition, the airport supports the consultation response submitted by Prologis.	Working Group which meets monthly. Comments on the draft environmental statement chapters are noted. The gaps in data referred to are noted and will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced. SEGRO has sought to progress protective provisions for the Airport with MAG (without eliciting any substantive response) and will continue to pursue this. The objection to compulsory purchase is noted. SEGRO will continue efforts to avoid the need for compulsory purchase.	
PIL 2	Prologis UK Limited	Prologis supports the principle of employment development and the East Midlands Freeport. However, it strongly objects to SEGRO's current approach, particularly the proposed compulsory acquisition of its land which is part of the EMAGIC Freeport Tax Site and is identified in the Local Plan as a potential strategic distribution location and which is subject to their planning application for up to 135,000 square metres of employment space with access fixed from the A453. Prologis remains open to further discussions and intends to register as an Interested Party in the Examination process.	The environmental information consulted upon is being further progressed (including highway mitigation). SEGRO intends to continue to work positively with all the highway authorities on the detail of the proposal, principally through the Transport Working Group which meets monthly. Comments on the draft environmental statement chapters are noted. The gaps in data referred to are noted and will be considered by SEGRO in determining	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		Prologis believes a negotiated solution is possible and preferable. The Prologis consultation response also objects to the scheme on the basis that the Preliminary Environmental Information is incomplete and lacks, Chapter 4: Consideration of Alternatives, Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (no highways modelling or Transport Assessment), Chapter 21: Cumulative Impacts. The response also raises procedural concerns stating that the consultation does not comply with Regulation 12 of the EIA Regulations and the Gunning Principles (consultation must be at a formative stage, provide sufficient information, allow adequate time, and responses must be conscientiously considered). It also notes that SEGRO has not published a Programme Document or Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCM), as required by the 2024 Pre-application Prospectus and Guidance. It also expresses concerns about the Section 35 Direction stating that the current proposals exceed the scope of the Section 35 Direction granted by the Secretary of State, referring to an increase in the proposed floor space of 45% and the inclusion of significant highways works not previously disclosed.	whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced. The objection to compulsory purchase is noted. SEGRO will continue efforts to avoid the need for compulsory purchase. Some of the procedural points are incorrect and misguided. SEGRO has responded to those points direct.	
National Bodies				
NB1	Royal Mail	Royal Mail supports the proposal but wishes to ensure protection of its ability to provide efficient mail sorting and delivering in accordance with its statutory obligations. Royal Mail is concerned about disruption to road-based distribution and delivery services during the construction period and	SEGRO notes the comments of Royal Mail and intends to ensure that construction traffic impact is appropriately mitigated.	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		suggests a number of mitigations to address its concerns.		
NB2	National Grid Electricity Transmission	The response indicates that NGET will require an adequate form of Protective Provisions to protect existing infrastructure and new infrastructure and requests that it is consulted at the earliest stages so that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO and to remove the requirement for objection.	SEGRO notes this and will ensure the inclusion of appropriate protective provisions.	NO
NB3	Coal Authority	On the basis that the proposed development does not lie within the defined coalfield, the Coal Authority had no specific comments.	Noted.	NO
NB4	GTC Plant Enquiry Team	The GCT Plant Enquiry Team responded by completing the website Enquiry form stating that it is generally supportive of the principle of the scheme, confirming that it does not have existing infrastructure in the vicinity of the order limits and therefore that it has no objections to the development.	Noted.	NO
NB5	Mainline Pipelines Ltd	Mainline Pipelines responded by completing the website Enquiry form stating that it is generally supportive of the principle of the scheme. The response indicates that this is because it does not affect the MLP Pipeline route and therefore it does not wish to make any comments on the statutory consultation.	Noted.	NO
NB6	Open Spaces Society	The Open Space Society responded by completing the website Enquiry form stating that it is generally not supportive of the principle of the scheme. The	Noted. The intention is that further consideration of the Community Park proposals will include consideration of all	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		Open Space Society response states that it considered it unlikely that the proposed approach to landscaping and earthworks is likely to work. The Open Space Society also expressed concerns about proposals to convert footpaths into cycle tracks and in relation to Hyam's Lane notes that it should remain on the definitive map, be physically separated from the cycle and horse track and have physical barriers to separate users. The society requests that the new PROWs are added to the definitive map.	public access and PROW.	
Area Bodies				
AB1	NHS Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland	The response indicates that the NHS Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland have no comments at this time.	Noted.	NO
AB2	Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service	Warwickshire Fire & Rescue Service responded by completing the website Enquiry form stating that it is generally not supportive of the principle of the scheme. The response states that the scheme is out of its jurisdiction and suggests that SEGRO contacts Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service.	Noted. Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service were consulted as a prescribed consultee, but no response received.	NO
Local Bodies				
LB1	Protect Diseworth	Protect Diseworth – Lay Response - Protect Diseworth's response highlights a number of inconsistencies between the information contained in the SoCC and the actual consultation undertaken. The response also undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the Socio Economic	The criticisms of the consultation are not accepted. The section 42 consultation and the section 47 consultation were carried out in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and the Statement of Community Consultation.	YES The height of the landscaping bund along the western boundary of the main site will be increased

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		chapter of the ES, identifying a number of key issues including overstated economic benefits, misrepresentation of demand for industrial premises, flawed justification for site selection, unsubstantiated deprivation benefits, environmental and infrastructure costs ignored (including traffic and air pollution), freeport status and business rates overstated and lack of reskilling and workforce planning. Protect Diseworth's consultation response then considers draft ES Chapters 7: Noise and Vibration (including the conclusion that the CEMP and missing appendices must be supplied), 9: Ecology and Biodiversity (including concerns in relation to incomplete documentation and lack of hyper linking and that the consultation is premature in the absence of the missing information and concerns in relation to contacting SEGRO and how the information is displayed for ease), Chapter 12: Heritage and Environment (including concerns in relation to Grade II listed homes and the Diseworth Conservation Area, vibration damage, air quality and health risks because of planning restrictions on listed properties, traffic impacts, inadequate consultation with residents, cumulative impacts on village character, public health concerns, inadequate consultation, failure to consider alternatives, non-compliance with national policy statements, failure to demonstrate national need), Chapter 15: Agriculture and Soils (including concern in relation to loss BMV and concerns in relation to the proposed Soil Management Plan) along with other areas of concern being noise,	SEGRO does not believe the criticisms of the contents of the Socio Economic chapter of the ES are warranted but intends to review them when finalizing the chapter. Comments on the draft environmental statement chapters are noted and will be considered in the finalization of those chapters. The comments on the gaps in data referred will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced.	to provide further screening to Diseworth. A detailed drawing of the Community Park will be discussed with the Parish Council and Protect Diseworth and will be included in the application submission as a commitment.

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		lighting, air quality, landscaping, water management, pathways, site access, construction phase impacts. The response concludes by setting out the mitigation measures that Protect Diseworth require in terms of visual impact, noise, lighting, air quality, landscaping, water management, pathways, site access, construction phase and generally).		
		Protect Diseworth Technical Response - Protect Diseworth Technical response makes a number of general observations in relation to the SoCC, its lack of focus on the pre statutory consultation process and its lack of information/detail in relation to how the community will be consulted along with a suggestion that consultation has not taken place in accordance with the SoCC and whether the days/hours chosen for the S42 public exhibition provided maximum flexibility to support attendance. Specific concerns were raised in relation to number of properties consulted, methods of contact and use of social media channels. The Protect Diseworth Technical response considers the Consultation Material protected and notes that there were a number of incomplete ES chapters (Traffic and Transport, Noise, Air Quality, Lighting, Population and Human Health). In addition, it is noted that none of the Appendices were made publicly available (other than where a special request has been made). Comments were also made on the Planning Statement and	The consultation was carried out in accordance with the contents of the published SoCC which was the subject of consultation with the local authorities. The role of the SoCC is to deal with s.47 consultation, not pre-statutory consultation engagement. Nonetheless such engagement has been extensive and has included Protect Diseworth. The ES chapters consulted upon were preliminary (being preliminary environmental information), however, the comments will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced. SEGRO will also respond positively to further dialogue with Protect Diseworth on an ongoing basis. Consideration will be given to the inclusion of Protect Diseworth within the CLG subject	

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		Exhibition Boards (too little information on nature of environmental impacts). The response states that Protect Diseworth is left with the impression that the engagement process up to the point of the statutory consultation has been insufficient, has lacked transparency and has not prioritised the local community and that consultation has not been meaningful. The response includes a request that SEGRO sets out a programme of dialogue to directly engage with Protect Diseworth to discuss their various specific concerns and questions regarding the proposed development and that this is done in a meaningful and transparent manner between the date of the consultation response and when the application(s) are submitted. In addition, concerns are raised in relation to landscape and visual (including landscaping mitigation), noise, lighting, air quality, traffic and transport (including pedestrian and cycle links), flood risk and surface water management, delivery of local benefits to existing community, detailed agreement on mitigation and how that is secured. The response includes technical reviews on landscape and visual impacts and traffic and transport and noise. The response also requests that Protect Diseworth is included within the Community Liaison Group.	to consideration of its representative credentials.	
LB2	Diseworth and Long Whatton Flood Working Group	The Diseworth and Long Whatton Flood Working Group responded that there is not sufficient information to be confident that the proposed drainage scheme will not inadvertently present a flood risk. The response raises a number of technical questions in relation to discharge rates, flood mitigation, foul water drainage and the	Comments on the environmental information are noted and will be considered in the finalisation of the relevant ES chapter. SEGRO has engaged with the Group and met with them in January 2025 to discuss	NO

ID No.	Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues Raised	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		proposed drainage strategy and seeks reassurance in relation to flooding and modelling and methodology.	their concerns and to talk through the emerging drainage strategy.	
LB3	Erewash Riders (bridleway group)	The Erewash Riders responded by completing the Website Enquiry form stating that it is generally not supportive of the principle of the scheme. However, the response goes on to state that the respondent agrees with the strategic context and justification for the scheme. The response also queries whether horse access is included within the Hyam's Lane footpath and cycleway proposals and the community park and more generally how horse access is incorporated into the scheme stating the routes to join different areas would be good.	The intention is that further consideration of the Community Park proposals will include consideration of horse access.	NO

Regard to s.42 Consultee responses

- 9.6 In addition to the information contained in the table above which sets out the regard SEGRO had to responses from statutory consultees on 1 May 2025 SEGRO published on its website a Summary of the responses to statutory consultation – Main Themes document (which included all responses to the Stage 2 Consultation). A copy of this document is attached at **Appendix 23**.

Conclusions

- 9.7 Part 1 of this Chapter explains the consultation responses received in response to the s.42 statutory consultation and how SEGRO has had regard to those responses. It confirms that SEGRO has fulfilled the requirements under section 49(2) of the Act.

Part 2 – MCO Application

- 9.8 In relation to the MCO Application, Regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations requires SEGRO to have regard to responses to the consultation and publicity undertaken under regulations 10 and 14. A relevant response for the purpose of regulation 10 is defined in regulation 15(3)(a) as a response from a person consulted under regulation 10 that is received by SEGRO before the deadline imposed. The deadline set for these purposes was 17 March 2025; however, any late responses received were accepted and considered as if they had been submitted by the deadline.
- 9.9 The consultation for the MCO Application was part of the same consultation exercise as that carried out for the DCO Application. The majority of responses to the consultation were focused on the EMG2 Works and the Highway Works with there being very little focus on the EMG1 Works. However, the responses set out in **Table 16** below did refer to the development proposed by the MCO Application. The table sets out the response of SEGRO.

Table 16 - Summary of Response Received from consultees and SEGRO's Response

MCO APPLICATION			
Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues raised	Applicant Response	Change?
Kegworth Parish Council	Object to Plot 16. Concerned about: - existing visual impact of EMG1 - container stacking noise has not been seriously considered previously Whilst the Parish Council say “We have until now been pleased with the visual appearance of EMG 1 from J24 and the success of the landscaping and the bund” they oppose Plot 16 because it	The objection is an objection in principle which will not be overcome by any scheme changes. SEGRO notes the comment regarding the visual appearance of EMG1 from J24 and also the concerns expressed. The environmental assessment work which is currently ongoing does not demonstrate that Plot 16 will give rise to any adverse impacts (visual	No

MCO APPLICATION			
Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues raised	Applicant Response	Change?
	represents further 'mission creep' and a willingness to sacrifice environmental priorities in the interest of commercial gain. The Parish Council consider it will detract from the landscaped appearance at the north end of the site regardless of height. on the basis of visual impact, noise impacts, and "mission creep".	impact or noise) which are unacceptable.	
Forestry Commission	Concerned regarding the lack of information, particularly in the Arboriculture report. Concerned about the impact on King Street Plantation adjacent to Plot 16.	SEGRO will be progressing its assessment work, however, the indications are that there will be no unacceptable impact on Kings Plantation as a result of Plot 16 – the specific concern is noted, and regard will be had to it when finalising the assessment work. The comments on the lack of information will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced.	

Conclusions

- 9.10 Part 2 of this Chapter explains the consultation responses received in response to the Regulation 10 and 14 statutory consultation and how SEGRO has had regard to those responses. It confirms that SEGRO has fulfilled the requirements under regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations.

10 STAGE 2 CONSULTATION – RESPONSES RECEIVED UNDER SECTION 47: DUTY TO CONSULT LOCAL COMMUNITY AND DUTY TO HAVE REGARD TO RELEVANT RESPONSES UNDER S49 AND REGULATION

Introduction

- 10.1 This Chapter reports on the responses to Stage 2 consultation under section 47 (consultation with the local community) as well as SEGRO's consideration of the issues raised in the responses.

Part 1 - DCO Application

- 10.2 For the purposes of the DCO Application, Section 49(2) of the Act requires SEGRO to have regard to relevant responses to the consultation and publicity that has been undertaken under sections 42, 47 and 48 of the Act. A relevant response for the purpose of section 47 is defined in section 49(3)(b) as a response to consultation under section 47(7) that is received by SEGRO before the deadline of 17 March 2025 set in accordance with consultation conducted pursuant to the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). Although a deadline was set, as required, any late responses received were accepted and considered as if they had been submitted by the deadline.
- 10.3 In total 205 responses to the consultation were received from the local community.

Attendance at Public Exhibitions and Webinar

- 10.4 198 people attended the first Exhibition in Diseworth and 68 people attended the second exhibition at the Hilton Hotel, East Midlands Airport.
- 10.5 Six people registered in advance to attend the on line webinar, although only one person attended. The webinar lasted approximately an hour, and a recording of the presentation and discussion, including answers to questions posed during the session, was posted on the project website.

Breakdown of total section 47 responses

- 10.6 The following table provides a breakdown of how people chose to provide feedback:

Table 17 - Number of Section 47 Responses by Format Received

Response Format	Number of Responses Received
Feedback Form response via the consultation webpage	97
Feedback Form responses received by hand or by Free post	106
Emails and letter	2
Total	205

Summary of Responses from Individual Respondees

- 10.7 This section of the report is a summary of the key matters raised by the local community in response to the Stage 2 Consultation. The analysis finds that opposition was the most common response, with concerns largely focusing on the proposed

development's potential for exacerbating existing traffic problems, landscape concerns and heritage matters. There were some additional concerns with regard to inadequacy of information at that stage.

- 10.8 A summary of the common themes, SEGRO's consideration of the same and whether the issue led to a change in the proposed development is set out in **Table 18** below.

Table 18 - Common Themes raised by individual respondents to Stage 2 s.47 Statutory Consultation and SEGRO's Response

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
Lack of information – various points were made with regard to incomplete environmental assessment.	The comments on the lack of information will be considered by SEGRO in determining whether or not to undertake a further consultation when the assessment work is further advanced.	N/A
Principle / need for EMG2		
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 application, together with commentary of the scale and type of jobs that it will deliver.	NO
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.		
Location of EMG2		
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.	The objection is an objection in principle which will not be overcome by any scheme changes. 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. The locational benefits and an assessment of alternative	NO

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
	sites will be set out in full in the application.	
Design		
Building Heights: Lack of understanding about the parameters plan and the building heights, with some respondents concerned that buildings heights were 86m, rather than 86 AOD. 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). A few respondents raised concerns about further applications being submitted for taller heights beyond the DCO limits.	Further clarity on the parameters plans and the building heights will be provided in the DCO and MCO applications. If made, the DCO will restrict the building heights. Any increase to those heights will then require a new consent.	YES More clarity will be included in the documentation as to the means by which heights will be restricted
The proposed colour palette of the buildings, with some respondents suggesting the buildings should be green to blend in better with the countryside.	The design and colour palette of the buildings is being considered and will be determined at detailed design stage.	NO
Heritage		
Concerns about building near listed buildings and a conservation area.	The impact on heritage assets will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement accompanying the application. From the assessment work carried out to date it is not anticipated that there will be any unacceptable impacts on heritage assets.	NO
Drainage and flood risk		
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	SEGRO is working closely with the Environment Agency and lead local flood authority to confirm its drainage	NO

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
risk.	strategy. The impact on flooding and drainage will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement.	
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.	With regard to previous problems at EMG1, there were issues with regard to the drainage during construction of EMG1 which required a temporary drainage solution to resolve. The issue has now been dealt with by the installation of the permanent drainage strategy at EMG1.	
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.	SEGRO has had regard to these issues in developing its drainage strategy.	
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.		
Existing problems with surface water flooding along the A453 site frontage in storm events fronting the EMG2 Main Site.		
Visual impact and landscaping		
Concerns about the visual impact from Diseworth and the lack of a sufficient buffer. 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. 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	The visual impact and landscaping of the scheme is under active consideration, including the form / height of the perimeter mounding. The landscape and visual impacts will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement	YES The form of landscape buffer area between the built form of EMG2 and Diseworth is under consideration, and it is anticipated that the bunding will be increased in height to reduce visual impact.

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
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). 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.		
Concerns that the EMG1 landscaping had not delivered on its promises, and the same could happen with EMG2.	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.	NO
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.	More detailed visualisations from a wider range of viewpoints, including from Diseworth, are being prepared and will be made available	YES More detailed images to be provided
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.	The visual impact and landscaping of the plot are being considered, including the need for bunding / screening, however, no substantial change is anticipated given that the assessment work to date indicates that there will be no unacceptable visual impact from Plot 16.	NO
Traffic – add in re active travel support		
Whether traffic will stay on the 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. Some respondents queried why the A453 at the airport / Finger Farm roundabout is not being dualled and / or no works are proposed to the Finger Farm roundabout.	The impacts of traffic will be fully assessed within the Environmental Statement. SEGRO is working closely with National Highways to develop the appropriate mitigation for the proposed development. That mitigation will involve substantial works to J24 which will provide sufficient capacity to negate the need for substantial works to the Finger Farm	YES Minor works to Finger Farm will be added to the scheme as part of comprehensive

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
	roundabout, however, it is anticipated there will be a need for minor works at that junction.	mitigation.
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.	Traffic modelling is underway which will identify any issues so that they can be mitigated if necessary.	Hyams Lane is to be closed to all vehicular traffic except in the case of emergencies
Concerns that traffic at Finger Farm roundabout could be made worse (some respondents noted that there is already queuing traffic on the A453).	As above, traffic modelling is underway which will identify any issues so that they can be mitigated.	
Concerns that people who work at EMG2 could park in Diseworth.	The scheme will incorporate adequate parking for those who work at EMG2.	
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.	The future use of Hyam's Lane and at Long Holden is being considered.	
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.		
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.	Traffic modelling is underway which will identify whether this could be an issue.	
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.		
Concerns about existing weaving / safety issues on the A50 heading north west from M1 Junction 24.	As above, traffic modelling is underway which will identify any issues so that they can be mitigated.	

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
Safety concerns about entry from Derby Road (old A6) onto Junction 24 including about lane guidance and markings.		
Concerns that airport users are parking in Diseworth and that the scheme could make this worse.	SEGRO does not believe that the scheme will contribute to this issue but is considering the matter.	
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 to serve the proposed development.	
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 Constructional Environmental Management Plan which will include a Construction Traffic Management Plan to minimize disruption.	
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.	
Sustainable transport		
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 through the development of a Sustainable Transport Strategy which is intended to build upon a similar, very successful, strategy which operates at EMG1.	NO
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.	The active travel proposals to be included in the application are part of an overall sustainable transport strategy. Appropriate pedestrian and cycle routes will be secured in the DCO.	
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.	

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
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 for instance into the proposed Isley Woodhouse site and onto Cloud trail extension to Ashby.	The need for and extent of cycling / walking measures is being considered.	
Ecology / biodiversity / agricultural land		
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.	No
Concerns about the loss of agricultural land, specifically arable land.	The impact on agricultural land will be addressed in the Environmental Statement.	
Noise		
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.	YES
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 will be addressed in detail within the Environmental Statement.	An appropriate requirement with regard to noise to be included in the draft DCO
Lighting		
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 applications through the Environmental Statement.	NO

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
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 has recently installed new lighting, which is having a significant effect on Diseworth.		
Community park		
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.	YES A detailed drawing of the Community Park will be discussed with Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council, Protect Diseworth and other interested parties and will be included in the application submission as a commitment.
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).		
Other issues		
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.	YES Use of Long Holden by vehicles is to be restricted
The impact of the development on local residents' 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 and the resultant assessment included within the Environmental Statement.	NO

Summary of main theme	Applicant's Response	Change?
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.	YES Through consideration of the detail of proposals for the Community Park which will have regard to horse riding routes

- 10.9 A table setting out a summary of the individual public consultation responses to the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation can be found in **Appendix 24**.
- 10.10 Following the public consultation, on 28 February 2025, SEGRO met with the resident of 6 Langley Close, Diseworth to discuss comments and concerns regarding boundary and opportunities for planting to ensure that the residents visual and security concerns were addressed. This meeting was followed up in May 2025 with a draft landscape scheme which has been incorporated into the revised proposals for the Community Park.

Conclusion

- 10.11 The relevant issues raised from responses have been summarised, considered and responded to.

Part 2 - MCO Application

- 10.12 It should be noted that the equivalent provision for the MCO Application, providing a duty to consult the local community under Regulation 13 of the 2011 Regulations, was revoked by the Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) (Amendment) Regulations 2015. However, there remains a duty under regulation 15 for SEGRO to have regard to relevant responses to the consultation and publicity that has been undertaken under regulations 10 and 14 of the 2011 Regulations.
- 10.13 The consultation for the MCO Application was part of the same consultation exercise with the local community as that carried out for the DCO Application. Accordingly, any responses from the local community in respect of the MCO Application received in response to the consultation under s.47 are addressed here.
- 10.14 Where responses objected to the very principle of development there was no differentiation between the development of Plot 16 (the MCO Application) and the development on the EMG2 Main Site – the objections often were to any more warehousing in the area wherever it was. Accordingly, the objections in principle referred to in Part 1 can be taken to apply to the MCO Application as well as the DCO Application.
- 10.15 Where specific comments were made the majority of responses to the consultation were focused on the EMG2 Works and the Highway Works with there being very little focus on the EMG1 Works. However, the summary of main themes in Table 18 above does refer to concerns with regard to the effect of Plot 16 on landscaping and its visual impact and drainage issues at EMG1.
- 10.16 In addition, the responses set out in **Table 19** below specifically referred to the development of Plot 16 proposed by the MCO Application. There was one response in support which is also referred to in the table below.

Table 19 – Summary of individual responses to Responses to Stage 2 Reg 13 Statutory Consultation and SEGRO's Response

MCO APPLICATION			
Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues raised	Applicant Response	Change?
Mike McIntyre Local Resident and Parish Councillor	The proposed extension to the EMG1 site, ie Unit 16, should be removed, It appears to be an opportunistic move to extend the boundary. The proposed Unit 16 will have an adverse effect on the King Street Plantation woodland. It is already surrounded on 3 sides and would now be virtually cut off.	SEGRO will be progressing its assessment work, however, the indications are that there will be no unacceptable impact on Kings Plantation as a result of Plot 16 – the specific concern is noted, and regard will be had to it when finalising the assessment work.	NO
Helene Smith – Local Resident	I want to make it clear that I'm not supporting any further industrial development in the area around East Midlands airport or East Midlands Gateway 1, including the building of a new Gateway. I don't believe it is necessary, and will have a negative effect on local residents, traffic and wildlife.	The objection is an objection in principle which will not be overcome by any scheme changes.	NO
Michael Davies – Local Resident	Sound and light insulation on existing EMG1 is insufficient This should be resolved. EMG1 green areas are now being taken back. How long will these last? As this proposal includes extensions to EMG1 it is relevant to refer to existing issues: As a Kegworth resident EMG1 imposes 24-hour light	SEGRO will be progressing its assessment work, however, the indications are that there will be no unacceptable impact in relation to noise or light. The specific concerns are noted, and regard will be had to them when finalising the assessment work.	NO

MCO APPLICATION			
Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues raised	Applicant Response	Change?
	and noise pollution from the existing site. This is not ameliorated for residents closest to the site as the bunding is insufficient and the prevailing wind carries the sound. Strangely the site is shielded on other sides, but no space was afforded for enough bunding to shield the Kegworth side. A major issue is the road and the junction created to allow access to and egress from EMG1. When the site was built the road was raised thereby giving no noise protection as the sound carries down towards Kegworth. Add to this the sweep of the road and lack of speed restriction and it is easy to see why it has become an all-night race track. Most nights for hours this creates a major disruption that affects the village and is worse than the airport noise. This is not addressed but was created by EMG1. The effects on the local area of EMG 1 are therefore not resolved but with these further developments it will make matters worse. Light, noise, traffic issues from the existing site still exist and further amendments to EMG1 in this proposal will only worsen that. More traffic, more roads so more noise and congestion, higher gantries more light and sound pollution. The proposal should include major new sound insulation improvements which it does not. It is also noted that the proposal seeks to have Green areas in EMG 1 developed.	SEGRO notes the comments regarding the current impact of EMG1 which does not accord with its understanding, however, any such impacts will be taken into account when undertaking the environmental assessment work for the proposed development.	
Dennis Holness – Local Resident	Supports the proposed development.		

MCO APPLICATION			
Statutory Consultee	Summary of Issues raised	Applicant Response	Change?
	Makes a reference to difficulties in navigating a footpath which is not a footpath involved in or connected to the proposed development.		

Conclusion

10.17 The relevant issues raised from responses have been summarised, considered and responded to.

11 STAGE 2 CONSULTATION – RESPONSES RECEIVED UNDER SECTION 48 AND REGULATION 14: DUTY TO PUBLICISE

Introduction

- 11.1 This Chapter reports on the responses to publicity under section 48 and regulation 14.

Part 1 – DCO Application

- 11.2 For the DCO Application, Section 49(2) of the Act requires SEGRO to have regard to relevant responses to the consultation and publicity that has been undertaken under sections 42, 47 and 48 of the Act. A relevant response for the purpose of section 48 is defined in section 49(3)(c) as a response to publicity under section 48(2) that is received by SEGRO before the deadline set out in the publicity.

Overview of responses

- 11.3 Responses directed to the DCO Application were received in relation to section 42 and section 47 consultation. These are summarised in Parts 1 of **Chapters 9 and 10** of this Report. It is not clear whether any of the responses were sent as a result of having seen the section 48 notice. That cannot be easily ascertained, unless a respondent had decided to express that they were responding specifically as a result of having seen the section 48 notice in the newspaper.
- 11.4 No respondent specifically referred to the section 48 notice. Accordingly, all comments have been considered in Parts 1 of **Chapters 9 and 10**. SEGRO therefore considers that it has fully complied with its duty under section 49 to have regard to all responses.

Conclusions

- 11.5 For the reasons explained in paragraphs 11.3 – 11.5 above, Part 1 of this Chapter confirms compliance with the requirements of section 49(2) of the Act with regards to publicity under section 48.

Part 2 – MCO Application

- 11.6 In respect of the MCO Application, SEGRO has a duty under regulation 15 to have regard to relevant responses to the consultation and publicity that has been undertaken under regulations 10 and 14 of the 2011 Regulations.
- 11.7 Responses directed to the MCO Application were received in relation to the regulation 10 consultation. These are summarised in Parts 2 of **Chapters 9 and 10** of this Report. It is not clear whether any of the responses were sent as a result of having seen the regulation 14 notice. That cannot be easily ascertained, unless a respondent had decided to express that they were responding specifically as a result of having seen the regulation 14 notice in the newspaper.
- 11.8 No respondent specifically referred to the regulation 14 notice. Accordingly, all comments have been considered in Parts 2 of **Chapters 9 and 10**. SEGRO therefore considers that it has fully complied with its duty under regulation 15 to have regard to all responses.

Conclusions

- 11.9 For the reasons explained in paragraphs 11.7 - 11.9 above, Part 2 of this Chapter confirms compliance with the requirements of regulation 15(2) of the 2011 Regulations with regards to publicity under regulation 14.

12 STAGE 3 NON STATUTORY ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION

Introduction

- 12.1 This Chapter describes the additional, non-statutory, consultation which took place in respect of both the DCO Application and the MCO Application.
- 12.2 As a result of the Stage 2 Consultation and further assessment work SEGRO decided to make a number of changes to the DCO Application some of which are referred to in the Segro responses to consultations in previous chapters. These are summarised in **Table 20** below, along with the reason for the change.

Table 20 – Scheme Changes following Stage 2 Consultation

Change	Reason
DCO Application	
Community Park – more detail of the Community Park was developed with a more detailed drawing (with a public right of way) being introduced. The draft DCO will require the development to be carried out in accordance with that drawing.	The proposal to include a Community Park within the proposal was welcomed by some respondents, however, they requested that more detailed information be provided about what it would include and also that provision be made for a public right of way within it.
Increase in the height of the landscape bund along the western boundary of the EMG2 Main Site.	Some respondents requested a higher bund to provide further screening to Diseworth and users of the Community Park.
Confirmation of the inclusion of HGV Parking and driver welfare facilities as part of the proposals to accommodate HGV's using the EMG2 Main Site – to be delivered early in the development of the site.	Some respondents were concerned regarding existing and future HGV parking capacity due to some current local issues surrounding the supply of HGV parking and roadside facilities.
Introduction of measures to limit vehicle access along Long Holden and removal of footpath link to Long Holden from the middle of the EMG2 Main Site.	Some respondents were concerned regarding possible car parking and the potential for anti-social behaviour on Long Holden.
Additional mezzanine floorspace provided for additional uses.	The further technical assessment work had demonstrated that a proposed impact in mezzanine floorspace would be acceptable and create no additional impacts over and above that which has been assessed.
Changes at M1 J24 to remove the segregated left turn lane (A453 to A50) which came about following liaison with NH geometry specialists on the number of merges / conflict points on the A50.	Following liaison with NH geometry specialists on the number of merges / conflict points on the A50.
Additional works to widen the A453 westbound exit of the Finger Farm roundabout and increase the length of the two	Detailed traffic modelling had shown that additional works to this section of the roundabout are required.

Change	Reason
lane section on the approach to the Hunter Road/EMG2 access junction.	
Changes to existing signage on the M1 before J 23A northbound corridor and between J23A and J24.	Revised signage is required to direct drivers to the new exit to the A50. The signage changes followed dialogue with NH.
A453/The Green junction minor highway works removed.	Further technical assessment showed that these works were not required.
The electricity substation upgrade (located within EMG1) is included in the EMG2 Works rather than the EMG1 Works.	The upgrade is principally to provide power to the EMG2 Main Site. Change was to ensure clarity regarding the appropriate consenting route.
MCO Application	
The works to provide a pedestrian crossing at the EMG1 exit are included in the EMG2 Works rather than the EMG1 Works.	These works are associated with the provision of a drop off lay by within EMG1 and are therefore should be part of the EMG1 Works and authorised by the MCO.

12.3 In addition, since the Stage 2 Consultation, SEGRO had undertaken further technical work on its proposals. Given the changes proposed and availability of updated technical work SEGRO decided to undertake additional consultation to ensure everyone had the opportunity to review the updated information and proposals before the applications were made.

12.4 As part of this Stage 3 consultation, all the draft application documents consulted on as part of the Stage 2 Consultation were updated and re-provided for comment. In addition, the following new or updated draft documents were made available for comment:

12.4.1 Additional Environmental Statement material including draft Chapter 4 Alternatives, draft updated Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport, and draft Chapter 21 Cumulative Impacts;

12.4.2 Draft Transport Assessment;

12.4.3 Technical Appendices to Environmental Statement chapters; and

12.4.4 Proposed Community Park plan and additional details.

When Consultation Took Place

12.5 Consultation took place between Tuesday 1 July 2025 and Tuesday 29 July 2025, a period of 29 days.

Who was consulted?

12.6 SEGRO consulted the same key stakeholders, persons and entities for the stage 3, non-statutory, additional consultation as it did for the stage 2 statutory consultation (all s.42 and s.47 consultees). This included utilising the same Core Consultation Area shown in the SoCC (**Appendix 8**).

Advance Notice

- 12.7 Advance notice was given to various stakeholders of the intention to hold a further consultation exercise as follows:

Table 21 – Advance Notice to Consultees – Pre Consultation

Consultee	Notice	How and when sent?
County and District Ward Councillors Officers of NWLDC and LCC Parish Councils PILs Occupiers of EMG1 Local MP	Notice of intention to hold further Non Statutory Additional Consultation	E mail on 15 May 2025 (an example of the email is attached at Appendix 25)
County and District Ward Councillors Officers of NWLDC and LCC Parish Councils PILS Occupiers of EMG1 Local MP	Notice of dates of further Non Statutory Additional Consultation	E mail on 16 June 2025 (an example of the e mail is attached at Appendix 25A)
District, County and Parish Councillors and Protect Diseworth	Follow up emails in a form identical to the 16 June e mail reminding of the dates of the further Non Statutory Additional Consultation.	Email on 26 June 2025 (an example of the email is attached at Appendix 26)

How was consultation carried out?

- 12.8 An Additional Consultation Newsletter dated 25 June 2025 was distributed and consultees were informed as set out below. A copy of the newsletter can be found at **Appendix 27**.

Local authorities (section 43)

- 12.9 All section 43 local authorities were sent a letter by first class Royal Mail on 25 June 2025 confirming that further consultation was being conducted on changes made to the proposed development following the feedback received from statutory consultation and updated environmental assessment work. The letter provided details of the new or updated documents being consulted upon and provided details of how they could respond. A copy of the letter is provided at **Appendix 28**.
- 12.10 In addition to the notification on 25 June 2025, North West Leicestershire District Council, as a host authority, were also notified of the Stage 3 Consultation by email on 1 July 2025. The email attached a copy of the Consultation Newsletter June 2025. The email provided North West Leicestershire District Council with a drop box link to key documents.

- 12.11 In addition to the notification on 25 June 2025, Leicestershire County Council, as a host authority, were also notified of the Stage 3 Consultation by letter, sent by email on 1 July 2025. The letter sets out how SEGRO has sought to respond to the issues previously raised by the County Council and highlights the consultation material of particular relevance to those matters.

Parish Councils (section 42)

- 12.12 In addition to the advance notice all parish councils who had previously been consulted or responded to the Stage 2 Consultation were sent a letter by first class Royal Mail dated 25 June 2025 explaining that further consultation was being conducted on changes made to the proposed development following the feedback received from statutory consultation and updated environmental assessment work. The letter provided details of the new or updated documents being consulted upon and provided details of how they could respond (**Appendix 28**).

Other statutory consultees (section 42)

- 12.13 Relevant statutory consultees were sent a letter by first class Royal Mail dated 25 June 2025 explaining that further consultation was being conducted on changes made to the proposed development following the feedback received from statutory consultation and updated environmental assessment work. The letter provided details of the new or updated documents being consulted upon and provided details of how they could respond. (**Appendix 28**).

PILs (section 44)

- 12.14 In addition to the advance notice, individuals and organisations with an interest in the land were sent a letter by first class Royal Mail dated 25 June 2025 explaining that further consultation was being conducted on changes made to the proposed development following the feedback received from statutory consultation and updated environmental assessment work. The letter provided details of the new or updated documents being consulted upon and provided details of how they could respond. A copy of the letter is provided at **Appendix 28**. There had also been separate correspondence with some of the PILs which ensured awareness of the consultation.
- 12.15 SEGRO also erected a number of site notices around the area affected by the proposed development to raise awareness in the same locations and manner as for the statutory consultation.

Local Community - Mailing to Core Consultation Area

- 12.16 The Additional Consultation Newsletter providing details of the additional consultation and how people could respond was sent on 24 June 2025 by first class Royal Mail to all residents and businesses within the Core Consultation Area.

Website

- 12.17 All consultation documents were made available to download from the website: <https://www.segro.com/slpemg2> via dedicated tab on the webpage marked "Additional Consultation". The documents were available throughout the additional consultation period (1 July 2025 to 29 July 2025) and remained available after the consultation period closed. SEGRO proposes to remove that material only once the DCO Application and MCO Application are submitted.

Feedback mechanisms

12.18 Comments on the Stage 3: Additional Consultation were sought through the existing feedback channels:

12.18.1 Online via the form on the "contact us" tab: <https://www.segro.com/countries-repository/united-kingdom/segro-logistics-park-east-midlands-gateway-2/contact-us>

12.18.2 By Post: EMG2, PO Box 11382, Nottingham, NG2 9AU

12.19 A bespoke Additional Consultation Form was provided via the "Contact Us" tab. A copy of the form is included in **Appendix 29**. The Additional Consultation Form set out the following questions which expressly differentiated between the DCO Application for the EMG2 Works and the MCO Application for the EMG1 Works:

In relation to the DCO Application for the EMG2 Works

1. Do you have any comments on our proposals for a new community park as shown on the plan provided?
2. Do you agree with our proposal to increase the height of the landscaping bund along the western boundary of the main site between the community park and the built development?
3. Do you agree with the changes proposed to Long Holden to address concerns about parking and anti-social behaviour?
4. Do you have any comments on any of the other changes made to the proposed development as described in the newsletter?
5. Have any of the changes made a difference to whether you support or oppose the development?
6. Do you have any comments on the draft documents provided, including the new documents identified in the newsletter?
7. Do you have any additional comments that you would like to make on the proposed development or on the consultation materials?

In relation to the MCO to the EMG1 DCO (MCO) for the EMG1 Works

8. Do you have any comments on the changes made to the proposed development as described in the newsletter?
9. Have any of the changes made a difference to whether you support or oppose the development?
10. Do you have any comments on the draft documents provided, including the new documents identified in the newsletter?
11. Do you have any additional comments that you would like to make on the proposed development or on the consultation materials?
12. If you have any other comments generally about our proposals for EMG2 as a whole, please set them out below.

What was Consulted Upon?

12.20 A list of the material consulted upon is in **Appendix 30**.

Conclusions

12.21 This Chapter demonstrates that SEGRO has carried out additional consultation with statutory consultees and local communities in respect of updated material and changes made to the proposed development since the Stage 2 statutory consultation.

13 STAGE 3: NON STATUTORY ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION - RESPONSES

Part 1 - DCO Application

Introduction

- 13.1 As explained above all parties who were consulted at the time of the statutory consultation were also consulted on the Additional Consultation. A total of 26 responses were received from all the consultees in response to the Stage 3 Consultation.

Responses

- 13.2 **Table 22** below is a summary of the principal issues raised by each respondent to the additional consultation along with confirmation of whether the issue led to a change in the proposed development, and details of SEGRO's consideration of the issue. The table includes responses from both statutory consultees and the local community, and, for completeness, includes respondents who previously responded to the s.42 statutory consultation but did not respond directly to the Additional Consultation to confirm that no further formal response was received.

Table 22 – Summary of all Responses to Additional Consultation

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
National Agencies				
NA1	National Highways	NH stated that the emerging proposals appear to provide the appropriate strategic solution to mitigate the development's impact. Further work is required to complete the modelling and satisfy NH that the design is acceptable. NH made reference in their response and an Appendix to it to several issues and points of detail which they wish to be addressed. NH "welcome the collaborative way in which Segro and your consultants have continued to engage with National Highways since the February 2025 Statutory Consultation and are encouraged by the emerging design for the mitigation proposals as well as the progress made on the traffic modelling. We will continue to work with you and the project team to close out the modelling and agree the design over the coming weeks."	SEGRO intends to continue the close collaborative relationship with NH to address the matters raised in its response and Appendix and to finalise the design of the mitigation. The Transport Working Group which continues to meet regularly.	YES Details of highway mitigation design.
NA2	Environment Agency	Comments were made on water quality issues with in particular detailed comments on the contents of the CEMP.	SEGRO has had regard to these comments in finalising documentation.	NO
NA3	Natural England	No response	Whilst there has been no direct response to the Additional Consultation SEGRO's consultants have been in regular contact with NE on the contents of the ES chapters and a Statement of	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
			Common Ground which is ongoing.	
NA4	Forestry Commission	No response	Whilst there has been no direct response to the Additional Consultation SEGRO's consultants have been in regular contact with the Forestry Commission on the contents of the ES chapters and a Statement of Common Ground which is ongoing.	NO
NA5	UK Health and Security Agency	No response		NO
Local Authorities				
LA1	North West Leicestershire District Council	NWLDC reserved its position but provided comments on the draft DCO (and the draft MCO). NWLDC continued to welcome the addition of an HGV park within the proposals and wish consideration be given to the HGV parking being available for use by other HGV's not connected with EMG1 or EMG 2. NWLDC made comments on the need for requirements in respect of the HGV parking and some detailed comments on some of the ES chapters which remained to be addressed. NWLDC stated that their Landscape Consultant "generally" agrees with the method and the assessment results and considers that the applicant's landscape consultant has worked on addressing comments that were made at the statutory consultation stage. The Council's	SEGRO intends to retain the dedicated HGV parking within the proposal to ensure that the development meets its own needs. It will continue to give consideration to the management of the HGV parking. Comments from NWLDC and its consultants on the draft environmental statement chapters and DAD are noted and will be considered in the finalization of those chapters. Regular engagement is intended to continue.	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		Landscape Consultant is also pleased to see more detail regarding the landscape mitigation and community park." NWLDC did raise concerns regarding the adequacy screening adjacent to the A453, acknowledging that the drafted requirements will ensure NWLDC has control over the final design. NWLDC confirmed that the approach to lighting is agreed. A copy of advice from the Council's Heritage Consultant and their Landscape Consultant was provided, along with comments on the Design Approach Document.		
LA2 (1)	Leicestershire County Council	Leicestershire County Council responded with some further observations regarding the highway work and made reference to further work which in its view should be done. The letter requested amendments to the surface water drainage requirements in the draft DCO. The letter made further comments on the Materials and Waste chapter of the ES, some of which acknowledged that previous comments had been resolved and others which required further consideration. LCC referred to several aspects of assessment relating to public health.	SEGRO has met with LCC specifically to discuss the points raised, in addition to the regular Transport Working group meetings. This was to clarify any misunderstandings and to familiarise those who do not attend the TWG with aspects of the ongoing work. Discussions are ongoing in relation to the highway assessment. Further consideration has been given to the drainage requirements in the draft DCO. The Materials and Waste chapter of the ES has been reviewed in light of the comments in the LCC response. The comments on public health assessments have been reviewed in finalising the relevant	YES Details of mitigation design

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
			chapters.	
LA2 (2)	Leicestershire County Council – Ecology and Biodiversity	The response stated that there is no objection to the proposals. The report comments on the mitigation proposals and agrees with the approach. Recommendations are made for some details (such as location of bat boxes) to be confirmed when the detailed proposals come forward. Some clarification has been requested regarding some of the surveys, by particular reference to skylarks with a query raised as to the need for mitigation. A request was made for a BNG assessment.	The comments received have been taken into account in the finalisation of the relevant ES Chapter which has included more details on the survey results and assessment and the onsite mitigation. The BNG assessment was provided to LCC.	NO
LA3	Charnwood Borough Council	No response.		NO
LA4	Derby City Council	No response.		NO
LA5	Leicester City Council	The response was from the Council as a highway authority. It observed that the results from the transport modelling to date have shown that the Area of Influence does not extend as far as the Council's administrative boundary and they do not expect that to change. The letter confirms that the Council has had input into the Sustainable Transport Strategy and Travel Plan Framework. It acknowledges the benefits of a purpose built bus interchange and also referred to option of rail travel to East Midlands Parkway Station with bus connectivity to the development. The Council "welcomed the continuation of the	Noted	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		collaborative approach adopted to date as part of the EMG2 Transport Working Group".		
LA6	Lichfield District Council	No response		NO
LA7	South Derbyshire District Council	The District Council responded in respect of concerns they have for the maintenance and enhancement of the Airway bus service which connects Swadlincote with EMA and EMG1 and also serves other towns within South Derbyshire. They consider that EMG2 "presents an excellent opportunity to enhance the long term viability of the service" and requested a change to the wording of the Sustainable Transport Strategy to direct bus services to the employment catchment rather than main local urban areas.	SEGRO welcomes the implicit support for the Sustainable Transport Strategy and confirms it has amended the public transport objectives in the Sustainable Transport Strategy to refer to the employment catchment of the site as requested.	NO
LA8	Warwickshire County Council (WCC)	WCC welcomed the increase in the height of the bund along the western boundary of the main site and the changes to Long Holden to avoid future anti-social behaviour. WCC also welcomed the HGV parking and driver facilities.	Noted	NO
Parish Councils				
PC1	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council	No response		NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
PC2	Castle Donington Parish Council	No response		NO
PC3	Kegworth Parish Council	Kegworth PC maintains its objection to the DCO. The letter reiterated concerns regarding the visual impact from the south and south east, issues with regard to a single point of access, impact on J24. The letter confirmed that the changes since the statutory consultation do not overcome its objection to the principle of development. Concern also expressed regarding the DCO authorisation. The letter also asserts that EMG1 has brought relatively little in either quality or quantity to already buoyant employment take-up in the surrounding communities.	The Parish Council maintains its previous objections which were submitted in response to the statutory consultation. Given the objection in principle SEGRO believes that none of the points made can be addressed in an appropriate change to the MCO Application or the MCO Application. SEGRO clearly does not accept the comment with regard to EMG1. The benefits of EMG1 will be apparent for the application documentation, in particular the Planning Statement and the Socio-Economic chapter of the ES.	NO
PC4	Breedon on the Hill Parish Council	No response.		NO
PC5	Weston on Trent Parish Council	No response.		NO
Persons with Interest in Land				
PIL 1	Manchester Airport Group (EMA)	MAG continues to object to the use of a DCO and associated compulsory purchase powers in respect of land it owns within the EMG2 Main Site.	The objection to compulsory purchase is noted. SEGRO will continue its efforts to avoid the need for compulsory purchase. SEGRO has made regular requests to MAG for	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		The letter criticises the length of the consultation period and the fact that the consultation is non-statutory. Consultation. It referred to the planning application submitted in May 2024 by MAG relating to part of the EMG2 Main Site now being taken forward jointly with Prologis and that the application will likely be granted “in short order”. Reference is also made to aerodrome safeguarding and the need for a Bird Hazard Management Plan such as that which is successful at EMG1 and protective provisions.	meetings/engagement with MAGS airport safeguarding team over the last several months but have been unable to secure such engagement. SEGRO has extensive experience in developing adjacent to an airport and directly relevant experience from developing EMG1 but would welcome discussions with MAG and will continue to encourage them to engage directly. SEGRO will also continue to press MAG for engagement on protective provisions. Points regarding adequacy of consultation are addressed separately in Chapter 16 of this report.	
PIL 2	Prologis Limited and Prologis Limited (DLA Piper)	The letter reiterated the previous comments submitted by Prologis in response to the statutory consultation. The letter asserts that SEGRO's Additional Consultation is procedurally unfair and unlawful and that it has not complied with its statutory duties. Much of the letter sets out details of that assertion. The letter also asserts that compulsory acquisition powers are not necessary or justified. It also asserts that there are deficiencies in the SEGRO Transport Assessment because it is based on the 2019 PRTM model available at the	Points regarding lawfulness and adequacy of consultation are addressed separately in Chapter 16 of this report. SEGRO will continue its efforts to avoid the need for compulsory purchase. Discussions began with MAG in February of 2020 and progressed with detailed discussions on a regular basis and it was thought were proceeding to a satisfactory conclusion until August 2024 when MAG advised SEGRO that it had decided to proceed with development on its land with another development partner, Prologis. Prologis acquired its interests in the EMG2 Main	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		time of the commencement of modelling rather than the more recent 2023 PRTM.	Site in October 2024. Notwithstanding the impression given by the response, SEGRO approached Prologis to discuss its interest in November 2024 and has tried to pursue discussions with Prologis on a regular basis since that date. Discussions have now taken place and are ongoing.	
National Bodies				
NB1	Royal Mail	No response.		NO
NB2	National Grid Electricity Transmission	No response.		NO
NB3	Coal Authority	No response.		NO
NB4	GTC Plant Enquiry Team	No response.		NO
NB5	Mainline Pipelines Ltd	No response.		NO
NB6	Open Spaces Society	No response.		NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
NB7	Joint Radio Company (JRC)	The response explains that JRC analyse proposals for wind farms on behalf of the UK Fuel & Power Industry. It states that JRC does not object to the development and are content with the mitigation.	The response seems directed at a wind farm proposal. Attempts to contact the consultee to discuss the response have been unsuccessful.	NO
Area Bodies				
AB1	NHS Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland	No response		NO
AB2	Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service	No response		NO
AB3	CPRE Leicestershire	Referred to the need to ensure that the design of the community park (and any other facilities) should be based on needs defined by the local community Welcomed the increased landscape bund as a measure to reduce visual impact, however, it did not wish the land bund to be the only measure of impact. Wished there to be extensive use of hedgerow and mature trees and that the design “be by reference to recommendations by horticultural/arborist/agricultural experts and the local community”. Referred to preference for use of brownfield land rather than productive greenfield land. Referred to concerns regarding losing heritage	The design of the Community Park has been the subject of discussion with local interested bodies, including Protect Diseworth.	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		and tranquillity of Diseworth and flooding. CPRE advised that they were responding at the request of Project [sic] Diseworth. The response goes on to refer to the principles of good infrastructure development that support society's prosperity as well as being responsible stewards of the environment. It stated that CPRE supports the need for critical national infrastructure as long as it is undertaken in a responsible way without the environment being damaged or local community adversely impacted.		
Local Bodies				
LB1	Protect Diseworth Response	Reiterated its objection to the principle of development. Reference is made to a planning application on the norther part of the EMG2 site submitted by MAG and the prejudice to Protect Diseworth in having to deal with both that application and the DCO application. The letter goes on to detail its concerns regarding the effect of the development. It also raised concerns about the Community Park being used by dog walkers, exacerbating parking problems in the village. Reference is made to a country park in St Albans where they say saplings were planted and left to	Protect Diseworth maintains its previous objections which were submitted in response to the statutory consultation. Given the objection in principle SEGRO believes that none of the points made can be addressed in an appropriate change to the scheme. With regard to the scheme in St Albans - as part of the Radlett scheme, SEGRO is forming a new country park of c. 700 acres, only 218 acres consist of existing open space on which anyone can roam; land that has been neglected for a number of years. SEGRO is at the start of a multi-year programme, working with local stakeholders, to reinvigorate the existing open space as well as investing in new footpaths,	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		die. The letter confirmed the support for the HGV parking area.	planting and other features to provide the comprehensive country park detailed in the planning permission. Prior to the bird nesting season, trees and vegetation have been cleared ahead of the commencement of both the onsite and offsite infrastructure as well as clearing the development plateau, all of which has been in accordance with the planning consent. During the last planting season 130,000 saplings were planted, some of which have not survived due to the recent dry conditions. It is standard practice on SEGRO schemes to replace planting that has not survived during the following planting season. This is required by the consent and will be done at the appropriate time of year.	
LB2	Diseworth and Long Whatton Flood Working Group	No response	Whilst there has been no direct response to the Additional Consultation SEGRO's consultants have been in contact with the Group and answered questions they have raised.	NO
LB3	Erewash Riders (bridleway group)	No response		NO
LB4	Litton Properties Ltd	Litton Properties are the owners of land adjacent to Finger Farm. They comment that they are supportive of the proposals provided that they do not impede their ability to develop their site in accordance with their planning permission. The site concerned is to be accessed off the Finger Farm roundabout.	SEGRO is aware of the site and planning permission referred to and is satisfied that the proposals will not prevent the development of the site concerned.	NO

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
Local Residents				
LR1	Iain Anderson	Not in support. Disagrees with location. Brownfield first. Concerned about cumulative impact of development and impact to people and environment.	Given the objection in principle expressed by local residents in these responses SEGRO believes that none of the points made can be addressed in an appropriate change to the DCO application or MCO application. SEGRO believes that all of the impacts of the development have been appropriately assessed. SEGRO notes the fact that some residents do not welcome the Community Park, however, the engagement SEGRO has had with representatives of the village have indicated that it is seen as a welcome addition to the scheme, notwithstanding their objection in principle.	NO
LR2	Charles Brompton K	Not in support. Disagrees with location and proximity to village. Comments that consultation information is not full and clear – asks various questions. Concerned about nuisance parking, noise/light/air pollution, flooding.		
LR3	Neil Curling	Not in support. Disagrees with location. Not in support with community park due to concerns it will encourage disrepair and litter. Concerned about the height of buildings, scope of highways works and environmental impact.		
LR4	Kirsty Davis	Not in support. Disagrees with scale. Concerned about representativeness of 3D development visuals, validity of traffic data, height of bunding and scale of proposals.		
LR5	Stuart Dudley	Not in support. Disagrees with location and need. Inadequate separation between site and village. Concerned that imagery is not fully representative of visual impact of development and heritage impacts.		
LR6	Kathryn Hutchinson	Not in support. Disagrees with location and scale. Disagrees with community park and ASB issues it may bring, landscaping and visual impact, access to village from site, road safety, flooding,		

ID No.	Consultee	Summary of Response	Applicant Response	Scheme Change?
		light/noise pollution, cumulative impact.		
LR7	Jamie Mountain	Not in support. Disagrees with need. Concerned about litter and traffic impact and safety. Concerned about methodology for identifying highway works (changes needed at A453).		
LR8	Christine Platts	Not in support. Disagrees with location. Concerned about destruction to environment and wildlife, and landscape and visual impacts.		
LR9	Ian Robertson	Not in support. Disagrees with location. Concerned about nuisance parking and vehicular access via Hyams Lane and Long Holden, public access into community park and traffic impact. Hedgerows along A453 to J23A should be retained.		
LR10	Dr S J Webster	Not in support. Low unemployment in the area. Concerned about traffic and pollution, especially from employees travelling into the area, and roof PVs.		

- 13.3 Following the Stage 3 Consultation and further assessment work, SEGRO decided to make a number of changes to the DCO Application which are referred to below along with the reason for the change. The changes include a change to the proposals for Long Holden (explained in the **Table 23** below) which arose out of the ongoing dialogue SEGRO has with local landowners in the vicinity of the development.

Table 23 – Pre-submission Changes to the DCO Application

Change	Reason
Deletion of an alternative access to the EMG2 Main Site from the A453 with consequent reduction of Order Limits along the north of the A453 to remove land which would not be required and minor amendment to the parameters plan for the DCO to remove the provision for a potential alternative access.	It had become clear through the assessment work undertaken that the most appropriate access to the EMG2 Main Site was at the A453 Hunters roundabout. This enables bus operators to service the EMG2 Main Site and the East Midlands Airport and Pegasus Business Park thus optimising the level of bus services to the site with a shuttle bus provided within the EMG2 Main Site, as operates at EMG1.
Addition of a small area of land on the north side of the A453 at Finger Farm.	Through discussions with the water authority, it became clear that rights over this land may be required for a foul drainage connection.
Change to the proposed status of Long Holden.	Following feedback (not reflected in any consultation responses) from a landowner of land south of Long Holden whose land is accessed from Long Holden the proposal to stop up Long Holden (and replace with a bridleway) has been removed. Instead access control is proposed by means of a 'no motor vehicles except for access' traffic regulation order along with a lockable gate (with bypass for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders). This maintains the control over vehicular use of Long Holden other than by those who require access and maintains its status as public highway.

Part 2 - MCO Application

- 13.4 The consultation for the MCO Application was part of the same consultation exercise as that carried out for the DCO Application. The only scheme change prior to the Additional Consultation was the addition of a small area of land within EMG1 for some additional drainage works required for Plot 16.
- 13.5 The majority of responses to the Stage 3 consultation were focused on the EMG2 Works and the Highway Works with there being very little focus on the EMG1 Works.
- 13.6 There was one response directed specifically at the MCO Application on behalf of a local resident, who stated:

"I have two comments/concerns with regard to the changes to EMG1 as specified in the recent newsletter,

firstly the inclusion of a paragraph on the increasing of the height of the container cranes that operate in the railway junction area is an attempt to 'salami slice' the original planning permission given for EMG1. The original permission was for craneage to support a 5 high stacking of containers which is the industry standard. If an increase is required it should have been in the original application where it could have been judged as part of that application. An attempt to slip in an increase in height into a subsequent application or MCO is unethical as it is an effort to distort the planning process. I am also concerned that the craneage will be changed to an overhead crane structure which will greatly impact the visual effect rather than the use of individual vehicles. It must be said that the whole description of this change is designed to be misleading as if the height of the cranes is to be increased does this not mean the stack height of the containers is to be increased so impacting the visual effect significantly.

My second concern relates to the changes in the water run off provisions in the changes to EMG1. Over a period of time the run off control pools have been removed in EMG1, we have been unable to obtain any information as to the justification for this change specifically relating to the capacity of the system to hold up run off in a high rain volume event. This system must be designed for the fifty year event not normal rain volumes, I am sure the capacity of the drains under the motorway has not been increased so if there is a rain event the system will back up into where the ponds were and then overflow into the Lockington watercourse. I require proof that the change in the water run off scheme associated with the Plot 16 development has been approved by the appropriate independent specialists and not an internal SEGRO person. I would expect to receive a written response to these two concerns, I accept I may be short of some detailed information on the plans which give rise to my concerns, I would be happy to receive detail that would put my mind at rest."

- 13.7 In relation to the first concern the position is not as stated. The EMG1 DCO initially authorised the erection of containers 3 high. This was subsequently, at the request of the rail terminal operators, increased to 5 high under a planning permission. The crane height authorised by the EMG1 DCO provides insufficient clearance to satisfactorily accommodate the 5 high stack of containers— hence the need to increase the crane height to approve the efficiency of the terminal. The effect of the increase in height has been assessed in the ES and is felt to be acceptable.
- 13.8 In relation to the second concern, there is a misunderstanding with regard to the function of the “run off control pools”. The pools concerned were installed as a temporary measure to deal with run off whilst EMG1 was being developed. In time those temporary pools have been replaced by the long term permanent drainage strategy, and they are no longer required.
- 13.9 SEGRO accordingly believes that no scheme changes are appropriate in response to this consultation response.

14 ON GOING ENGAGEMENT

- 14.1 Throughout 2025 SEGRO has continued to engage with statutory consultees, key stakeholders and the local community.
- 14.2 SEGRO continues to hold monthly meetings with North West Leicestershire District Council officers (pursuant to a Planning performance Agreement) and there is a standing invitation for a members' briefing.
- 14.3 The Transport Working Group continues to meet every month, and other meetings have been held with NH and LCC separately with the costs of both covered by SEGRO.
- 14.4 SEGRO's consultants continue to liaise with the relevant stakeholders and have pre-application payment agreements with Natural England and the Environment Agency.
- 14.5 There have been meetings and other liaison with Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council and Protect Diseworth on a regular basis.
- 14.6 Dialogue with PILS and the representatives of the Freeport has been ongoing.

15 PRE-APPLICATION GUIDANCE – COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 50

Introduction

- 15.1 This Chapter records how SEGRO has satisfied the requirements under section 50 of the Act to have regard to guidance about the pre-application procedure and has had regard to advice issued by the Planning Inspectorate under section 51 of the Act.

Section 50 Pre-application Guidance

- 15.2 Section 50 of the Act stipulates that guidance may be issued by the Secretary of State regarding the pre-application procedure and that applicants must have regard to any guidance issued under this section. The relevant pre-application guidance dealing with pre-application consultation issued under section 50 is titled “Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects April 2024”.
- 15.3 The Guidance in relation to pre-application consultation is contained in paragraphs 019 – 26. The paragraphs are summarised in **Table 24** below. Whilst the guidance is directed at DCO applications the Table below also identifies how it has complied with in respect of both the DCO Application and MCO Application.

Table 24 – Compliance with Government Guidance on pre-application consultation.

Para	Summary of Relevant Guidance	Means of Compliance
019	Sets out the statutory provisions which must be adhered to. Sets out the benefits of consultation	This Consultation Report confirms compliance with the statutory requirements – see Chapter 1 Table 3, Chapter 6 Tables 10 and 11, Chapter 7 Table 12, Chapter 8 Tables 13 and 14
020	Pre-application consultation must be appropriate. Consultation could be a single round of consultation or be undertaken in separate stages. Larger, more complex, applications are likely to warrant going beyond the 28 day minimum timescales to ensure enough time for consultees to understand project proposals and formulate a response. Applicants should set consultation deadlines that are realistic and proportionate. Where responses are not received by the deadline the applicant is not obliged to take those into account. Once applicants have completed the consultation process set out in their SoCC, where a proposed application is amended in the light of responses to consultation then, unless those amendments materially and substantially change the proposed application or materially changes its effects as a whole, the amendments themselves should not trigger a need for further consultation. The amendments can be reported as part of the consultation report submitted with the application. Only where the project taken as a whole changes very significantly, and to such a large degree that what is being taken forward is fundamentally different from what was previously consulted on, should re-consultation on the proposed application as a whole be considered.	This report explains that there have been three stages of engagement/consultation. Stage 1 – engagement from 2020 with key PILs and engagement from 2022 with local authorities, key stakeholders and representatives of the local community (See Chapter 3) Stage 2 – statutory consultation for a six week period in Feb/March 2025 under s.42, 47 and 48 and Regulations 10 and 14. (See Chapters 6, 7 and 8) Stage 3 – non statutory consultation for a 29-day period in July 2025 with all consultees previously consulted under s42 and s47. (See Chapter 12) Any responses received beyond the close of consultation deadlines were treated as having been received by the due date and were considered. The amendments to the proposals following the Stage 2 and Stage 3 consultations are set out in Table 20 of Chapter 12 and Table 23 of Chapter 13 respectively. Whilst a further consultation was undertaken following the statutory consultation this was to enable consultees to consider further environmental information as well as scheme changes. Applying the advice in Para 20, neither the scheme changes following statutory consultation nor those following the non-statutory consultation would of themselves give rise to consideration of a further consultation.

Para	Summary of Relevant Guidance	Means of Compliance
021	Sets out where details of who is required to be consulted is contained including prescribed consultees.	This Consultation Report confirms compliance with the statutory requirements – see response to para 019 above.
022	Refers to local community consultation and advises it is good practice for applicants to work with local stakeholders in the formative stages of the project, through early engagement. Refers to the requirement to produce a SoCC. Consider engaging with local community groups at an early stage.	Table 6 of Chapter 3 sets out a summary of the extensive early engagement with all stakeholders including the local community. This included formal representative bodies such as Parish Councils but also included local discretionary bodies being Protect Diseworth and the Long Whatton & Diseworth Flood Working Group. A SoCC was published in the form contained in Appendix 8 following consultation with NWLDC and LCC
023	Applicants must: • Consult prescribed bodies under s.42 • Publish the application under s.48 • Have regard to all s.42,47and 48 responses pursuant to the requirements of s.49 Applicants should arrange early engagement with statutory consultees.	Prescribed bodies were consulted under s.42 for the DCO Application and Reg 10 of the 2011 Regulations for the MCO Application as described in Chapter 6 . The DCO Application was published under s.48 and the MCO Application under Regulation 14 of the 2011 Regulations as described in Chapter 8 . Regard was had to all the responses received under s.42, s.47 and s.48 pursuant to s.49 and Regulation 10 and Regulation 14 pursuant to Regulation 15 of the 2011 Regulations as described in Chapters 9,10 and 11 . In addition, Chapter 13 describes how regard was had to responses received in response to the non-statutory consultation. As described in Chapter 3 engagement with statutory consultees commenced in 2022 (PILS 2020). Arrangements are in place for payment of pre-application input from NWLDC, LCC, National Highways, Natural England and the Environment Agency.

Para	Summary of Relevant Guidance	Means of Compliance
024	Where compulsory powers are sought to acquire an interest in land or take temporary possession then due diligence must be used to identify and consult with the relevant parties (PILs). Due diligence must be undertaken in identifying all land interests. Applicants must ensure that the Book of Reference is sufficiently up to date at the time of submission and meets the requirements of the regulations. Where appropriate the Book of Reference should be supplemented by a Land and Rights Negotiation Tracker. Applicants should be proactive in and helpful to parties who have new interest which emerge following statutory consultation but just before the submission of an application. Applications should explain in the Consultation Report how they have dealt with any new interests in land emerging after conclusion of the statutory consultation.	Whilst SEGRO had been engaging with principal landowners since early 2020, as set out in Chapter 3 above, in order to establish the identity of all PILs, SEGRO appointed a specialist land referencing company to undertake detailed land interest investigations including service of land information questionnaires (refer to Statement of Reasons (Document DCO 4.1)). All PILs identified during land referencing were notified as part of Section 42 consultation. No new interests have emerged since. Appendix 17 contains the full list of PILs. A Land and Rights Negotiation Tracker is included within the DCO application documentation (Document DCO 4.4).
025	The Adequacy of Consultation Milestone should be early enough to enable applicants to consider how to undertake any additional engagement that may be needed but sufficiently towards the end of the pre-application stage to assess the adequacy of the consultation that has been done. It is likely to be no later than around 3 months before submission. The Adequacy of Consultation Milestone should be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. If the adequacy of consultation is seriously adrift the Planning Inspectorate will advise the applicant about steps to be taken.	SEGRO completed its Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCM) and submitted a report to the Planning Inspectorate which was published on 6 May 2025. A copy of the AoCM is enclosed at Appendix 31. At a meeting held on 4 June 2025, the Planning Inspectorate confirmed that the AoCM was of a satisfactory standard, only commenting that copies of all notices and examples of the letters used to discharge SEGRO's pre-application consultation duties should be appended to this Consultation Report. The combined Section 48 and regulation 14 Notice is at Appendix 12 and the letter sent to consultees is at Appendix 11.

Para	Summary of Relevant Guidance	Means of Compliance
026	The Consultation Report should provide clarity not just on what consultation has been done but, crucially, how the applicant has taken it into account. It should therefore: • Provide a general description of the consultation process including the timeline • Set out what the applicant has done to comply with statutory requirements of the Planning Act, advice under s.51, relevant secondary legislation and this guidance • Set out compliance with requirements to consult local communities as described in the SoCC • Set out any relevant responses to consultation (but not a complete list of responses) • Provide a description of how the proposed application has been informed by and influenced by taking account of responses, showing any significant changes made as a result • Provide an explanation as to why any responses requesting changes were not followed • Be expressed in terms sufficient to enable the Planning Inspectorate to understand fully how consultation has been undertaken and how the issues raised have been addressed or responded to.	See Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 Table 5. See Chapter 1 Table 3, Chapter 6 Tables 10 and 11, Chapter 7 Table 12, Chapter 8 Tables 13 and 14 and Chapter 15 Table 24. See Chapter 7 Table 12. See Chapters 9, 10, 11 and 13. See Chapter 12 Table 20, Chapter 13, Table 23. See Chapter 9 Tables 15 and 16, Chapter 10, Tables 18 and 19, Chapter 13 Table 22.
026	Good practice to inform consultees of the results of consultation	Following the statutory consultation SEGRO produced a Summary of Responses to Statutory Consultation Main Themes Document (Appendix 23) which was available on the project website and was also sent to various interested parties, such as the Parish Councils and Protect Diseworth. In addition, the newsletter distributed in advance of the non-statutory consultation to statutory consultees and the local community

Para	Summary of Relevant Guidance	Means of Compliance
		informed them of the scheme changes made following the non-statutory consultation and the reasons for them (Appendix 27). Responses from PILS were replied to directly by SEGRO.

Section 51 Advice

- 15.4 Since the inception meeting held on 13 May 2024, SEGRO has engaged with and received advice received from the Planning Inspectorate. SEGRO agreed with the Planning Inspectorate that it would include a table identifying how it has had regard to and complied with the advice provided by the Planning Inspectorate, which has been provided in Table 25 below.
- 15.5 A copy of the section 51 advice log maintained by the Planning Inspectorate and published on its EMG2 project website is set out with a column added to the advice log to record how SEGRO has had regard to and updated the DCO and or MCO Application respectively.

Table 25 – Regard had to advice from the Planning Inspectorate

East Midlands Gateway - s51 Advice Library		
Topic	Meeting date: 08 October 2024	Applicant's response/update
General Update	The applicant advised the Inspectorate that it is engaging with relevant highway authorities including National Highways to confirm whether the extent of the proposed highway improvement works meets the threshold for a highways NSIP in their own right. The Inspectorate relayed the importance of understanding whether the application will include other works which would be classed as NSIPs in their own right and advised the applicant to communicate this at the earliest stage possible.	The Applicant has liaised with National Highways and provided calculations to confirm that the proposed works to the strategic highway network satisfy the criteria for an NSIP in section 22 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant has confirmed to the Inspectorate and also advised the Secretary of State for Transport that its DCO application will comprise a business and commercial project of national significance and a Highways NSIP.
Scoping Opinion	The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it is not possible to change the Scoping Opinion, but that the Inspectorate can clarify any comments it has made on scoping for the applicant.	The Applicant has identified how it has addressed the Scoping Opinion responses provided by the Inspectorate in each chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES).
Programme Update	The Inspectorate advised the applicant to consider the timetable they have set out for the remainder of the pre-application stage to ensure adequate time is allocated to allow for the submission of the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCM) and, should the applicant require, a draft documents submission. The Inspectorate reiterated further the importance of allowing sufficient time to take account of the feedback received from the Consultation including the Preliminary Environmental Information Report before their submission.	The Applicant kept the Programme under review throughout the pre-application stage and provided updates to the inspectorate as required. A simplified programme entitled " <i>Process Timeline</i> " was maintained on the homepage of the Applicant's website (www.segro.com/slpemq2) during the pre-application stage. The latest programme dated June 2025 remains available to download on the website.
Programme Update	The Inspectorate reminded the applicant of the importance of securing agreements to share and discuss information with consultation bodies. The applicant confirmed that it has arrangements / agreements already in place with key consultation bodies.	The Applicant put planning performance agreements in place with both District and County Council authorities. The applicant also complied with the necessary requirements to access statutory consultees' pre-application services.

Programme Update	The Inspectorate requested that the Programme Document be provided as soon as possible to allow the Inspectorate to understand the applicant's proposed pre-application timescales.	As above, the Applicant kept its Programme under review throughout the pre-application stage and provided updates to the inspectorate in October and December 2024 as well as May and June 2025.
Topic	Meeting date: 14 January 2025	
Identity of applicant	The Inspectorate noted that the applicant was intending to simultaneously make a Material Change Order (MCO) application as well as a DCO application. The Inspectorate noted that the applicant will need to explain/clarify why it (i.e. Segro EMG Ltd) believes it has the legal standing to apply for a material amendment to the made Order 2016 given that the powers conferred by that Order are vested in three (apparently) entirely different companies. The applicant confirmed it would be submitting its MCO application under the name of Segro (EMG) Ltd being the new name of Roxhill (Kegworth) Ltd, one of the undertakers for the original East Midlands Gateway Phase 1 (EMG1) DCO. The Inspectorate invited the applicant to clarify in due course if the two applications would be submitted under the same name.	The Applicant has confirmed, and made clear throughout its application material, that the MCO Application is made by SEGRO EMG Ltd and the DCO Application is made by SEGRO Properties Ltd.
Section 35	The Inspectorate noted that the section 35 direction provided the option for the applicant to contact the Secretary of State where the details of the Project change prior to submission: <i>The Secretary of State considers that if the details of the Proposed Project change, before submitting any application to the Planning Inspectorate, the applicant may wish to seek confirmation from the Secretary of State that the development which is to be the subject of the proposed application is the same as that for which this Direction is given.</i> The Inspectorate advised the applicant to contact the Secretary of State to confirm the section 35 direction still applies to the project in its current form to ensure the application meets the s55 PA2008 test for acceptance. The applicant advised they considered the Project had not materially changed and therefore they did not need to seek confirmation from the Secretary of State but that they would keep this under review as set out in the direction.	The Applicant has kept the position under review and liaised with the Secretaries of State for Housing Communities & Local Government; and for Transport. The section 35 direction (the "Direction") relates the Applicant's DCO application for a business and commercial project of national significance. The Applicant has taken independent advice and is satisfied that its application for a business and commercial NSIP remains consistent with the Direction that was given.

Strategic Highways Improvements	The applicant advised that the highways improvements were likely to exceed the threshold in the Planning Act 2008 and constitute an additional NSIP. The Inspectorate enquired how the applicant intended to carry out their statutory consultation whilst there was still uncertainty over whether the highways improvements would constitute an NSIP or additional works. The applicant advised it was presenting its calculations to National Highways and using those calculations it would consult on the basis that the highways improvements constitute an NSIP. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to resolve/clarify this before submission, ensuring appropriate and clear evidence in its application.	As noted, the Applicant has completed statutory and non-statutory consultation on the basis that the strategic highways improvements constitute an NSIP. The Applicant has liaised with National Highways and provided calculations to confirm that the proposed works to the strategic highway network satisfy the criteria for an NSIP in section 22 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant has confirmed to the Inspectorate and also advised the Secretary of State for Transport that its DCO application will comprise a business and commercial project of national significance and a Highways NSIP.
Multiple Secretaries of State	The applicant enquired as to how the Planning Inspectorate would be involved if there were multiple consenting Secretaries of State. The Inspectorate advised this would not be a unique position and that the Secretary of State who gave the Section 35 direction would likely become the Lead Secretary of State. The Inspectorate invited the applicant to approach and confirm this directly with the Secretary of State for Transport and the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government respectively.	The Applicant has liaised with the Secretaries of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government; and for Transport. The Inspectorate will be aware that the Secretary of State for Transport has indicated her intention to become the Lead Secretary of State for the concurrent but separate determination of the DCO Application and the MCO Application.
Material Change Order (MCO) and DCO	The applicant advised the Secretary of State has the powers to align the DCO application and MCO timelines, so that they were examined together and a decision reached simultaneously. The Inspectorate advised the two could not be examined as one application from a practical standpoint, even if the applicant felt there was no legal barrier, that the procedures were distinct, and separate Examining Authorities would likely be assigned to each. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to contact the relevant Secretaries of State directly regarding alignment to explain their intentions.	See above
Environmental Statement	The applicant advised it intended to submit one Environmental Statement (ES) for the two applications. The Inspectorate advised that, while it is possible to prepare one ES for both applications, it could lead	The Applicant provided draft chapters to the Inspectorate and has acted on feedback received in April 2025 to ensure the ES provides a clear distinction

	to risks during acceptance and potential examination of any application(s). The Inspectorate advised that a draft of the project description chapter could be reviewed as part of the draft document review, under the Standard tier of service.	between the assessment of the DCO Application and the MCO Application.
Program Update	The applicant advised that it intended to submit its draft documents at the beginning of February and would coincide with their statutory consultation. The Inspectorate queried whether this would allow for sufficient review of feedback gathered from the draft document review or statutory consultation. The applicant confirmed it had factored in the Inspectorate's stipulated response times for considering draft documents as well as statutory consultation responses prior to submission of its proposed applications.	The Applicant provided draft ES chapters 1-3 to the Inspectorate and has acted on feedback received in April 2025 to ensure the ES provides a clear distinction between the assessment of the DCO Application and the MCO Application. A separate table listing the feedback received from the Inspectorate on the draft documentation and how the Applicant responded is set out in Table 26 below.
Any other Business	The Inspectorate advised that DEFRA had recently released guidance on the assessment of air quality.	The Applicant thanked the Inspectorate and has addressed the DEFRA guidance in Chapter 8 (air Quality) of its ES (Document DCO 6.8/MCO 6.8)
Topic	Meeting date: 03 April 2025	
Consenting Route	The Inspectorate advised that applying to the Secretary of State for an amendment to their s35 direction to include the EMG1 works would offer a simpler, streamlined consenting route. The applicant noted this option had been considered and confirmed they will be continuing with their preferred route; a DCO application, comprising two NSIPs, and Material Change application.	In addition to the Applicant's response noted at the 3 April 2025 meeting, the Applicant has liaised with the Secretaries of State. The Inspectorate will be aware that the Secretary of State for Transport has indicated her intention to become the Lead Secretary of State for the concurrent but separate determination of the DCO Application and the MCO Application. The EMG1 Works were not associated development to the business and commercial project of national significance but were changes to works already authorised by a DCO.

Statutory Consultation	The applicant informed the Inspectorate the proposed development had been consulted on as a cohesive whole (all three elements) and they would be submitting one Consultation Report. The Inspectorate advised the applicant draw out which responses applied to the s35 works (DCO application) versus the Material Change works to EMG1.	The Applicant has detailed the separate consultation requirements and, where appropriate, identified where responses related to the DCO or MCO Application or both in the combined Consultation Report.
Published guidance and advice	The Inspectorate also suggested the applicant have regard to the published advice: Advice on good design, published 23 October 2024. The Inspectorate advised the applicant take note of the flood risk and surface water maps contained in the Environment Agency's guidance on new national flood and coastal erosion risk, recently updated on 25 March 2025, and consider whether it impacts their proposal.	The Applicant has had appropriate regard to the advice on good design. The Applicant consulted upon and has submitted a Design Approach Document (Document DCO 5.3/MCO 5.3). The Applicant has utilised the latest EA guidance and provided a figure showing the risk from surface water flooding at Appendix 13D to Chapter 13 of the ES (Document DCO 6.13D/MCO 6.13D).
Comments on draft documents	The Inspectorate advised the applicant take note of how East Anglia 1 North and East Anglia 2 offshore wind farm's application documents differentiate between the two schemes. The applicant noted that it had received feedback from Natural England in relation to habitats regulations matters. The Inspectorate advised that any feedback received could be included in the applicant's Habitats Regulations Report.	The Applicant reviewed the approach adopted for East Anglia 1 North and East Anglia 2. Whilst it was noted that those applications used separate rather than a single ES, the Applicant introduced separate sections within each topic chapter to clearly differentiate between the assessments for the DCO Application and the MCO Application. As noted, the Applicant included feedback received from NE in its Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment (Document DCO 6.9H/MCO 6.9H).
Programme	The Inspectorate advised the applicant's Material Change consultation should be reflected in their Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCM) document. The Inspectorate advised that, in actively considering their programme, should the applicant's intended submission date change, they inform the Inspectorate at the earliest possible opportunity.	The AoCM prepared by the Applicant and published on the Inspectorate's website in May 2025 covered both the DCO Application and MCO Application as advised (See Appendix 31). The Applicant provided its current Programme to the Inspectorate on 17 June 2025. A copy also remains available on the Applicant's website.

Topic	Meeting date: 04 June 2025	
Programme	The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it is possible to stagger the relevant representation periods for the DCO and Material Change applications. The Inspectorate suggested this may help to mitigate comments on the individual applications being incorrectly submitted against the wrong project. The Inspectorate requested the applicant provide an updated illustrative programme post submission to show how the DCO and Material Change applications could interact with each other during the acceptance and subsequent determination periods. The applicant confirmed it would write to the Secretaries of State to update on progress with both applications and request further clarity on the potential to co-join the DCO and Material Change applications. The Inspectorate advised that due to the DCO and Material Change applications being consulted on as one whole project, the applicant should clearly identify in its Consultation Report which consultation comments applied to each or both applications.	The Inspectorate will be aware that the Secretary of State for Transport has indicated her intention to become the Lead Secretary of State for the concurrent but separate determination of the DCO Application and the MCO Application. The Programme provided by the Applicant on 17 June 2025 showed how the DCO and MCO Applications could interact with each other post submission; noting that co-joining would be at the discretion of the Secretary of State. The Applicant has detailed the separate consultation requirements and, where appropriate, identified where responses related to the DCO or MCO Application or both in the combined Consultation Report. The timing of the relevant representation periods is under consideration.
Consenting Route	The Inspectorate advised the applicant to clearly set out in their Material Change application how they are not affected by Schedule 6 (5)(2) of PA2008.	The Applicant has included this information in its Regulation 16 Acceptance Checklist (Document MCO 1.5) enclosed with the covering letter to the MCO Application (Document MCO 1.1).
Preparation of application documents	The Inspectorate advised, where documents are relevant to both the DCO and Material Change applications, to submit duplicates so that each document receives a unique reference number that relates to each application. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it can provide consent to publish Material Change application documents once they have been submitted, and to consider whether they wish the DCO documents to be	The Applicant has provided duplicate copies of the documents that are common to the DCO and MCO as requested. The Applicant confirmed in its pre-submission letter dated 4 August 2025 that it is content for the MCO Application documents to be published as soon as practicable after they are received by the Inspectorate.

	published when received by the Inspectorate or at the end of the acceptance period if the application is accepted. The Inspectorate advised that the applicant may provide a draft statement, in the vein of Regulation 16(2)(i) of The Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 in advance of the Material Change application submission to aid understanding of resourcing requirements. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to submit separate GIS shapefiles for both the DCO and Material Change applications, a minimum of 10 working days in advance of the applications' submission.	
Issues Tracker	The applicant confirmed it would provide an updated issues tracker to the Inspectorate.	An updated issues tracker is appended to the covering letter to the DCO Application (Document DCO 1.2)
Feedback on Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCM) document	The Inspectorate advised the AoCM was tested against the s55 tests that would be employed at acceptance. The applicant is advised to include copies of all notices and letters issued to discharge their duties during pre-application in their Consultation Report; such as the letter used to notify s42 consultees of the deadline for receipt of consultation responses, and the s48 notice sent to EIA consultation bodies. The applicant is advised to clearly express, in their application, to what extent they have had regard to advice from the Inspectorate (as per PA2008 s50(3)). A table appended to the Consultation Report was suggested by the applicant recording how regard has been made to the Inspectorate's advice.	The Applicant has appended an example of all notices and letters used to discharge its pre-application duties to the Consultation Report. This table is included in the Consultation Report to explain how it has had regard to the s51 Advice received from the Inspectorate.
Pre-application guidance and use of PADSS and SoCGs	The Inspectorate advised that if Local Authorities were engaging with the SoCGs then there is no requirement for them to maintain PADSS if they consider them to be unnecessary.	The Applicant is continuing to progress SoCGs with local authorities as advised.

- 15.6 On 1 April 2025, the Planning Inspectorate provided advice regarding the draft application documents submitted by SEGRO on 18 February 2025. A copy of the advice provided under section 51 of the Act and details of how SEGRO has responded to and taken on board that advice is included in **Table 26** below.

Table 26 – S.51 Advice on Draft Application Documents

General		
Ref No.	Comment or question	Applicant's response
1.	Applicant's identity is inconsistent across documents. E.g. Statement of Reasons (SoR) 1.1 states SEGRO Properties Ltd; Consultation Report (CR) 1.1.1 states SEGRO Properties Ltd and SEGRO (EMG) Ltd. The Applicant should ensure consistency across all application documents upon submissions and/or ensure the "Applicant" identity is consistent with the proposed application being made i.e. Development Consent Order (DCO) and/or Material Change Order (MCO). The Inspectorates advice issued on 14 January 2025 has reference.	The identity of the Applicant is: DCO Application - SEGRO Properties Ltd; MCO - SEGRO (EMG) Ltd The above is consistent throughout all application documents and was selected to take onboard PINS previous comments about the identity of the Applicant for the MCO. The Applicant confirmed at a meeting with the Inspectorate that the SoR only relates to the DCO Application. The Consultation Report covers both the DCO and MCO Applications.
2.	East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park (EMG1) Works are mentioned across documents (e.g. SoR 1.2) as one of the elements comprising the proposed development. Should this be the case, as they would MCO not the DCO process? Understand the Environmental Statement (ES) covers both.	Although EMG2 is being promoted as one project, the Applicant has clarified in all application material that the EMG1 Works are to be consented by the draft MCO, being a material change to the EMG1 DCO.
3.	Advised to review formatting as there are inconsistencies within documents e.g. word spacing.	Noted. Formatting has been reviewed as part of document control prior to submission.
4.	Individual sheets were submitted separately for both the Land Plans and Work Plans. At application submission, these documents should be submitted as a whole, rather than as separate sheets.	The Land Plans and Works Plans are each one document but comprised of multiple sheets and will have key plans where they comprise 3 sheets or more.
5.	There should be clarity as to how the Applicant envisages submitting the application for East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2) and the Material Change	The Inspectorate will be aware that since providing its comments, the Secretary of State for Transport has

General		
Ref No.	Comment or question	Applicant's response
	application for the MCO relating to EMG1. Given the likely interrelated nature and effects of the two developments, examination by two separate/ independent ExA's, working with different statutory timetables could result in unintended/ disjointed outcomes and complexities for the stakeholders/ IPs trying to engage with both applications. It may prove over burdensome for a single ExA to examine both applications particularly given the need to accommodate the differing statutory timescales. The Applicant should consider whether it would be more appropriate, and procedurally straightforward, for the MCO application for EMG1 to form part of the application (and DCO) for EMG2. This would allow a single ExA to examine both schemes alongside each other, to the same timescale and allow for stakeholders/IPs to engage with a single examination and examination timetable. Seeking to run two concurrent examinations, even with the same members of the ExA (or a smaller subset of the EMG2 ExA for the MCO) could lead to unintended complications.	indicated her intention to become the Lead Secretary of State for the concurrent but separate determination of the DCO Application and the MCO Application.
6.	Currently it appears that there would be an application for EMG2 and a separate application for the MCO for EMG1. There should be clarity as to the Applicant's/application identity between the two separate applications. For example, the Explanatory Memorandum for the MCO for EMG1 is labelled (in the top left of the front page of the Explanatory Memorandum) as being a document related to EMG2. The separation between documents for both applications should be clear.	Noted. The Applicant has adopted a document numbering system that prefixes each document with DCO or MCO for clarity. Where a document covers both applications, it will bear both document reference numbers.

Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
Ref No.	Article / Schedule / Requirement	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	Part 1, 2. (Interpretation)	<i>"the undertaker"</i> means then lists SEGRO Properties Ltd and SEGRO (EMG) Ltd (and any other person who has benefit of this order). We draw the applicant's attention to advice issued at the meeting held on 14 January 2025 regarding this matter. See <u>General Ref no. 1</u>	As above at General Ref no.1.
2.	Schedule 1, Part 1	Consider providing greater clarity/precision as to the type of uses that could be accommodated as part of the "commercial and business development". The parameters/design principles in the ES refer to use classes B2 and B8 (relating to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987), but this is not carried forward to the DCO, and there does not appear to be a firm definition of the nature of the works proposed. Also see <u>Draft Environmental Statement comment 7</u> below.	Noted. The Applicant has revised the wording accordingly.
3.	n/a	Ensure Schedules cross-refer to the correct Articles e.g. Schedule 15 has no cross-reference	Noted. This has been addressed in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO Application.
4.	"Schedule 2a	This Schedule is missing from the Contents page	Noted. This has been addressed in the draft DCO submitted with the DCO Application.
5.	Schedule 13	This Schedule is titled as Schedule 3	Noted. This was an automatic number formatting error and has been corrected.

Draft DCO Explanatory Memorandum			
Ref No.		Comment or question	
1.	1.3	See <u>General Ref no. 1.</u>	As above at General Ref no.1.
2.	2.3	'The Scheme' includes EMG1 works which will be part of the MCO application. 2.3 says The Scheme is described in Schedule 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). However, the EMG1 works are not described in the dDCO so this statement is partially incorrect.	Noted. The Applicant has clarified that the EMG1 Works will be consented by the MCO.
3.	Title page	See General Ref no. 5.	As above at General Ref no.5.

Draft sample Works Plans and Land Plans			
Ref No.	Plan Name and Ref	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	General	The Applicant is reminded that it is a requirement to submit a Land Plans and Works Plans for the proposed DCO and MCO application. With reference to the Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) regulations 2011, in particular Regulation 16 (2)(i). If the document is intended to support both the material change application and the DCO this should be set out in the structure.	The Applicant clarified at a meeting with the Inspectorate that no changes to compulsory purchase powers were requested in the MCO and so no Land Plans or a BoR would be provided for the MCO Application. The Applicant has produced a Regulation 16 checklist which is submitted with the covering letter to the MCO Application. The Guide to the Applications clearly explains the approach where documents are common to the DCO Application and the MCO Application and encloses document lists for each application.

Draft sample Works Plans and Land Plans			
Ref No.	Plan Name and Ref	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
2.	General	The Applicant has not provided a Key Land or Works Plans. The Applicant is advised to review The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 in particular regulation 5 of the APFP. Applications for orders granting development consent must be accompanied by a Land Plan (Reg 5. (2)(i)), Works Plan (Reg 5. (2)(j)) and a Key Plan (Reg 5. (4)). The latter is required where a plan comprises three or more sheets.	The Applicant confirms that the submission documents include a Key Plan where they comprise 3 sheets or more.
3.	Works Plans	The legend for works plan depicts the “Works” number. However, this does not provide a description of the “works” as defined in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO. It is advised that the applicant provide a short description of the “works” within the legend as per Schedule 1 e.g. Works 1 – construction of warehousing; Works 2 – construction of road infrastructure. Upon review of Schedule 1 of the draft DCO the applicant has defined Works No. 1 “<i>Within the area of land shown on the works plans for Works No. 1 the construction of warehousing including</i>” It is therefore suggested that an appropriated short description to apply on the Works Plan when depicting this works could be: <i>Works 1: Construction of Warehousing</i>, similarly with <i>Works 2: Construction of Road Infrastructure</i>.	Noted. The Applicant has included a short description on the updated plans submitted with each application.
4.	Work/Land Plans	In reference to Ref no. 2 above, any Key Plan submitted should have cut lines that demonstrate the overlap and/or relationship between the sheets.	The Applicant confirms the plans have been prepared accordingly and that the sheets and cut lines are consistent across the Land Plans and Works Plans.

Draft sample Works Plans and Land Plans			
Ref No.	Plan Name and Ref	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
5.	Work Plans	The legend on each sheet of the Works Plan reflects all Works associated to the DCO Application, it is recommended that each sheet of the Works Plan only reflects within the legend the Works applicable to the respective sheet.	Noted. The Applicant has revised the plans submitted with each application.
6.	Land Plans	Sheet 1 has a different orientation to Sheets 2 and 3. Even though a northing arrow is present on each sheet, pursuant to APFP 5(3), consider orienting all sheets in the same direction to aid accessibility and readability.	Sheet 1 is deliberately orientated differently to allow details to be shown at a reasonable scale. As PINS notes, a northing arrow is provided, and the sheet is consistently orientated across Works and Land Plans. The Key Plan also shows the orientation of the sheet to aid legibility and avoid confusion.
7.	Land Plans	A number of plots included in the BoR appear to be missing from the plans, for example plots 10 and 13. The plans must adhere to the requirements in APFP 5(i).	At the time of submission of the draft plans, the Applicant was in the process of completing a revised numbering exercise following conclusion of its land referencing process. The numbering has been updated to use sheet-no./landowner/plot [e.g. 1/1/a].
8.	Land Plans	The Legend shows <i>Order Limits</i> and <i>Order Land – Land required for highway works only etc</i> with the same colour coding (white box with a red outline). Each item in the Legend should be distinctive.	Noted. The Applicant has reviewed and amended the legend.

Draft Consultation Report (CR), including section 42 consultee list			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	General	Appendices were not included with the draft CR so the Inspectorate is unable to verify whether the CR is of a "satisfactory standard" as per the requirements of the s55 checklist.	Noted. The final Consultation Report includes multiple appendices which are identified in the CR, electronic index and document lists supporting the applications.
2.	General	It appears on review of the CR, that the Applicant intends to submit a single CR to cover both the Statutory Consultation undertaken for the DCO and MCO application. It is a requirement to provide a CR as part of an application for a DCO (Section 37(3) of the PA2008) and/or application for a MCO (CRDCO Regulations 2011, Reg 16 (2)(l)). Upon review of the consolidated CR, it is unclear whether this CR will be broken up further to illustrate the consultation undertaken solely for the DCO and/or solely for the MCO or whether a completely separate CR will be submitted for the MCO. If the Applicant intends to submit a single CR, then this will need to be drafted well enough for parties to understand the Applicant's statutory duties when consulting on these applications and how regard was had for the DCO and/or MCO application. If the document is intended to support both the material change application and the DCO this should be set out in the structure.	PINS will be aware that a combined s46 notice was published and acknowledged by PINS covering all DCO and MCO statutory regulations. The Applicant confirms a single Consultation Report covers the DCO and MCO and, noting the suggested points of clarification, has differentiated between each application.

Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	Planning Inspectorate guidance	The applicant is directed to guidance from the Planning Inspectorate on HRA matters, Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Habitats Regulations Assessment. Where Natural England and/or Environment Agency guidance has been used in the preparation of the report, this could also be listed.	Noted. The Applicant has included this in the methodology of the final report.
2.	N/A	The HRA document does not contain a description of the proposed development. This needs to be addressed prior to submission of any application, as it is not clear whether the assessment is consistent with the development that consent is being sought for. If the document is intended to support both the material change application and the DCO this should be set out in the structure.	Noted. The Applicant has included this in the introduction to the final report.
3.	Figure 1	With reference to ID 2 above, Figure 1 is not consistent with the plans supplied as draft works plans and draft land plans in that it appears to show work associated with the material change / DCO application as well as the dDCO, but this is not set out in the way the document is structured. The HRA report should therefore be clear whether it is intended to support both applications and if so, the plans amended to demonstrate this.	Noted. The Applicant has updated this document to clarify that it covers both applications as required for submission.
4.	N/A	The document should also contain or refer to a baseline position.	Noted. The Applicant has updated this document to include a baseline as required for submission.
5.	N/A	Has the report been prepared with reference to Natural England or the Environment Agency? Where feedback has been sought or received from either party on the approach or conclusions, this should be included.	The Applicant confirms the response and approval received from Natural England has been included in the body of the report with a copy of the full response enclosed as an appendix.

Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
6.	N/A	The references to footnotes are not showing in the current document, these need to be available in the final version or expanded within the text.	Noted. The Applicant has updated this document as required for submission.
7.	Paragraph 1.4	Refers to the competent authority as North West Leicestershire District Council. This should be the relevant secretary of state(s).	Noted. The Applicant has updated this document as required for submission.
8.	Paragraph 3.6	We suggest additional evidence/ references could be provided where 2010 is the most recent recorded condition status.	Noted. The Applicant has updated this document as required for submission and the methodology has been confirmed by Natural England.
9.	Paragraph 4.2	The report should explain, with reference to the nature of the proposed development and any relevant external guidance, the reasons for the choice of the 15km search area.	Noted. Natural England has confirmed that the updated sHRA appropriately identified and screened all relevant impact pathways and that the methodology used aligns with published guidance.
10.	Potential impacts (no section reference, pages 6 and 7)	It is not clear how the impact-pathways were selected and how they relate to the proposed development, although as above, this would be helped by including a project description. Section 3.0 of the HRA report also sets out the qualifying features of the River Mease SAC but does not pull this information through when discussing potential Likely Significant Effects. The assessment should also clarify how the conclusions have been reached with reference to the qualifying features.	Noted. Natural England has confirmed that the updated sHRA appropriately identified and screened all relevant impact pathways and that the methodology used aligns with published guidance. The updated sHRA incorporates Natural England's formal agreement with the conclusions of the sHRA, including their statement that no further assessment is required.
11.	Paragraph 4.10	Suggest this needs to set out the evidence that has been used to determine that there is no hydrological connectivity with the proposed development to support the conclusions.	Noted. The Applicant has updated the hydrological connectivity section within the sHRA as required for submission.
12.	Conclusions of no LSE (section 5.0)	The conclusions are not entirely clear. It concludes both that there is no pathway that could lead to effects on European sites but also concludes that the proposed development 'poses no risk of adverse	Noted. The updated sHRA incorporates Natural England's formal agreement with the conclusions of

Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
		effects on the integrity of the River Mease SAC'. Suggest review the wording to clarify the conclusions.	the sHRA, including their statement that no further assessment is required.
13.	In-combination assessment	The conclusions state there are no routes to an LSE 'both alone or in-combination with other projects or plans' but without presenting a separate in-combination assessment. This should be addressed prior to submission of any application, to demonstrate how in-combination conclusions have been reached.	Noted. The updated sHRA incorporates Natural England's formal agreement with the conclusions of the sHRA, including their statement that no further assessment is required.

Draft Environmental Statement (ES) project description chapter(s)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	N/A	Comments raised on the project description in the Planning Inspectorate's scoping opinion (2024) do not appear to have been addressed in this draft chapter. As the ES should be based on 'the most recent scoping opinion', the applicant should be sure that the ES provides comment, such as in the form of a table, on each of the matters raised in the Planning Inspectorate's scoping opinion, and how the document addresses these points.	PINS does not permit submission of the wider chapters under its standard tier service. The Applicant confirms that each chapter includes a table recording PINS scoping opinion comments and how the matters raised have been addressed in each relevant chapter.
2.	dDCO and comparison with ES project description	The dDCO currently includes works that are not covered in the draft project description, such as watercourse diversions and reference to a possible energy centre. Equally, the draft ES project description refers to 'general industrial uses' as being a component of the proposed development but this description does not appear in the dDCO. The draft ES chapter notes that no existing structures require demolition, whereas this is listed as a possible work in the dDCO (Works no.5). The ES should provide an assessment of the works for which consent is being sought and this should	The Applicant has updated the ES and dDCO as required for submission.

Draft Environmental Statement (ES) project description chapter(s)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
		be reflected in the ES. For ease of reference, there should also be consistency in the terminology used. The applicant should be aware that failure to address these points could lead to a risk in the Inspectorate accepting the application.	
3.	General comments	The project description provides some information on the proposed development description, but many elements are not fully explained such that it is difficult to understand what information could be used to inform an assessment. For example, the proposed 'general industrial uses' are not defined further, there is no information on the extent or operation of possible solar voltaics. Where these details are addressed in other parts of the ES, we would recommend that the applicant considers how easy it is for the reader to access the information and ensure that appropriate cross references are provided, noting that the ES should be a standalone document and not rely on multiple references out to other application documents.	The Applicant has updated the ES and included cross referencing where necessary and appropriate.
4.	N/A	For ease of reference, it would be useful for the relevant works plans to be referred to when discussing different elements of the proposed development. Alternatively, separate figures could be provided to support the description provided for ease of understanding.	The Applicant has updated the ES, used a consistent terminology identified in a glossary and included figures where necessary.
5.	N/A	The chapter approach is to describe what the proposed development would comprise during construction and operation, but largely it does not describe how it would be built and operated nor where many of the elements would be sited. Where details are yet to be decided, for example the exact locations of construction activities, a set of assumptions should be included such that a worst-case assessment can be completed.	The Applicant has updated the ES as required for submission.

Draft Environmental Statement (ES) project description chapter(s)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
6.	Paragraph 3.2.6	The parameters/ design principles include use classes B2 and B8 to describe elements of the proposed development, which do not directly relate to developments seeking consent under the Planning Act 2008. It would be encouraged to not rely on descriptions from The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and instead provide a more detailed description regarding these elements of the proposed development.	The Applicant has removed references to use classes orders as advised.
7.	Paragraph 3.2.10	This paragraph indicates that individual buildings will come forward for approval at various times but under the same DCO. How will this be accounted for within the ES? The DCO cannot account for any subsequent permissions required for additional buildings/ works.	The Applicant has clarified that the development will be delivered as a single phase in terms of development plateaus on the EMG2 Main Site but individual buildings will be delivered based on occupier demand.
8.	Paragraph 3.2.12	The project description refers to wide ranging energy efficiency measures without many details. How will these measures be defined such that an impact assessment could be completed?	The Applicant has updated the ES as required for submission.
9.	Paragraph 3.2.15	As above – what parameters are assumed for the drainage works such that relevant impact assessments can be completed?	The assessment has utilised the limits identified on the submitted Parameters Plans.
10.	Paragraph 3.2.17	This paragraph indicates that the limits of deviation for the highway works are set out in a separate chapter. It would be preferable if the project description contained all of the information that the assessment has been based on for ease of reference and to avoid different aspect chapters assessing different levels of information.	The Applicant has updated the ES as required for submission.

Draft Environmental Statement (ES) project description chapter(s)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
11.	Paragraph 3.2.16a	The applicant identifies two options for the principal access location. Details of the alternative access location do not seem to be set out in the project description. While effort should be made to resolve possible options prior to submission of an application, where this is not possible the description should be sufficient to understand the environmental impacts of each possible option.	The DCO application pursues a single point of access.
12.	Paragraph 3.2.21e	An upgrade to the existing substation is proposed and a new switch room and switchgear. No parameters for these upgrades are provided, this should be included in the ES or confirmed that no additional external works are required to accommodate this change.	The DCO Works Plans show that the red line for the substation upgrade has been tightly drawn.
13.	Paragraph 3.2.13	'Substantial' landscape bunds and modifications to the levels within the site are proposed but no details are provided in the project description of how or when these will be built and no parameters for the bunds appear to be provided (unless these are provided within the parameters plans, and if so, this should be made clear). Consideration should also be given to types of vehicles, plant and machinery required, whether offsite vehicle movements would occur, or what methods would be used in the construction of these earthworks. Equally matters such as any soil treatment measures, where soil would be stored until needed, the finished levels in each plateau. If details are yet to be confirmed, assumptions should be made in order to inform the assessment of effects. Appropriate figures would also aid understanding.	The Applicant confirms this information is on the Parameters Plans. The Applicant confirms that a soil management plan is appended to the ES (Appendix 15C).
14.	Paragraph 3.3.2	While it is noted that the cut fill balance indicates no need for offsite disposal, the ES could equally set out whether all on-site materials are suitable for the end purpose as landscape materials or if materials may need to be imported. The ES should provide details where imported materials may be required or confirm if they are not required.	Chapter 18 (Materials and Waste) includes this assessment.

Draft Environmental Statement (ES) project description chapter(s)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
15.	Paragraph 3.3.3	The description indicates that piled foundations for bridge works may be required. The ES should include either details of the methods and numbers of piles that could be required or provide a set of assumptions in order to support the assessment of effects. We also note that below ground works to install services will be carried out, but no parameters are provided for these works.	Noted. The Applicant will include in the final chapter(s).
16.	Paragraph 3.3.7	The description indicates a closure of Hyam's Lane may be required. The details of the alternative routes that would be followed should be included.	Noted. Further explanation of temporary closures to be provided
17.	Paragraph 3.4.2	It would be helpful for more detail to be provided on the phases of development, particularly to understand whether there is potential for activities to overlap.	Chapter 3 (Proposed Development) includes a construction programme which covers the potential for the DCO and MCO construction works to overlap.
18.	Section 3.5.3 – operational phase	This section sets out the vision for the operation of the proposed development, but not necessarily how the proposed development would then operate – matters such as numbers of likely operational vehicle movements and whether vehicle movements would occur 24/7 for example. It also does not set out any maintenance activities, such as may be required for the solar voltaics.	Noted. Will expand on this in updated draft or signpost to where it can be found in other application documents

Draft Planning Statement			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	3.22	EMG1 Works (MCO application) <i>An upgrade of the EMG1 substation to accommodate a 3rd circuit and increase capacity to 33kV in order to accommodate the power requirements at EMG1 and EMG2 Main Site. This will require a new switch room and switchgear.</i> If the MCO is not granted, this reads as though the DCO application for EMG2 would be affected. If EMG2 is not granted, would this be necessary for EMG1?	The expansion of the substation has been included in the DCO Application.

Draft Statement of Reasons (SoR)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	1.1	Paragraph 1.1 refers to ' <i>second phase of EMG1 which is a SRFI</i> '. As the SoR is for the proposed NSIP EMG2, which may in the Applicant's mind be the second phase of EMG1, this introduction should focus on EMG2 (the project name is not mentioned).	The project name has been incorporated for clarity.
2.	1.2	The proposed project name should be consistent throughout all documents, for example the SoR is titled East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2). However, in paragraph 1.2, ' <i>the proposed development is referred to as East Midlands Gateway 2</i> '.	This has been addressed in the submission material and a glossary of terms which are used consistently throughout the application documentation is provided for clarity.
3.	3.3.4	Payment of contributions is Paragraph 36 not Paragraph 4. The Applicant is advised to ensure all references throughout the document are correct.	The Applicant has reviewed and updated all references as required.

Draft Statement of Reasons (SoR)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
4.	3.5	Appendix 4 is titled Status of Negotiation and showing the purposes for acquiring land appears to be outside of its scope.	Noted. Will amend in the updated draft document.
5.	4.13	'where were' – the word 'were' seems to be erroneous.	This has been corrected in the submitted SoR.
6.	Appendix 2	<i>Land to be temporarily</i> [appears to be missing the word 'used'?] <i>and new rights to be acquired permanently.</i>	This has been corrected in the submitted SoR.
7.	Appendix 3	Other documents refer to the temporary possession of land, rather than the temporary use. Consider the accuracy of the title and terminology across documents.	This has been corrected in the submitted SoR and updated in other documents for consistency.

Draft Funding Statement (FS)			
Ref No.	Paragraph / Section	Comment or question	Applicant's Response
1.	2.1	<i>The applicant is SEGRO Properties Limited</i> <u>See General Ref no. 1</u>	See response to General Ref no.1.
2.	4.5	As Section 2 is incomplete, this sentence is incorrect.	Section 2 has been completed in the submission document.
3.	1.8	DLCG 2013 guidance quoted. Only place in the FS where 'timing' or 'availability' are explicitly mentioned.	Noted. The submission document addresses both the availability of funds and timing.

Conclusion

- 15.7 This Consultation Report has been prepared in accordance with the latest Guidance issued by the Planning Inspectorate and satisfies section 50 of the Act.

16 **CHAPTER 16 – ADEQUACY OF CONSULTATION ISSUES RAISED BY SPECIFIC CONSULTEES**

- 16.1 There have been three responses to consultation which have raised specific issues with regard to the adequacy of consultation which it is thought appropriate to respond to. Two of them are PILs with whom, as yet, no agreement has been reached. The other is Leicestershire County Council who raised issues in its response to the statutory consultation in February/March 2025. These have been referred to in **Chapter 9** but are addressed in more detail below.

Leicester County Council (LCC)

- 16.2 In its response to consultation LCC has not suggested that consultation was inadequate in terms of the parties who were consulted or the means of consultation.
- 16.3 LCC was of course consulted upon the SoCC and responded to it. All its suggestions were responded to positively with changes made to the text of the SoCC accordingly (see **Chapter 4 Table 8**).
- 16.4 The points made by LCC in response to the statutory consultation, concerned the preliminary nature of some of the environmental assessment material which was consulted upon and its concern with regard to the “lack of a fully developed evidence base”. The response identified areas of further work, in particular in relation to highway impact assessment and mitigation, materials and waste and public health.
- 16.5 SEGRO provided a detailed response to LCC on 14 April 2025. That response:
- 16.5.1 Explained that preliminary environmental information was consulted upon and it was clear that further assessment work was to be done. The consultation was to help inform the further assessment and finalisation of the proposals.
 - 16.5.2 Specifically addressed the further work the LCC letter had referred to in respect of highway impact assessment, all of which was known to the Transport Working Group (TWG) of which LCC is a participant. The response identified the anticipated timing of the further work prior to submission of the application.
 - 16.5.3 Noted the request with regard to drainage requirements for inclusion in the draft DCO.
 - 16.5.4 Confirmed that points raised regarding the draft ES Chapters on Materials and Waste and Public Health would be addressed.
 - 16.5.5 Requested some further responses from LCC on material which had been consulted upon e.g. Access and Rights of Way Plans and Traffic Regulation Plans.
- 16.6 Further correspondence was then received from LCC on 1 May 2025 responding to the 14 April letter. The main point of LCC's further correspondence was to confirm its position with regard to the outstanding highway assessment work required to be undertaken prior to the submissions, which varied from SEGRO's position.
- 16.7 Notwithstanding the fact that SEGRO did not agree with many points made by LCC it was the case that other consultees had also raised concerns with regard to the extent

of gaps in the draft ES chapters consulted upon and clearly felt they would benefit from additional information.

- 16.8 Accordingly, as described in **Chapters 12 and 13**, SEGRO decided to undertake a further consultation on advanced chapters of the ES as well as some changes to the scheme which had been introduced after having regard to the statutory consultation responses received. LCC were given advance notice of this and then specifically written to at the commencement of the consultation period to identify the consultation material relevant to LCC's interests and to provide an easy link to it.
- 16.9 LCC responded to the Additional Consultation as reported in **Chapter 13**. There was no suggestion of lack of adequacy of consultation as such, but the difference in view between SEGRO and LCC persisted with regard to the progress on highway assessment work being undertaken. Additional comments were made on the Materials and Waste chapter, some of which were simply acknowledging that previous points raised had been addressed. Any additional points with regard to Materials and Waste, Public Health and Ecology have been considered in the finalisation of the relevant ES Chapters prior to the submission of the applications.
- 16.10 The TWG meetings have continued on a regular basis up until the submissions of the applications and it is anticipated that they will continue thereafter as required.
- 16.11 In addition, meetings have taken place with other LCC officers on 24 July 2025 and specifically in relation to highway matters on 14 August 2025. The purpose of the latter meeting was to discuss the SEGRO and LCC views of any further assessment work to be undertaken.
- 16.12 It is SEGRO's view that the LCC position should not be categorised as one which doubts the adequacy of consultation but is simply reflective of a difference in view as to the extent of highway assessment work which is required to be undertaken prior to consultation. Assessment work has continued since the Additional Consultation and that work has been incorporated in the final assessments included in the documentation supporting the applications.

PILs (MAG and Prologis)

- 16.13 The above PILs responded to both the statutory consultation and the additional consultation and asserted that the consultation was inadequate. Manchester Airport Group (MAG) is the owner of part of the land north of Hyam's Lane within the EMG2 Main Site, Prologis acquired an option over that land in November 2024 and acquired ownership of other land to the north of Hyam's Lane within the EMG2 Main Site in October 2024. There has been detailed correspondence between the PILs and SEGRO with regard to the points raised.
- 16.14 Whilst not all the issues raised by the two PILs are identically expressed there is sufficient communality to enable a combined response.
- 16.15 Accordingly, the paragraphs below are a composite response to the issues raised.

Issue 1- Fair Consultation – the Gunning Principles

- 16.16 The PILs assertion is that the law requires that all consultation be carried out in a manner which satisfies the four tests known as the "Gunning Principles" which are derived from *R v Brent LBC ex parte Gunning (1985) 84 LGR 168*.

- 16.17 The Gunning Principles are not a statutory requirement. They operate as a basis for conducting an objective assessment to determine whether public consultation has been fair. SEGRO addressed the Gunning Principles in its response to Prologis's statutory consultation submissions and made it clear that SEGRO does not accept the points made.
- 16.18 Set out below is **Table 27** which explains how both SEGRO's statutory consultation and additional consultation have complied with each of the four principles:

Table 27– Compliance with Gunning Principles

No.	Consultation Principle	Statutory Consultation 3 February 2025 to 17 March 2025	Additional Consultation 1 July 2025 to 29 July 2025
1.	Consultation at a formative stage	Informal consultation (see Chapter 3) took place over a prolonged period prior to the statutory consultation. This enabled the proposals to evolve in a form suitable for formal consultation, as described in the Design Approach Document (Document DCO 5.3/MCO 5.3). Statutory Consultation was then held on the emerging proposals for EMG2 and the components that would be included in both the proposed DCO and MCO applications. In respect of the EMG2 Main Site (with which the PILs are concerned) the proposals represented an iteration of the illustrative schemes submitted with the application for a Section 35 Direction granted on 21 February 2023 and representations recognised in the Regulation 18 emerging North West Leicestershire District Council Local Plan. Manchester Airport Group and SEGRO had made joint representations to the emerging Local Plan. Options were included, such as two points of access into the EMG2 main site.	The consultation was held on updated environmental information and the changes made to the proposals following evolution of the scheme and in response to comments received during statutory consultation. The comments informed further scheme changes.
2.	Sufficient information	Preliminary environmental information must be made available and SEGRO elected to publish draft chapters of its environmental statement. PINS guidance recognises that this may not be the same information that will be submitted with the application¹.	A newsletter identified the changes made in response to comments received during statutory consultation. It also identified the new material being consulted upon. The material included advanced ES Chapters.

¹ Ibid

No.	Consultation Principle	Statutory Consultation 3 February 2025 to 17 March 2025	Additional Consultation 1 July 2025 to 29 July 2025
		See Appendix 15 and 16 for a list of the material consulted upon and a leaflet which was circulated, all as described in Chapters 6 and 7	A full index of all the material consulted upon was provided to direct consultees to areas of concern. See Appendix 27 and 30 for a list of the material consulted upon and a newsletter which was circulated, all as described in Chapter 12
3.	Adequate time for response	Consultation satisfies section 45(2) of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) if conducted for a minimum of 28 days. SEGRO extended its statutory consultation period to 6 weeks.	Non-statutory consultation is not bound by section 45(2) of PA 2008. However, SEGRO elected to conduct further non-statutory consultation proportionate to the changes made to the proposals and recognising that an earlier longer statutory consultation period had been held only 3 months earlier.
4.	Conscientious consideration	SEGRO carefully considered all responses received and published a summary of the main themes arising from the responses received to the statutory consultation in April 2025 (Appendix 23). SEGRO also identified the changes it made to the emerging proposals which were the subject of statutory consultation in a newsletter posted to residents in the core consultation area as identified in the Statement of Community Consultation. See Chapters 9 and 10 and Table 20, Chapter 12	SEGRO carefully considered all responses received and made further changes to its proposals including reducing the application red line boundary, adding a further drainage connection and changes to the proposals in respect of a section of adopted highway known as 'Long Holden'. See Chapter 13 and Table 23

Issue 2 – Consultation Inadequate

16.19 The assertions made, in summary, are that:

16.19.1 there was too much information provided to consultees in the Additional Consultation

16.19.2 there was insufficient direction as to the content of the further material

16.19.3 there is “no reasoned appraisal of alternatives”

16.19.4 the material does not demonstrate that SEGRO has had regard to the PILS objections

16.19.5 consultation was a tick box exercise rather than constructive engagement

16.19.6 a further statutory consultation should be completed

16.19.7 there has been repeated failure to meaningfully engage with Prologis.

16.20 The categorisation of SEGRO's approach to consultation is not recognised and, in SEGRO's view, is clearly motivated by a desire to delay and frustrate the applications proceeding.

16.21 The 28-day consultation period allowed for comments on the Additional Consultation material would have been adequate to discharge the statutory consultation duration requirements stipulated in section 45(2) PA 2008. It is therefore misguided to complain that the 28-day period allowed for the Additional Consultation was unreasonable or that it would fail to satisfy the third Gunning Principle.

16.22 Appropriate recognition should be afforded to the steps SEGRO took to raise awareness of the consultations. As briefly summarised in the preceding table, SEGRO circulated a Newsletter identifying the changes made to the proposals in response to comments received during statutory consultation and identifying the new material consulted upon (**Appendix 27**). The Newsletter was posted to addresses in the Core Consultation Area, as identified in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), even though there was no requirement to do so because that consultation was additional to the consultation events identified in the SoCC. The Newsletter was also published on SEGRO's EMG2 website and is the first document listed in the full index of the additional material consulted upon. It was also posted to statutory consultees and other key stakeholders. All as described in **Chapter 12**.

16.23 The PINS guidance² recognises that non-statutory consultation is entirely optional but may be conducted by promoters where they have made changes to a project. Consistent with that position SEGRO consulted on the changes it made arising from responses provided during statutory consultation.

16.24 The PINS guidance recognises that non-statutory consultation may involve a reduced number of consultees or area. However, SEGRO voluntarily conducted its non-statutory consultation in the same way as its statutory consultation, save for the use of newspaper notices and in-person events. This approach was deployed to ensure those

² 'Non-statutory consultation and engagement', Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on the Consultation Report, 8 August 2024 (updated 24 March 2025)

who had previously responded to the statutory consultation event were aware that changes to the scheme had been made. The additional consultation consequently exceeded what was necessary.

- 16.25 It is disingenuous to suggest that SEGRO has not had full regard to the responses received – see **Chapters 9, 10 and 13**.
- 16.26 It is not accepted that SEGRO has had anything other than full regard to the PILs' comments in response to consultation. All comments have received a written response direct to both MAG and Prologis. The duty on promoters in section 49 of PA 2008 is to have regard to responses received, not to agree with them.
- 16.27 The most surprising aspect of the complaints made is the assertion that there has been “a repeated failure to meaningfully engage with Prologis”. Prologis only recently acquired its interests in the EMG2 Main Site in October/November 2024. As soon as SEGRO were aware of this it sought to engage with Prologis, and has done so, however, initially, there were significant delays in obtaining a response from Prologis. More recently there have been regular meetings which are continuing, with an effort to reach agreement.
- 16.28 SEGRO has also made determined efforts to continue to engage with MAG in respect of the protective provisions to be included in the draft DCO for the benefit of the airport and also securing the necessary interests in respect of the active travel link alongside the A453 which involves land owned by MAG. Despite many efforts over several months there has been no substantive response on these matters.

Issue 3 – Failure to comply with Section 42 Planning Act 2008

- 16.29 The assertion is that:
- 16.29.1 the statutory consultation which took place in February/March 2025 was defective due to missing information
 - 16.29.2 the statutory consultation gave inadequate time for consideration of the proposals and there was no explanation for compulsory acquisition of Prologis' land
 - 16.29.3 the scheme has been subject to change which means it differs materially from that which was subject to the statutory consultation so that it no longer relates to its “proposed application” within the meaning of the Act
 - 16.29.4 a further statutory consultation should be held.
- 16.30 For the reasons already set out, none of these assertions are accepted. Whilst scheme changes have been made (in response to serious consideration of consultation responses) these have not been such as to materially change the scheme which still comprises the EMG2 Works, the Highway Works and the EMG1 Works.
- 16.31 The guidance issued by the Secretary of State relating to pre-application consultation³ states, in para 020:

“Once applicants have completed the consultation process set out in their SoCC, where a proposed application is amended in the light of responses to consultation

³ Planning Act 2008 Guidance on the Pre-Application Stage April 2024

then, unless those amendments materially and substantially change the proposed application or materially changes its effects as a whole, the amendments themselves should not trigger a need for further consultation. The amendments can be reported as part of the consultation report submitted with the application.

Only where the project taken as a whole changes very significantly, and to such a large degree that what is being taken forward is fundamentally different from what was previously consulted on, should re-consultation on the proposed application as a whole be considered.”

- 16.32 The changes are described in **Table 20** of **Chapter 12** and are comfortably within the scope of changes which ordinarily arise from consultation and cannot conceivably be considered to give rise to a requirement for further consultation.
- 16.33 Accordingly, No requirement for a further statutory consultation exists and the non-statutory additional consultation is reported on in **Chapters 12 and 13** in accordance with the PINS guidance on non-statutory consultation.

Conclusion

- 16.34 SEGRO is confident that the consultation on the applications has been compliant with the statutory requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and the 2011 Regulations and has also complied with the Gunning Principles.

17 CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

- 17.1 This Consultation Report outlines the consultation undertaken by SEGRO prior to the submission of both the DCO Application and the MCO Application. This Report sets out how SEGRO has consulted upon each application and had regard to the responses received in shaping the proposals. The conclusions in respect of each application are considered separately below.

DCO Application

- 17.2 Pre-application consultation is a legal requirement for applications for a Development Consent Order. This Report sets out SEGRO's compliance with the statutory requirements of the Planning Act 2008 with regard to pre-application consultation on the DCO Application.
- 17.3 The pre-application consultation process took place over three phases:
- 17.3.1 **Stage 1** Engagement / Informal consultation on the emerging proposals which has taken place since 2022 (2020 in the case of the main PILS).
 - 17.3.2 **Stage 2** Consultation – a statutory consultation which took place from 3 February to 17 March 2025. This provided more details on the proposals to be applied for and included preliminary environmental information.
 - 17.3.3 **Stage 3** Consultation - a non-statutory additional consultation which took place from 1 July to 29 July 2025. This provided the opportunity for consideration of updated environmental information and some scheme changes in advance of finalising the proposals and the DCO application.
- 17.4 A summary of the key dates relating to the above consultation is contained in **Chapter 2, Table 5**.
- 17.5 In addition to these stages of consultation, SEGRO has undertaken informal engagement throughout the development of the proposals and continues to do so.
- 17.6 **Chapter 3** of this Report sets out the background to the emerging proposals and outlines the engagement/informal consultation which took place between 2020 prior to the statutory consultation in early 2025. The chapter records how the engagement/informal consultation helped shape the proposals. It is concluded that there was extensive and helpful engagement with key relevant stakeholders including representatives of the local community.
- 17.7 **Part 1 of Chapter 4** confirms that a SoCC was consulted upon and published in accordance with section 47.
- 17.8 **Part 1 of Chapter 5** confirms that the duty to notify the Secretary of State of the proposed application under section 46 was appropriately discharged.
- 17.9 **Part 1 of Chapter 6** sets out the details of the statutory consultation exercise and demonstrates that it complied with the requirements of section 42.
- 17.10 **Part 1 of Chapter 7** sets out the details of the consultation with the local community and demonstrates that it complied with the requirements of s.47.

- 17.11 **Part 1 of Chapter 8** confirms that the duty to publicise the application under s.48 was appropriately discharged.
- 17.12 **Part 1 of Chapter 9** reports on the responses received pursuant to the consultation exercise described in **Chapter 6** and demonstrates that the Applicant has had regard to those responses.
- 17.13 **Part 1 of Chapter 10.** reports on the responses received pursuant to the consultation exercise described in **Chapter 7** and demonstrates that the Applicant has had regard to those responses.
- 17.14 **Part 1 of Chapter 11** confirms that there were no separate responses received pursuant to the s.48 notice and that all responses received are referred to in either **Chapter 9 or Chapter 10**
- 17.15 **Chapter 12** explains the rationale for the further non statutory Additional Consultation and provides details of how that consultation was carried out. The consultation was extensive being carried out in the same manner, and involving the same consultees, as the statutory consultation apart from there being no press notices of exhibition events.
- 17.16 **Part 1 of Chapter 13** reports on the responses received pursuant to the consultation exercise described in **Chapter 12** and demonstrates that the Applicant has had regard to those responses.
- 17.17 **Chapter 14** confirms the ongoing engagement which has continued since the consultation exercises, and which is ongoing
- 17.18 **Chapter 15** demonstrates that the Applicants has had regard to both the Secretary of States relevant guidance issued under section 50 and the advice received from the Planning Inspectorate under section 51
- 17.19 **Chapter 16** addresses some specific criticisms of the Applicant's consultation. This chapter demonstrates that such criticisms are not well founded and do not have regard to the statutory requirements or the Secretary of State's guidance.
- 17.20 **In conclusion** the contents of the above chapters demonstrate that appropriate consultation has been carried out and has informed the proposals which are put forward in the DCO application.

DCO Application

- 17.21 Pre-application consultation is a legal requirement for applications for material changes to a Development Consent Order. This Report sets out SEGRO's compliance with the statutory requirements of the 2011 Regulations with regard to pre-application consultation on the MCO Application.
- 17.22 The pre-application consultation process took place over three phases:
- 17.22.1 **Stage 1** Engagement /Informal consultation on the emerging proposals which has taken place since 2024
- 17.22.2 **Stage 2** Consultation – a statutory consultation which took place from 3 February to 17 March 2025.This provided more detail on the proposals to be applied for and included preliminary environmental information.

- 17.22.3 **Stage 3 Consultation** – a non-statutory additional consultation which took place from 1 July to 29 July 2025 This provided the opportunity for consideration of updated environmental information and some scheme changes in advance of finalising the proposals and the MCO application.
- 17.23 A summary of the key dates relating to the above consultation is contained in **Chapter 2, Table 5**.
- 17.24 In addition to these stages of consultation, SEGRO has undertaken informal engagement throughout the development of the proposals and continues to do so.
- 17.25 **Chapter 3** of this Report sets out the background to the emerging proposals and outlines the engagement/informal consultation which took place between 2020 prior to the statutory consultation in early 2025. The chapter records how the engagement/informal consultation helped shape the proposals. It is concluded that there was extensive and helpful engagement with key relevant stakeholders including representatives of the local community.
- 17.26 **Part 2 of Chapter 4** confirms that a SoCC is not required as part of consultation on a application an MCO but confirms that the Core Consultation Area referred to in the SoCC published in respect of the DCO Application was widened to include local community more affected by the MCO proposals than the DCO proposals.
- 17.27 **Part 2 of Chapter 5** confirms that the duty to notify the Secretary of State of the proposed application under regulation 12 of the 2011 Regulations was appropriately discharged
- 17.28 **Part 2 of Chapter 6** sets out the details of the statutory consultation exercise and demonstrates that it complied with the requirements of regulation 10 of the 2011 Regulations.
- 17.29 **Part 2 of Chapter 7** sets out the details of the consultation with the local community in accordance with the SoCC which although not required under the 2011 Regulations was applied to the MCO application to ensure widespread consultation.
- 17.30 **Part 2 of Chapter 8** confirms that the duty to publicise the application under regulation 14 of the 2011 Regulations was appropriately discharged.
- 17.31 **Part 2 of Chapter 9** reports on the responses received pursuant to the consultation exercise described in **Chapter 6** and demonstrates that the Applicant has had regard to those responses.
- 17.32 **Part 2 of Chapter 10**. reports on the responses received pursuant to the consultation exercise described in **Chapter 7** and demonstrates that the Applicant has had regard to those responses.
- 17.33 **Part 2 of Chapter 11** confirms that there were no separate responses received pursuant to the regulation 14 notice and that all responses received are referred to in either **Chapter 9 or Chapter 10**
- 17.34 **Chapter 12** explains the rationale for the further non statutory Additional Consultation and provides details of how that consultation was carried out. The consultation was extensive being carried out in the same manner, and involving the same consultees, as the statutory consultation apart from there being no press notices of exhibition events.

- 17.35 **Part 2 of Chapter 13** reports on the responses received pursuant to the consultation exercise described in **Chapter 12** and demonstrates that the Applicant has had regard to those responses.
- 17.36 **Chapter 14** confirms the ongoing engagement which has continued since the consultation exercises, and which is continuing.
- 17.37 **Chapter 15** demonstrates that the Applicants has had regard to both the Secretary of States relevant guidance issued under section 50 and the advice received from the Planning Inspectorate under section 51
- 17.38 **Chapter 16** addresses some specific criticisms of the Applicant's consultation. This chapter demonstrates that such criticisms are not well founded and do not have regard to the statutory requirements or the Secretary of State's guidance.
- 17.39 **In conclusion** the contents of the above chapters demonstrate that appropriate consultation has been carried out and has informed the proposals which are put forward in the MCO application.