



Planning Inspectorate

Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000
Email:
for the DCO:
emgateway2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
for the MCO:
EMG1MaterialChange@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Historic England

Your Ref:

Our Ref: DCO: BC0410001
MCO: TR0510002

Date: 19 May 2026

Dear Sir/ Madam

**The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – rule 17
Application by SEGRO Properties Limited, for an order granting development
consent for a scheme comprising the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2)**

**The Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent
Orders) Regulations 2011 – regulation 44
Application by SEGRO (EMG) Limited, for an order making material changes to the
previously approved East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange and Highway
Order 2016**

Request for further information

We are writing as the Examining Panel appointed under the Planning Act 2008 and the two above regulations to seek additional information to assist us in writing our report to the Secretary of State for Transport relating to the above two applications.

We are writing under rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 and regulation 44 of The Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011.

Background to the request

During Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) the Examining Panel (ExP) considered progress on the Heritage and Archaeology Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and matters relating to setting effects including differences in approach and conclusions between the applicant, North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC), Leicestershire County Council (LCC) and Historic England (HE). In particular the ExP explored written responses to ExQ1 (Historic Environment) and the extent to which further clarification or assessment may be required to resolve matters raised by HE. As HE was unable to attend the ISH3, it would assist the ExP and other parties if HE can respond to these matters in writing.

The request

The ExP notes the outstanding areas of discussion and disagreement in HE's submission [\[AS-080\]](#). In light of this HE is requested to provide an update on the current status of the SoCG with the applicant identifying the principal matters still under discussion or not agreed and signpost where these matters are set out within the Examination documents. HE is also referred to a separate rule 17 letter of even date relating to the content of SoCGs.

With reference to [\[AS-080\]](#) and responses to ExQ1 (Q11.0.7), HE is requested to explain whether its request for further consideration of the Hyam's Lane approach and group value has any bearing on its view of the level of harm to the significance of Diseworth Conservation Area or whether this request relates solely to the completeness and robustness of the assessment methodology.

The ExP notes in HE's response to ExQ1 (11.0.1) that HE has sought further consideration of the approach from Hyam's Lane and a more holistic assessment of setting including matters described as approach or "kinetic" experience and group value. The ExP explored this during ISH3 with the applicant and NWLDC. HE is requested to clarify as precisely as possible the additional assessment work required to address these concerns, for example additional viewpoints sequential or route-based assessment narrative analysis linked to existing visualisations or other proportionate outputs, and explain what would be sufficient to align its position with NWLDC's response to ExQ1 (Q11.0.1). Additionally, HE states that St Mary and St Hardulph should be considered further and that harm to significance may fall towards the lower end of less than substantial harm. HE is requested to explain whether its concern relates to a missing receptor in the setting assessment, a disagreement on magnitude of change or a disagreement on significance or harm conclusion.

With reference to the response to ExQ1 (Q11.0.6) concerning Langley Priory the ExP notes that HE identifies a very limited contribution to setting but concludes that the proposed development would give rise to a negligible level of less than substantial harm. HE is requested to confirm whether it agrees with the conclusion reached by NWLDC that the association between the Site and Langley Priory is not meaningfully legible and, if not, to explain the extent to which historical or cultural associations contribute to setting and whether any additional or updated assessment would be required and of what type.

The ExP notes that the applicant has indicated during ISH3 that it will provide a further assessment note addressing effects on St Andrew's Church, Kegworth by Deadline 4. HE is requested to confirm whether in its view the existing ES material is sufficient in relation to this asset or response at Deadline 5 about whether further assessment is required following submission of applicant's note.

Please provide your response by **Wednesday 27 May 2026**.

Yours sincerely

Robert Jackson

Robert Jackson
Lead member of the panel of Examining Inspectors

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our ['Privacy Notice'](#) before sending information to The Planning Inspectorate.