

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 May 2026 15:47
To: East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
Cc: Midlands ePlanning
Subject: Request for further information - Rule 17

Categories: Deadline Submission

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your letter dated 19 May 2026.

The requests for further information are set out below with our responses in italic. We hope these responses are helpful.

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

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

In order to address our concerns regarding the sufficiency of assessment in relation to Diseworth conservation area, and the designated heritage assets therein, with specific reference to its significance and the approach along Hyam's Lane we suggest a sequential route-based assessment narrative analysis, as suggested above, would be proportionate and appropriate.

We suggest this could comprise a sequence of images taken along the 1.2km between the edge of Donnington Park Services and the Junction of Hyam's Lane and Grimes Gates. Suggested suitable locations are:

- *SK4623025056 (with views towards the Conservation Area, with the development visualised)*
- *SK4605024965 (with views towards the Conservation Area, with the development visualised)*
- *SK4584124882 with views towards the Conservation Area, with the development visualised)*
- *SK4570224797 ((with views towards the Conservation Area, with the development visualised)*

These should seek to reflect the experience along Hyam's Lane as the road leads north- west into the east of conservation area.

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.

Our concern relates to the degree of harm resulting from further loss of historic landscape character. Hence, the erosion of the contribution of significance made to the hilltop designated assets. The main disagreement is the assertion made by the Applicant that after embedded mitigation is matured would result in a 'negligible adverse effect'. Our point is simply that while we note there is a low level of harm, this should still be considered in the basket of effects resulting from this scheme. We are not looking for further assessment on this point.

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.

Having reviewed the position outlined by NWLDC, we are in agreement with this assessment on contribution to significance. The issue is evidently explored, and we have no reason to disagree.

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.

We welcome the provision of additional information for Deadline 4 and would be happy to review this for the forthcoming deadline.

Thank you again, and we look forward to further discussion with the applicant around the statement of common ground, and forthcoming at Deadline 5.

Yours Faithfully,


Inspector of Ancient Monuments

The Foundry
82 Granville Street
Birmingham
B1 2LH



Ensuring our heritage lives on and is loved for longer.

historicengland.org.uk

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received this e-mail in error, please do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. For information