

Deadline 4 Submission by National Highways Limited

NH Response to Action Points from ISH 3

Application by Segro Properties Ltd for an Order granting Development Consent for the Extension of Freeport, the second phase of East Midlands Gateway and East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Material Change Order

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: BC0410001 /TR0510002

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document is submitted by National Highways ("NH") for Deadline 4 in respect of application by **Segro Properties Ltd ("Applicant")** for an order granting development consent for **the East Midlands Gateway 2 project ("DCO")** and **East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange ("MCO")**. The Applicant seeks development consent for proposed authorised developments described in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO ("**Authorised Development**").
- 1.2 This document sets out the Examining Authority's Action Points following the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH2) and the Issue Specific Hearing 3 that are directly specifically to NH and NH's response to the same. In addition, the document provides NH's hearing summaries.

2. RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS ARISING FROM ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 3

Question Number	Question to:	Question:	NH Response
Q40	The applicants NH	<p>Review and comment on the M1 J24 link volume-to-capacity ratios (Appendix 5, Table 3 of [REP1-058]), noting that the 'With Development + Mitigation' scenario shows links operating at or near capacity.</p> <p>To confirm whether any additional mitigation is considered necessary, or explain why no further mitigation is required, having regard to the limitations and uncertainty inherent in the modelling assumptions.</p>	<p>As noted in the NH Technical Note, Appendix 5, Table 3 [REP-1058], further examination of the M1 northbound off-slip and the southern section of the circulatory was undertaken by NH. NH requested Volume over Capacity (V/C) plots by link for each scenario. These are presented in Appendix 5, Figures 1 – 4 [REP1-058].</p> <p>Whilst the results suggest a worsening of V/Cs, there is only a small increase on the circulatory section as highlighted in the Table 3 [REP1-058]. Further analysis of the delay outputs has shown that this increase is not associated with any significant changes to delay.</p> <p>The model is accounting for the traffic discharging at the stop line from the NB off-slip and stop line of the southern circulatory section. This interaction of two streams is handled by the adaptive traffic signals. The adaptive nature of the traffic signals cannot be fully replicated in a strategic traffic model but can in the VISSIM model.</p> <p>The adaptive nature of the traffic signals would account for a rebalance of available green time. This would therefore in practice reduce the delay on</p>

Question Number	Question to:	Question:	NH Response
			<p>the circulatory section because the adaptive nature of the MOVA operation seeks to prioritise the circulatory traffic to ensure exit blocking does not result in the junction being blocked, ensuring the effective discharge of the off-slip approaches; which are safety critical.</p> <p>NH is content that the proposed mitigation would effectively manage the interaction of traffic streams in a coordinated and safe manner at M1 J24.</p>
Q44	NH	To clarify its statement in the RSA Ref 5.4, [REP1-056], that the proposed solution is “optimal”, including whether this reflects that the design is the best practicable option or that risks have been reduced to as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP).	<p>NH agrees that the overseeing organisation response should be changed to;</p> <p>“NH is satisfied that the proposed solution is the most appropriate considering existing constraints, and that the risk associated with it is as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)”</p>
Q59	The applicants NH	National Highways and the applicants to update the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with information relating to their respective positions on Biodiversity Net Gain and the relationship with the mitigation hierarchy. This should include how the hierarchy has been complied with in accordance with paragraph 4.23 of the NNNPS and whether there are instances where the loss of habitat on National Highways land could otherwise be avoided or mitigated in situ. The applicants to provide an updated biodiversity net gain report showing the net change in habitat on land controlled by National Highways.	<p>Changes made to NH’s KPIs for RIS 3 mean that NH's objection in relation to biodiversity net gain, specifically regarding the provision of the required 10% net gain within the SRN estate boundary, can now be withdrawn. Further, NH is satisfied that no protected habitats or species on the SRN estate are affected by the proposed works.</p> <p>The SOCG has been updated to reflect agreement between the parties on this issue.</p>

Question Number	Question to:	Question:	NH Response
Q65	The applicants NH NWLDC LCC	To reconsider the article 5 and requirement 32 in relation to “a campus / headquarters including co-located head office functions”. (Post Hearing Note: see also action point 30 from CAH2)	NH has no comments on requirement 32.
Q66	The applicants LCC NWLDC All IPs	Due to the number and nature of the points discussed during agenda item 10 (dDCO) and 11 (dMCO), all parties including the applicants, local planning authority, LCC and National Highways are requested to refer to their notes and/ or the recording of the hearing on and provide written submissions addressing the matters raised in relation to the articles and schedules of the draft Development Consent Order and/ or draft MCO.	During ISH3, the ExA raised several queries on the drafting of requirement 27 (mezzanines). While NH had agreed the drafting with the Applicant, NH has made clear that it is only attached to the principle of the requirement, not the precise drafting. Following the hearing, the Applicant shared proposed drafting with NH, which NH is reviewing. In parallel, it is understood that the Applicant is using VISSIM to model the impact of mezzanine related traffic on the highway network, which NH will review in due course. Depending on the outcome of this exercise, NH may be amenable to the removal of this Requirement from the draft DCO.

3. HEARING SUMMARIES

3.1 Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2)

NH attended CAH2 on 12 May 2026 and makes the following written submissions:

Agenda item 2(b): Book of Reference: NH confirmed that it had provided its comments on the Book of Reference to the Applicant. No major issues were identified through NH’s review. NH’s comments comprised minor queries concerning boundaries and ownership.

Agenda item 3.1: In response to the ExA's queries on the Prologis/MAG scheme, NH explained that modelling for the Prologis scheme was yet to be agreed. It has been received recently prior to the hearing and was currently being reviewed.

3.2 Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3)

NH attended ISH3 on 13 and 14 March 2026 and makes the following written submissions:

Item 4: Traffic and Transport: NH confirmed the following:

- There are no outstanding areas of disagreement on traffic modelling with the Applicant.
- Extensive discussions have been held with the Applicant on the mezzanine floor. NH considers that a robust assessment has been undertaken. NH's position was that, in the absence of modelling, the mezzanine floor is dealt with through requirement 27 and is supported by the travel plan and associated monitoring. Please see NH's response to action Q66 above.

Agenda item 7.4: Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG): NH clarified that it was internally reviewing its position on the applicability of its key performance indicators (KPI) on BNG. Post ISH3 and following the outcome of NH's internal review, NH can confirm that this objection is withdrawn, as per action Q59 above.

National Highways Limited
12 June 2026