

PLANNING ACT 2008

**APPLICATION BY SEGRO PROPERTIES LIMITED FOR THE EAST MIDLANDS
GATEWAY PHASE 2 AND HIGHWAY ORDER 202X**

**APPLICATION BY SEGRO PROPERTIES LIMITED FOR THE EAST MIDLANDS
GATEWAY RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE MATERIAL CHANGE ORDER**

POST HEARING SUBMISSION

ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 3

WEDNESDAY 13 AND THURSDAY 14 MAY 2026

ON BEHALF OF

EAST MIDLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED

EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT PROPERTY INVESTMENTS (INDUSTRIAL) LIMITED

Interested Party References: [REDACTED]

Appearances

1. The following people attended on behalf of East Midlands International Airport Limited and East Midlands Airport Property Investments (Industrial) Limited (“EMA”):
 - (i) Jon Riley, Partner at Pinsent Masons LLP;
 - (ii) Alistair Andrew, Strategic Planning Director at MAG;
 - (iii) Jon Bottomley, Planning Services Director at MAG;
 - (iv) Simon Pratt, SCP; and
 - (v) Steven Carmody, SCP.

Agenda Item 3: Legal basis of determination of the DCO application and the relationship to the environmental statement

2. EMA agreed with and supported the submissions made by Hereward Phillpot KC on behalf of Prologis in relation to this agenda item.

Agenda Item 4: Traffic and Transport

Agenda Item 4.1

3. The ExP led a discussion as to the latest position on traffic modelling for the proposed development. Mr Pratt stressed that EMA needed further clarity on modelling outputs in order to be able to understand the capacity and effect of traffic on the junctions providing access to the airport.

Agenda Item 4.2

4. This agenda item was for the ExP to explore what assessment has been undertaken of the effects of the construction of the proposed development on surrounding network, with particular emphasis on overnight and weekend users of the network. Jon Bottomley from EMA responded to questions from the ExP relating to how traffic movements associated with freight, passengers and staff are distributed through a 24 hour period, explaining seasonal and daily peaks. EMA welcomed the ExP’s suggestion that the 24/7 nature of airport operations and its strategic importance means that it should be addressed in more detail in the Applicant’s traffic management plan, to “make it more clear that it is going to be able to deal with those peaks and troughs we’ve had described to us”.
5. Counsel for the Applicant sought to move away from that proposition by referring to how EMG1 inter-acted with airport operations. However, the very obvious difference is that EMG2 would impact the junctions on the A453 which provides the main access to the airport, whereas EMG1 did not. EMA therefore remains concerned about both the lack of information available about the impacts on those junctions and the Applicant’s apparent disregard for the importance of the airport. EMA note that LCC shared their concerns about the construction impacts on the airport.

6. EMA stressed that they do not have a full set of information necessary to determine the full range of impact of both construction and operation of EMG on the airport. EMA noted that it may well be that information exists and has been shared by the Applicant with the highway authorities. If so, EMA would like to see it as well.
7. In relation to the development of CTMPs, EMA is concerned that the Applicant could seek to agree these with the highway authorities without including EMA in those discussions. EMA therefore has no confidence in that sole proposed means of managing future impacts. EMA is grateful to the ExP for making this matter a subject of an action point.

Agenda Item 4.3

8. Agenda item 4.3 involved a discussion of the various 'works packages' relating to the highway network around junctions 23A to 24A of the M1 and their deliverability in light of the proposed development. In this context, Mr Carmody raised a number of queries about clearances for abnormal loads and whether routing of such vehicles may have to change as a result of the Applicant's works. The ExP encouraged EMA and the Applicant to have that discussion offline and referred to the Applicant responding "in due course" at Deadline 4.
9. Under agenda item 4.4, the ExP sought the responses of the applicants, National Highways and Leicestershire County Council (LCC) to the critique of the Transport Assessment submitted by East Midlands Airport in relation to traffic effects around the airport. EMA welcomed the statement by LCC that "it was a thorough and well put together note" and National Highway's confirmation that they held a similar view. EMA was disappointed that the ExP did not probe the Applicant at all on this matter during the hearing as the agenda had indicated, instead giving them until Deadline 4 to respond. That is especially disappointing given that the overriding theme of EMA's assessment was that the Applicant should have provided sufficient information to enable EMA to understand the highways impacts of EMG2 on the airport during construction and operation in its application, but has still not done so.
10. Mr Pratt raised a number of concerns about modelling outputs across a number of junctions, excessive queuing (notably on the southbound offslip of J24 of the M1) and limited mitigation. Once again, the ExP indicated that EMA should discuss the matter with the Applicant, rather than seek to explore it during the hearing. Counsel for the Applicant confirmed they would prefer to respond in writing at Deadline 4.

Agenda Item 4.5

11. Agenda item 4.5 related to the Applicant's Road Safety Audit. Mr Carmody highlighted a number of concerns about the completeness of the data and design needed to undertake a safety audit, including the fact that not all of the departures

from standard have been taken into account. Again, EMA was directed by the ExP to have a conversation outside the hearing with the Applicant.

12. EMA then made two specific requests of the ExP. First, in order to give EMA the confidence that it will receive from the Applicant the information it needs to inform its position, EMA respectfully requested that the ExP had regard to the list of missing information on traffic and transport identified at Appendix 3 of its Deadline 3 submission (REP3-059) and use it as a basis for requesting information from the Applicant in the ExP's next round of written questions so that the information is available for the benefit not just the airport but for all parties to the Examination.
13. Secondly, EMA asked the ExP to consider holding an issue specific hearing on traffic and transport in August to allow more than the hour or so spent on the first morning of ISH3 for any outstanding matters relating to impacts on the airport to be examined in the round.
14. The ExP declined or deferred those requests, saying that they were expecting the Applicant's response at Deadline 4 and suggesting they would be able to remedy any omissions by the Applicant through the use of a further round of written questions later in the Examination. Further, the ExP stated that they "haven't put our minds to whether there will be hearings in August, let alone what they might be about".
15. EMA expressed its disappointment with that response. Again, the relevant information should have been provided by the Applicant as part of their application and should not still be outstanding. The ExP's third round of written questions (if any) are timetabled for issue on 14 July 2026 with a deadline for response of 28 July 2026 – over four months after the start of the Examination and only two weeks before the final week of hearings, if indeed the ExP chooses to hold any.

Agenda Item 10: Draft Development Consent Order

16. EMA agreed with and supported the submissions made by Hereward Phillpot KC on behalf of Prologis in relation to this agenda item.
17. EMA reserved its position in relation to Requirement 33 and the Applicant's yet-to-be-provided Operational Environmental Management Plan. EMA noted that this may have implications for aerodrome safeguarding matters. EMA welcomes the ExP's request to the Applicant to liaise with EMA in relation to this matter.
18. In relation to protective provisions for the dDCO EMA confirmed that constructive discussions have taken place with the Applicant which create some confidence that progress can be made.

Agenda Item 11: Draft Material Change Order

19. EMA confirmed that it is trying to reach an agreed position with the Applicant on the substance of a set of protective provisions for the dDCO, which it would then seek to have incorporated into the dMCO as well.