East Midlands Gateway
Phase 2 (EMG2)

Document DCO 8.5 /MCO 8.5

Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and National Highways

June 2026

The East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
and Highway Order 202X and The East Midlands Gateway
Rail Freight and Highway (Amendment) Order 202X

SEGRO.COM/SLPEMG2

SEGRO

CONTENTS

1 Introduction

1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") is a written statement produced during the application process for a Development Consent Order ("DCO") and a Material Change Order ("MCO") for the scheme known as East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 ("EMG2" or "the Scheme") described in paragraph 1.3 below. This SoCG is prepared jointly by (1) SEGRO who has submitted the DCO Application through Segro Properties Limited and has submitted the MCO Application through Segro (EMG) Limited (referred to collectively as the Applicant and (2) National Highways ("NH").

1.2 The Guidance entitled 'Planning Act 2008: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects' (April 2024) ("the Guidance") describes a SoCG as follows:

"A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree, or indeed disagree. A SoCG helps to ensure that the evidence at the examination focuses on the material differences between the main parties and therefore makes best use of the lines of questioning pursued by the Examining Authority" (paragraph 007)

1.3 This SoCG has been prepared as part of the information accompanying the DCO and MCO applications for EMG2 which comprises:

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 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.	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 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**).

1.4 This SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the Guidance to assist the Examining Authority in examining the applications for the DCO and MCO by providing an understanding of the status of discussions or negotiations between the Applicant and NH.

1.5 Capitalised terms refer to the Glossary at Appendix A to Chapter 1 of the Environmental Statement (Document 6.1A) unless otherwise stated.

2 Parties to this SoCG

2.1 This SoCG is entered into by (1) the Applicant and (2) NH.

2.2 NH enters into this SoCG in its capacity as the overseeing organisation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such NH work to ensure that it operates safely and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. In the case of this proposal, NH's primary interest is in the M1 motorway and the A453, A50 and A42 Trunk Roads.

2.3 The Applicant enters into this SoCG as the future developer of the EMG2 Project and operator of the existing East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park located to the north of East Midlands Airport, which is proposed to accommodate the EMG1 Works being sought under the MCO application.

2.4 The purpose of this SoCG is to document the aspects of the EMG2 Project that are in agreement, those that remain under discussion, and those that are in disagreement between both parties. This will provide a clear understanding to other interested parties as to the current position between the Applicant and NH and allow the Examination to focus on key areas of the EMG2 Project.

2.5 A record of the meetings between the Applicant and NH is set out in the Appendix to this SoCG. It does not include the entirety of the historic and ongoing engagement between the Applicant and NH which has also been by way of a considerable number of emails, telephone calls and Teams meetings.

3 Structure of this SoCG

3.1 Section 4 of this SoCG considers matters relevant to the entire EMG2 Project, which includes development across both the DCO and MCO applications. This is because from a transport perspective, traffic associated with the MCO application on its own is negligible and so it was agreed that the impact of the DCO and MCO traffic be assessed as a single scheme, albeit there are separate conclusions as to their impacts contained within the Environmental Statement. Therefore, reference to 'EMG2 Project' refers to development within both the DCO and MCO applications and reference to 'EMG2 Main Site' refers to development on land south of East Midlands Airport only.

3.2 Section 5 then covers details that are only relevant to the MCO application, where they have no relevance to the DCO application.

3.3 The areas covered by this SoCG are as follows:

- 3.3.1 Scheme overview
- 3.3.2 Mezzanine floorspace
- 3.3.3 Pre-application engagement
- 3.3.4 Baseline conditions
- 3.3.5 Trip generation
- 3.3.6 Assessment methodology

3.3.7 EMFM 2019 – stage 1 modelling

3.3.8 Detailed junction modelling

3.3.9 Proposed highway works & EMFM 2019 stage 2 modelling

3.3.10 Site access

3.3.11 COBALT

3.3.12 Active travel

3.3.13 Public transport

3.3.14 HGVs

3.3.15 Construction activity

3.3.16 Principle of development

3.3.17 Good design

3.3.18 Highway works on the SRN

3.3.19 Road safety auditing

3.3.20 Highway drainage

3.3.21 Air Quality

3.3.22 Noise

3.3.23 Lighting

3.3.24 BNG

3.3.25 Protective Provisions and Land Interests

3.4 This SoCG records those matters which are agreed and any still under discussion between the Applicant and NH.

3.5 This SoCG is a document that will evolve during the Examination stage and will conclude with a version that confirms the final positions of the parties on relevant matters before the close of the Examination.

3.6 Within the following tables a Red Amber Green (RAG) status has been applied as follows: green – agreed, amber – a matter that is under discussion and/or further work is being completed and red – not agreed.

3.7 A Joint Position Statement between the Applicant and National Highways relating to SRN Mitigation has been agreed and is attached at Appendix 2.

4 EMG2 Project (DCO & MCO)

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
Highways and Transport						
4.1	Scheme Overview The DCO application seeks permission for a new logistics and advanced manufacturing employment park on the EMG2 Main Site comprising 300,000sqm of B2/B8 use plus an allowance of 200,000sqm of B8 mezzanine floorspace, together with HGV parking and a bus interchange, an upgrade to the EMG1 substation and provision of a community park. The MCO application seeks permission for a new B8 warehousing unit of 26,500sqm plus a mezzanine allowance of 3,500sqm, together with works to increase the permitted height of the cranes at the rail terminal and improvements to the EMG1 public transport interchange and site management building and addition of a pedestrian crossing near the entrance to EMG1.	Parameters Plan. **Document APP-039D**	The development described in column 2 has been assessed in the documentation submitted with the DCO and MCO applications.	It is agreed that the development described in column 2 has been assessed in the documentation submitted with the DCO and MCO applications.		D2 21 April 2026
4.2	Mezzanine Floorspace Requirement 27 of the DCO seeks to limit the use of the 200,000sqm mezzanine floorspace within the B8 element of the DCO. The agreed wording for Requirement 27 is as follows. *"No more than 200,000 sqm of total cumulative mezzanine floorspace shall be provided ancillary to the*	Parameters Plan. **Document APP-039D**	Following the discussion at ISH 3 the applicant is discussing further with NH the need for and wording of any requirement and is undertaking a sensitivity test utilising VISSIM.	Following the discussion at ISH 3, NH understand that The Applicant is undertaking VISSIM modelling runs to test the impact of the mezzanine floor. Discussions are		D2 21 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
	ground floor logistics and advanced manufacturing development uses. Such floorspace shall be used solely for the purposes of storage and shall not increase the distribution capacity and vehicle trip generation of the development hereby permitted above that presented in the submitted Transport Assessment. Prior to the installation of any mezzanine floorspace, the developer shall submit to and obtain written approve from the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, of a detailed floor plan identifying the location and extent of such mezzanine floorspace. For the avoidance of doubt, no office use shall be permitted on any mezzanine floor."			ongoing. Following the completion of the modelling NH will review the need for Requirement 27.		
4.3	Pre-Application Engagement BWB has been engaging with NH (including their consultants) and the wider TWG (involving NH, Leicestershire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Leicester City Council, East Midlands County Combined Authority and Nottingham City Council), since April 2022 to develop the TA, Sustainable Transport Strategy, Framework Travel Plan and Transport ES Chapter.	Appendices 19 and 20 of the TA **REP1-033**	The level of engagement with NH and wider stakeholders has been substantial which has ensured NH have had suitable time and opportunity to feed into the technical deliverables.	NH has attended the TWGS with other local authority partners and stakeholders to discuss the technical transport matters relating to the DCO and has had the opportunity to review technical information associated with the Applicant's modelling.		D1 7 April 2026
4.4	Baseline Conditions New traffic surveys were undertaken in November 2022 and May 2023 to inform the transport modelling.	Section 4 of the TA **REP1-033**	The traffic surveys were undertaken during an acceptable period and provide suitable data to	The traffic data collection exercise was undertaken in accordance with the Department for		D1 7 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
			inform the transport modelling	Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) unit M1-2.		
	Personal Injury Collision (PIC) records have been reviewed to identify existing highway safety problems on the surrounding network between 2019 and 2024. The PIC analysis within the TA identifies collision clusters at Finger Farm roundabout, M1 Junctions 24 and 25, A453/EMG1 Access Junction and M1 Junction 23, which require further assessment in the TA.	Highway Safety Position Statement (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0015_S2-P1) contained at Appendix 14 of the TA. **REP1-033**	BWB has considered existing highway safety records and sought to improve these within the proposed Highway Works. Information has been provided in the TA to explain how the EMG2 Project would not have any unacceptable impacts on highway safety. BWB provided further details regarding highway safety improvements by email on 09/02/26.	Following the submission of a Signage Strategy by the applicant and a further discussion NH confirms that sufficient measures have been undertaken that the development is unlikely to have further unacceptable impacts on highway safety.		D1 7 April 2026
	The existing opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of travel (walking, cycling, public transport).	Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment & Review Appendix 3 of the TA. **REP1-031**	A full understanding of all existing travel opportunities has been obtained through a WCHAR Assessment to inform the proposed design improvements.	NH has agreed the WCHAR assessment.		D1 7 April 2026
4.5	**Trip Generation**	Trip Generation Core Assessment Technical Note	The trip generation provides a robust assessment of the impacts	NH agrees that the traffic generation calculations are		D1 7 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
	The vehicle trip generation for the EMG2 Project has been calculated using the previously agreed B8 trip rates from the EMG1 DCO TA, along with new B2 trip rates from the TRICS database. Using these trip rates, the EMG2 Project could generate 929 vehicle trips in the morning peak hour and 1,065 vehicle trips in the evening peak hour, prior to the implementation of the Framework Travel Plan.	contained at Appendix 11 of the TA. **REP1-033**	of the EMG2 Project on the surrounding highway network.	acceptable and reflect the development proposals and land use.		
	The EMG2 Project has adopted the original modal split assumptions from the EMG1 DCO TA for the core assessment, which are as follows: • 80% single occupancy car driver • 11% car share • 5% public transport • 3% active travel • 2% other With the above assumptions, the EMG2 Project could generate up to 125 car share trips, 57 public transport trips and 33 active travel trips in the peak hour periods, prior to the Framework Travel Plan measures being implemented.	Section 7 of the TA **REP1-031**	The modal split and person trip generation have been calculated using an appropriate methodology.	NH agrees that the modal split and person trip generation calculations are acceptable and provide a suitable set of parameters to test the impacts of the EMG2 Project on the SRN.		D1 7 April 2026
	The Framework Travel Plan has a target to reduce the mode share of single occupancy car trips from 80% to 56% over a 10-year period by displacing them into other sustainable modes.	Sustainable Transport Strategy (ITP document reference EMG2_Sustainable	The Applicant agrees to commit to the 56% mode share target for single occupancy car journeys. This is set out in the	NH agrees that this is an ambitious but achievable target that reflects current travel behaviour at EMG1		DCO Submission (DCO 6.6B and 6.6C)

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
	The modal share target of 56% would reduce the number of single occupancy car journeys by 216 vehicles in the morning peak hour and 274 vehicles in the evening peak hour.	Transport Strategy_45-5, August 2025). APP-084 Framework Travel APP-085 Section 7 of the TA REP1-031	Framework Travel Plan and will be monitored during the 10-year travel plan period.	and the robust sustainable transport strategy that has been developed for the EMG2 Project.		D1 7 April 2026 (DCO 6.6A)
4.6	**Traffic Impact Assessment** The transport implications on the SRN are set out in the supporting transport documentation including traffic modelling and traffic impact assessment. This includes the traffic modelling assumptions, inputs and parameters which have been agreed.	Sections 8 to 14 of the TA REP1-031 VISSIM Modelling Forecasting Report - a revision to Appendix 50 of the TA REP1-043 EMFM 2019 Sensitivity Test REP1-059	The supporting traffic modelling and impact assessment has been agreed with NH. The impacts of the development on the SRN have been appraised and necessary mitigation has been identified.	NH agrees that the impact of the proposed development on the SRN has been established and unacceptable impacts upon road safety, notably at M1 junction 24, can be mitigated through the DCO process to NH's satisfaction.		D1 7 April 2026
4.7	**Proposed Highway Works & EMFM 2019 Stage 2 Modelling** The proposed Highway Works include improvements at M1 Junction 24. The key piece of infrastructure comprises a new free flow link between M1 northbound and A50 westbound that allows traffic to avoid M1 Junction 24.	Sections 12 and 13 of the **TA** REP1-031	The proposed Highway Works have been tested in EMFM 2019, which confirm the EMG2 Project could be accommodated and bring highway safety benefits.	NH agrees with the proposed Highway works.		D4 16 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
	There are also other Highway Works at M1 Junction 24, as well as improvements at the A6 Kegworth Bypass/A453 roundabout (EMG1) and M1 Junction 23A (Finger Farm).					
	A supplementary test has been undertaken in PRTM 2023 to understand whether the proposed Highway Works have the same material impacts in the latest version of the model.	PRTM 2023 Sensitivity Test Modelling Technical Note **REP1-058**	VISSIM models have been issued to NH who have confirmed they are acceptable and the unacceptable impacts upon road safety, notably at M1 junction 24, can be mitigated. NH have provided comments on the report which BWB have addressed and re-submitted at Deadline 1 but they have no impact on the conclusions of the modelling, which remain agreed.	NH agrees that the impact of the proposed development on the SRN has been established and unacceptable impacts upon road safety, notably at M1 junction 24, can be mitigated through the DCO process to NH's satisfaction. In 2028, with no development in place, there is forecast to be severe congestion on the SRN, specifically causing lengthy queues on the M1 Northbound offslip at Junction 24 and back onto the mainline carriageway, causing significant delays and safety concerns		D1 7 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
				relating to shunt type collisions. Without mitigation, the proposed commercial development would worsen the situation on opening. The proposed mitigation would provide sufficient capacity to enable the development traffic to be accommodated safely on the SRN and would result in there being no residual cumulative impacts, including at M1 Junction 24, the M1 northbound offslip or on the M1 mainline carriageway.		
4.8	**COBALT** A COBALT Assessment has been undertaken by BWB to understand how the proposed mitigation scheme would change the rate of PICs on the highway network	COBALT Assessment Technical Note (a revision to Appendix 73 of the TA) **REP1-049**	NH confirmed that the COBALT assessment is acceptable on 20 February 2026. A revised version (P6) addressing final comments was sent to NH on 17 April 2026, with two minor numerical changes to Paragraph 4.4, although	NH is satisfied with the COBALT assessment.		D1 7 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
			these do not result in any changes to the outcome of the assessment. Revision P6 of the COBALT Assessment will be submitted to the Examining Authority at the next appropriate deadline.			
4.9	**Active Travel** A sustainable transport strategy has been developed that includes new segregated footway/cycleway and crossing facilities, improvements to the existing Public Rights of Way network (including Public Footpath L45 'Hyam's Lane' Public Footpath L57 between Castle Donington and EMG1 and upgrading Long Holden to a bridleway and restricting vehicular access) that will encourage employees to travel by active modes of travel.	Section 6 of the TA **REP1-031** Sustainable Transport Strategy **APP-084** Framework Travel Plan **APP-085**	The sustainable transport strategy is comprehensive and will provide future employees with suitable opportunities to walk and cycle to the site.	NH agrees that a suitable active travel strategy has been developed.		D1 7 April 2026
4.10	**Public Transport** The sustainable transport strategy proposes enhancements to the public transport provision. This includes a new dedicated bus interchange on the EMG2 Main Site that would be served by existing public bus services and well as internal shuttle bus services that will transport employees from the bus interchange to all of the warehousing units across the EMG2 Main Site. This follows the successful EMG1 model.	Section 6 of the TA **REP1-031** Sustainable Transport Strategy **APP-084** Framework Travel Plan **APP-085**	The sustainable transport strategy includes improvements to the public transport provision which will provide future employees with good opportunities to use public transport when travelling to the site and then complimented by the	NH agrees that a suitable public transport strategy has been developed.		D1 7 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
			internal shuttle bus, modelled on EMG1.			
4.11	HGV's The HGV Route Plan provides details of the routes that HGVs associated with EMG2 would be permitted to use. The layout of the Strategic Road Network ensures that HGVs can access the EMG2 Project via appropriate routes.	HGV Route Plan Appendix 15 of the TA. **REP1-033**	The existing weight restrictions will ensure that HGVs have no significant impacts on the local highway network, as confirmed by the EMFM modelling. No additional management measures are required to control HGV movements which will need to adhere to the existing weight restrictions.	NH agrees that the HGVs will not cause any significant impacts to the SRN subject to the measures in the CTMP being agreed including enforcement of the cap on the number of HGVs.		D1 7 April 2026
4.12	**Construction Activity** The EMG2 Project is expected to generate 108 vehicle trips in the morning peak hour and 107 vehicle trips in the evening peak hour during the busiest phase of the construction programme. The additional construction trips have been tested using the East Midlands Freeport Model.	Construction Traffic Calculations Technical Note contained at Appendix 12 of the TA. **REP1-033** EMFM 2019 Forecasting Report contained at Appendix 74 of the TA. **REP1-049**	The methodology for calculating construction traffic movements was discussed with NH and tested in the EMFM 2019 model. This confirms that mitigation is not required to accommodate construction traffic movements.	The methodology to calculate construction traffic is agreed and the EMFM 2019 modelling shows that mitigation is not required to accommodate construction traffic movements. Measures have been put in place within the CTMP to enforce, the cap on the number of		D1 7 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
				HGVs. The CTMP has been agreed by NH.		
	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan has been produced setting out measures that will be adopted during the construction phase of the development to limit impacts of construction traffic on other road users.	Construction Traffic Management Plan Appended to the Construction Environmental Management Plan REP2-026D	The Applicant is committed to providing a cap on construction traffic movements in line with the CTMP. Traffic movements will be monitored during the construction phase. These details will be included in a revised CTMP. A Workforce Travel Plan has been produced and was issued to NH on 19 March 2026 A final agreed version is appended to the CTMP, which forms part of the CEMP.	The principles of the impact on the SRN have been agreed and confirmation that the agreed peak hour construction vehicle trips will be capped and monitored, with information supplied to NH on a monthly basis. A Construction Worker Travel Plan has been produced confirming how worker journeys to and from the site will be managed and enforced through the CTMP. Following discussions with the Applicant, a revised CWTP has been produced and agreed with NH.		D2 21 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
4.13	**Principles of design** NNNPS (March 2024) paragraph 3.8 identifies that transport infrastructure is a catalyst and key driver of growth. The NNNPS indicates that enabling growth, includes exploring options to unlock sites for housing and employment growth made accessible by both sustainable transport and major infrastructure. Modelling evidence shows that there are significant queues on the M1 J24 northbound off slip and on the mainline, exacerbated by development as early as 2028 which is a barrier to the development coming forwards. The mitigation proposed includes a new auxiliary link from the M1 northbound to the A50 westbound. This relieves traffic from the Finger Farm link and relieves congestion on the M1, mitigating the development impact. As set out in the NNNPS this provides resilience on the M1 to enable economic growth.	N/A	The proposed mitigation design has been tested in PRTM 2019, PRTM 2023 and VISSIM, which confirms that it would resolve any unacceptable impacts of the development on the SRN to accommodate development at EMG2.	NH is satisfied with the proposed design principles to mitigating the impact of the development on the SRN. The mitigation eliminates forecast mainline congestion on the M1 northbound mainline on the approach to Junction 24, providing resilience and enabling additional capacity to accommodate the traffic arising from the development.		N/A
4.14	**Good design** DMRB standard GG 103 sets out the principles of good design and requires evidence of how they have been achieved in the design of the highway mitigation	**Highway Design Approach REP2-024**	The Applicant has set out in the Highway Works Design Approach Document how the principles of good design have been achieved in the highway mitigation.	NH is satisfied with the proposed approach to mitigating the impact of the development on the SRN including how the principles of good design have been achieved and, in principle, with the interventions		D2 21 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
				proposed, subject to the successful completion of the compliance assessments against the DMRB. NH reviewed a Structure Options Report and agrees with the applicant that the overbridge design is the most suitable solution.		
4.15	**Highway Works on the SRN** The following drawings have been produced to show the design of the proposed Highway Works on the SRN: • Works Plans • Access and Rights of Way plans • A453 Bridge Plan • Highway Classification Plan Geotechnical Statement of Intent and Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR) to CD 622	**Works Plans** REP1-006D REP1-007D REP1-008D REP1-009D **AROW Plans** REP1-011D REP1-012D **A453 Bridge** APP-053D **Speed Limit Plan** REP1-023D **Preliminary Sources** APP-161 APP-162 APP-163	NH is in agreement with the drawings set out in column 2.	NH agrees with the drawings set out in column 2.		D1 7 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
		APP-164 APP-165 APP-166 **Geotechnical Intent APP-167**				
	• Speed limits plan • Highway lighting strategy	**Speed Limit Plan REP1-023D** **Highway Lighting Strategy APP-132** Appendix 13 **REP1-058**	NH is in agreement with the drawings set out in column 2.	NH agrees the lighting strategy and speed limits plan.		D1 7 April 2026
	There are a number of departures from standard identified within the proposed Highway Works. The geometric design drawings (Highway Plans) including vehicle tracking and locations of motorway signs and signals and including agreement to departures from standard inherent in the geometric design.	**Highway General Arrangement Plans REP1-015D REP1-016D REP1-017D REP1-018D** **Highway Works Cross Sections APP-046D REP1-019D REP1-020D** **Highway Works Long Sections APP-049D APP-050D APP-051D APP-052D**	BWB have submitted departures from geometric standards and signage and signalling departures all of which have been approved.	NH has agreed all 11 departures from geometrical standards and all signage and signalling departures.		D4 16 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
4.16	**Road Safety Auditing** Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the proposed Highway Works	Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Brief **REP1-056** Stage 1 Road Safety Audit response report **REP1-057**	The Stage 1 RSA CVs, audit team and report have been agreed. The Stage 1 RSA has been carried out and BWB has produced response reports which have been approved by NH.	The Stage 1 RSA CVs, audit team and report have been agreed. NH has received and agreed the designer's response.		D1 7 April 2026
4.17	**A453 Bridge**	**A453 Bridge Plan APP-053D** Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Brief **REP1-056** Stage 1 Road Safety Audit response report **REP1-057**	The level of design information provided for the Stage 1 RSA in relation to the A453 Bridge is in line with that required by GG 119 for a Stage 1 Audit, i.e. the horizontal & vertical alignments and visibility design. The details of the bridge itself will, in accordance with GG 119 be audited at Stage 2.	It is agreed that the level of design information provided for the A453 bridge is appropriate and accords with the requirements of GG119 for a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.	Green	D4 16 June 2026
Highway Drainage						

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
4.18	References in the Protective Provisions regarding highway drainage	Draft DCO Schedule 13 Part 1 **REP2-010M**	The Applicant is in discussions with NH regarding the Protective Provisions and anticipates that appropriate provisions will be agreed	The proposed Protective Provisions in the Draft DCO are not acceptable to NH. Ongoing discussions are taking place regarding NH preferred standard set of Protective Provisions.		
Air Quality						
4.19	Further information sought by NH relating to aspects of AQ assessment.	ES Air Quality Chapter **REP3-012**	The Air Quality Assessment has been agreed with NH.	Following further information being submitted in April 2026, NH is in agreement with the conclusions of the Air Quality Assessment.		D3 28 April 2026
Lighting						

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
4.20	Review of lighting strategy following completion of PRTM2023 sensitivity test	Appendix 13 PRTM Sensitivity Test **REP1-058**	A technical note confirming that the lighting strategy and road lighting plans remain appropriate when considered in relation to PRTM 2023 was submitted to NH on 27 March 26.	NH has agreed the lighting strategy.		D3 28 April 2026
BNG						
4.21	Assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain	Biodiversity Net Gain Report **REP3-041**	The DCO Application was submitted prior to the mandatory requirement for 10% BNG to be provided. Notwithstanding that position, the DCO Applicant has designed the scheme to achieve in excess of 10% BNG when assessed across the entire project (See Biodiversity Net Gain Report (**APP-116)** In the circumstances where the highway works to the SRN are not being publicly funded and the highway works are part of a larger scheme the KPI (which is not a legal obligation) referred to by NH does not apply and there is no purpose served in carrying	Due to a change to NH's biodiversity KPI for RIS3, NH is now content with the Applicant's approach to biodiversity net gain, specifically regarding the provision of the required 10% net gain within the SRN estate boundary.		D4 16 June 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
			out an assessment purely for the existing SRN estate. It would be disproportionate to require 10% BNG on the National Highways estate alone. There are no protected or notable ecological habitat features within the SRN estate being impacted; Effected habitats include plantation woodland, varied grassland of low to moderate distinctiveness, and mixed scrub, which are widespread on the SRN. The impacts on these habitats are not considered significant, and the proposals for the highway land will replace them with the same palette of newly created habitats that provide the same ecological functions. As explained in the BNG report the project as a whole will deliver at least a			

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
			10% gain in accordance with the metric.			
Protective Provisions and Land Interests						
4.22	Drafting of Protective Provisions including land interests	Draft DCO Article 19 and Schedule 13 Part 1 **REP2-010M**	Discussions are in progress regarding the contents of the protective provisions. The only land interests relate to the desire of NH to have the land which will become part of the SRN following the construction to be transferred to NH rather than adopted. This will be secured in the Protective Provisions	The proposed Protective Provisions in the Draft DCO are not acceptable to NH. Ongoing discussions are taking place regarding NH's preferred standard set of Protective Provisions. NH is reviewing the Book of Reference and will respond to the Applicant shortly.		

5 MCO

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
Highways and Transport						
5.1 – Scheme Overview	The MCO application seeks permission for a new B8 warehousing unit of 26,500sqm plus a mezzanine allowance of 3,500sqm, together with works to increase the permitted height of the cranes at the rail terminal and improvements to the EMG1 public transport interchange and site management building and addition of a pedestrian crossing near the entrance to EMG1.	Parameters Plan **APP-063M**	The development described in column 2 has been assessed in the documentation submitted with the DCO and MCO applications.	It is agreed that the development described in column 2 has been assessed in the documentation submitted with the DCO.		D2 21 April 2026
5.2 – Trip Generation	The peak hour traffic generation associated with the EMG1 Works equates to 5.7% and 6.3% of the total traffic from the EMG2 Project.	Section 7 of the TA **REP1-031** Section 6.9 of the Transport ES Chapter **AS-032** MCO Note -Transport Technical Note with further assessment of Plot 16 impact (**Document MCO 7.10**) submitted to the Examining Authority at Deadline 1 (does not appear on Ex Library)	The MCO application has been assessed in isolation of the DCO scheme within the Transport ES Chapter. The LinSig modelling also confirms that the MCO application would have negligible impact on the operation of the A453/A6 Kegworth Bypass junction (See **Document MCO 7.10**). Therefore, no mitigation is required.	NH has reviewed the LinSig modelling and agrees that the traffic from the MCO application (Plot 16) in isolation would not have a severe residual cumulative impact, nor an unacceptable impact upon highway safety. Therefore, it is agreed that mitigation is not required.		D2 21 April 2026

Ref	Matter	Relevant document reference and signposting	Applicant Position	NH Position	RAG status	Date
5.3 – Site Access	The MCO application would be served from A453/A6 Kegworth Bypass roundabout and Wilder's Way	Section 6 and Appendix 27 of the TA **REP1-031** **REP1-035**	The A453/A6 Kegworth Bypass junction could satisfactorily serve development within the MCO application.	NH agrees that the A453/A6 Kegworth Bypass junction will serve development within the MCO application.		D2 21 April 2026
5.4 – EMG2 Rail Freight Terminal	The MCO application seeks permission to increase the permitted height of the cranes.	EMG1 Rail Freight Terminal Technical Note (contained at Appendix 10 of the TA. **REP1-033**	The change to the heights of the cranes at EMG1 will not have any impacts on the agreed traffic generation.	NH agrees that the change to the heights of the cranes at EMG1 will not have any impacts on the agreed traffic generation.		D2 21 April 2026

6 Conclusions

6.1 The Applicant and NH confirm that all matters under discussion to the Scheme have been agreed as recorded in the tables in Sections 4 and 5 above.

6.2 As far the position with NH is concerned the only outstanding item relating to transport modelling and highway mitigation is the approval of five signage/signalling departures; and

6.3 The Applicant and NH will continue to engage with each other as necessary during the Examination processes with a view to narrowing and resolving any issues that may subsequently be raised.

SIGNATURES:

On behalf of the Applicant:

…….
Signature

…….
Name

On behalf of NH:

…….
Signature

…….
Name

APPENDIX 1

RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

Date	Form of engagement	Summary of matters dealt with
28/04/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Introduction meeting
27/07/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Initial transport scoping meeting
11/08/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Initial steps for the PRTM modelling
08/09/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM proforma details
13/10/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM methodology and proposed access arrangements
10/11/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM methodology, PRTM base year model review, traffic distribution pattern and traffic survey requirements
08/12/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM planning data assumptions and uncertainty log details
12/01/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM modelling update, introduction to VISSIM modelling and discussion on the public transport strategy
09/02/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM planning data assumptions, traffic flow furnessing and VISSIM scoping
09/03/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Development distribution pattern, PRTM Uncertainty Log and VISSIM scoping

13/04/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	VISSIM LMVR, PRTM Stage 1 outputs and sensitivity test modelling considering all draft Local Plan sites (since superseded)
11/05/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM forecasting report (Stage 1), traffic flow furnessing methodology & VISSIM base model validation
08/06/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM forecasting report and study area, traffic flow furnessing and forecast traffic flows and VISSIM base model validation
20/09/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sensitivity test PRTM modelling approach considering all draft Local Plan sites (since superseded), traffic flow furnessing and forecast traffic flows and VISSIM base model validation
14/12/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Transport modelling scenarios / methodology discussion
11/01/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Junctions 11 and LinSig model validation, initial review of transport modelling results and impacts, review of Isley Woodhouse Scoping Opinion
08/02/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Junctions 11 and LinSig base model validation, traffic flow furnessing methodology, initial review of transport modelling results and impacts, review of emerging NWLDC Local Plan
15/03/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	NWLDC Local Plan modelling work and Junctions 11 / LinSig base model validation.
18/04/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing and VISSIM base model validation review

09/05/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Assessment methodology for EMG1 core scenario, forecast year requirements and vision and validate methodology
13/06/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sustainable transport strategy, Junctions 11 and LinSig base model validation and trip rates for mezzanine floorspace. Initial review of proposed highway mitigation and Covid-19 sensitivity testing
11/07/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM proforma updates, proposed site access and public transport strategy update, Covid-19 PRTM sensitivity testing and vision and validate assessment methodology (relating to EMG1 surveyed trip rates and mezzanine floorspace uplift)
08/08/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sustainable transport strategy, PRTM modelling update including proforma and uncertainty log details, introduction to wider strategic modelling relating to the wider growth sites near East Midlands Airport
05/09/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing demand matrices, Stage 2 modelling related matters, PRTM 2023 sensitivity test, VISSIM modelling and construction traffic modelling
12/09/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM modelling update, approach for Statements of Common Ground / sign off sheets, vision and validate assessment requirements and wider strategic modelling approach
03/10/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	EMG1 rail freight terminal and impacts on trip generation, PRTM modelling scenarios and forecast years, strategy for wider strategic modelling
10/10/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sustainable transport strategy, initial overview of proposed mitigation strategy, PRTM proforma update

06/11/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 1 PRTM modelling update, vision and validate assessment requirements
14/11/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Wider strategic modelling update and EMG2 modelling related discussion
05/12/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Wider strategic planning modelling requirements including planning data assumptions, PRTM 2019 Stage 1 and 2 modelling update, VISSIM base model updates
12/12/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 vs 2023 discussion, requirements for public consultation, wider strategic modelling methodology and PRTM assessment requirements, sustainable transport strategy / framework travel plan update, vision and validate update and Covid-19 sensitivity test update
02/01/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 vs 2023 discussion and mechanism for delivering the wider strategic mitigation associated with East Midlands Growth Point schemes
09/01/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 vs 2023 model comparison, highway design update and overview of mitigation scheme, PRTM Stage 1 modelling outputs, sustainable transport strategy, mezzanine floorspace and impact on trip rates, construction traffic assessment requirements
06/02/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 1 and 2 PRTM modelling outputs and update on wider strategic modelling, including suitability of PRTM 2023, planning data assumptions and quantum of development to be assessed. The base VISSIM model updates were also discussed as well as the current position with sign off sheets

13/02/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Statutory consultation programme and approach, PRTM modelling outputs review, wider strategic modelling assessment requirements using PRTM 2023, VISSIM base model update and review of sign off sheets
06/03/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Development trip distribution and assessment methodology, traffic flow furnessing and PRTM outputs for Stage 1b modelling and overview of proposed study area for the Transport Assessment
13/03/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Statutory consultation overview / summary of responses, PRTM modelling update, VISSIM base model update, mezzanine floorspace discussion and expected operational use, construction traffic calculations, HGV route plan requirements, update on sign off sheets, sustainable transport strategy update and overview of Personal Injury Collision assessment
03/04/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 forecasting report and discussion over core scenario vs policy requirements, traffic flow furnessing and Stage 2 modelling, construction traffic calculations and assessment requirements, vision and validate assessment using surveyed trip rates from EMG1
10/04/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing update, Stage 2 PRTM modelling requirements, sustainable transport strategy update, highway design update, construction traffic calculations and assessment requirement, Highway Safety Position Statement and discussion over highway safety issues / areas of mitigation and COBALT Assessment methodology
01/05/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Assessment scenarios to be tested in TA and ES Chapter and how this complies with current policy, VISSIM model furnessing calculations, Stage 2 PRTM modelling update, construction traffic calculations and vision and validate / mezzanine discussion plus an update on sign off sheets

08/05/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 2 modelling PRTM outputs and discussion over results of mitigation, assessment methodology for TA and ES Chapter and compliance with current policy, sustainable transport strategy update, highway design update and overview of drawings, construction traffic calculations and discussion over highway safety position statement
05/06/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Discussion over comments received from NH on PRTM modelling, Stage 2 PRTM modelling, construction traffic PRTM modelling and approach for PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling
12/06/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing, stage 2 PRTM modelling update, assessment requirements of additional mezzanine floorspace, sustainable transport strategy, highway design update, review of highway safety (highway safety position statement and COBALT assessment) and update on sign off sheets. Initial conversations held over the requirement for PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity tests.
03/07/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 2A PRTM forecasting report and traffic flow furnessing and technical note for Stage 2 modelling.
10/07/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Non-statutory consultation overview, Stage 2 PRTM forecasting report, overview of transport modelling work in TA (Junctions 11, LinSig and VISSIM) and assessment of impacts / focus of mitigation, construction traffic modelling and PRTM forecasting report, comparison of PRTM 2019 and 2023.
07/08/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	VISSIM related work, traffic flow furnessing and demand matrices for Stage 2 modelling, Stage 2A/2B PRTM forecasting reports, PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity test, construction traffic PRTM forecasting report and overview of standalone junction modelling results.

14/08/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Proposed access strategy and number of access points, transport modelling update, PRTM 2023 sensitivity test, WCHAR Assessment, sustainable transport strategy update and sign off sheet update.
04/09/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 2A and 2B modelling matters, including PRTM forecasting reports, comments from NH and traffic flow furnessing, PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity test update, VISSIM modelling update and overview of construction traffic modelling in PRTM.
11/09/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 modelling update, highway design discussion, WCHAR Assessment, COBALT assessment, sign off sheets and PRTM 2023 modelling requirements / approach.
02/10/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 stage 2 modelling, including furnessing note update, response to comments from NH and LCC and sensitivity test with unconstrained A50 merge. Discussion on updates to standalone junction models to address LCC comments and update on PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity test, as well as any update on agreement for the mezzanine legal wording.
09/10/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 modelling update and review of Stage 2 results, PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling timescales update and sign off sheet update.
06/11/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Update on PRTM 2019 core modelling, PRTM 2019 sensitivity test modelling and PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling. Agreement reached with NH on mezzanine legal wording.
13/11/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 modelling update including A50 unconstrained merge sensitivity test, PRTM 2023 modelling update, mezzanine legal wording confirmation, highway design update.

04/12/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Update on the PRTM 2019 core modelling, the PRTM 2019 sensitivity test and PRTM 2023 sensitivity test
11/12/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Highway design update, including departure from standard process, Stage 1 Road Safety Audit update and discussions on transport modelling including PRTM 2019 core, PRTM 2019 sensitivity test and PRTM 2023 sensitivity test.
08/01/26	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Confirmation of final steps required to close out the PRTM 2019 core modelling and continued discussions on the PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling.
15/01/26	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling and discussion on initial drafts of the Statements of Common Ground.
05/02/26	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Continued discussions on the PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling as well as conversations as to whether additional assessment of the MCO application is required.
12/02/26	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Update on the DCO application and discussion on PRTM 2023 sensitivity test outputs and next steps.
		Discussions have been ongoing during the Examination

Appendix 2

East Midlands Gateway
Phase 2 (EMG2)

Document [ ]

Joint Position Statement between the DCO Applicant and National Highways relating to SRN Mitigation Scheme

APRIL 2026

The East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
and Highway Order 202X and The East Midlands Gateway
Rail Freight and Highway (Amendment) Order 202X

SEGRO.COM/SLPEMG2

SEGRO

1 Introduction

1.1 This Joint Position Statement has been agreed between National Highways and the DCO Applicant and relates to the DCO Application for the DCO Scheme known as East Midlands Gateway Phase 2. It relates specifically to the wider benefits that would be delivered by the mitigation works on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) included in the DCO.

1.2 This statement explains the broader context for the DCO Applicant's highway mitigation in relation to Junction 24 of the M1 motorway, and how that mitigation provides wider benefits and could contribute to an overall strategy for addressing the current and future issues relating to highway capacity at Junction 24 which, unless resolved, will operate as a constraint on planned growth in the region.

2 Operational Context of M1 Junction 24

2.1 It is recognised that Junction 24 of the M1 motorway is at times currently operating over capacity and that, without significant highway interventions, traffic on the SRN will encounter increased congestion, meaning that identified, planned growth necessary to grow the regional economy may not be able to be accommodated on the network. It is also recognised that the highway interventions required to mitigate the impact of development will need to be of a significant scale.

2.2 The planned growth in the immediate vicinity includes much of the proposed local plan allocations in the replacement North West Leicestershire Local Plan (involving a significant amount of employment development and approximately 6,000 houses). It also includes the Freeport sites in the area comprising the EMAGIC sites and the redevelopment of Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station into a zero-carbon technology and energy hub for the region. The Power Station redevelopment is authorised by a Local Development Order but much of the re-development is dependent upon a solution to the constraints at and around Junction 24 and a Planning Condition exists for mitigation to be implemented by the developer before an employment threshold equivalent to previous-use employment levels can be implemented on the site. Further afield the operational issues at Junction 24 will operate as a constraint on wider regional growth.

3. The Proposed DCO Mitigation Scheme as Part of a Strategic Solution to M1 Junction 24

3.1 In recognition of the need for a series of significant interventions at Junction 24 to mitigate the impact of their developments, and to avoid a suboptimal piecemeal approach, a consortium of developers (including the DCO Applicant, the owner of the Power Station, the proposed developers of a new village proposed in the local plan to the west of Diseworth and other landowners) has been working on a strategic solution to address the forecast congestion at the junction. To this end work has been undertaken to develop a design and demonstrate its operational effectiveness through traffic modelling, in consultation with National Highways.

3.2 The consortium, through engagement with National Highways and other key stakeholders, has identified a combination of highway upgrades which the consortium considers together provide a solution to the capacity issues at Junction 24. That solution has been discussed with National Highways. The consortium is undertaking strategic and microsimulation modelling to demonstrate the suitability of the proposed solution to mitigate the impacts of all planned growth in the area. National Highways is engaged in this exercise and will review the modelling and the effectiveness of the mitigation when it is available.

3.3 The majority of the works to the SRN proposed by the DCO Applicant in the DCO Application, which are required to mitigate the impact of the DCO Scheme, consist of one of those upgrades – known as "the green package", which comprises Works Nos. 8 - 12 in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO [**APP-012D**], being a new freeflow link from the M1 Northbound to the A50 Westbound. Due to its scale, this scheme of works constitutes a nationally significant infrastructure project itself and the NNNPS applies to it. The mitigation put forward by the DCO Applicant is consistent with, but not reliant upon, the remainder of the highway upgrades proposed by the consortium.

4. Wider Benefits of the Proposed SRN Mitigation Scheme

4.1 The DCO Applicant has included the "green package" as part of its highway mitigation and has assessed its impact in the environmental assessment and Transport Assessment submitted with the DCO Application. That assessment is dealt with in a SOCG between the parties to this statement. The assessment demonstrates that, as required by the NNNPS, the NSIP works comprising Works Nos, 8 – 12 improve the operation of the network and assist with capacity issues (NNNPS Para 5.283).

4.2 The DCO Applicant's strategic and microsimulation modelling, validated by National Highways, demonstrates that the proposed highway mitigation works (including the highways NSIP) provide wider benefits than simply mitigating the impacts of the East Midlands Gateway 2 development. They also eliminate forecast mainline congestion on the M1 northbound mainline on the approach to Junction 24 (without the planned growth[1]) and remove substantial traffic from Finger Farm Roundabout and the A453, enabling additional capacity to accommodate the traffic arising from the proposed development. Without these works being implemented, safety and congestion concerns will persist on the M1 Mainline and at Junction 24, which can be expected to act as a constraint on future development.

4.3 The mitigation included in the DCO in respect of Works Nos. 8 - 12 addresses forecast capacity constraints on the western side of Junction 24 and can be augmented by interventions on the eastern side of the junction, which will be required to enable further development to be brought forward, to form a strategic solution for the entire junction. Its early delivery as part of the DCO Scheme, provided such delivery is secured, will be beneficial to the future operation of the SRN and can be expected to

[1] In a previous version the words in parenthesis were "planned growth/development" however this was incorrect since the forecasting referred to includes the development proposed in the DCO.

enable the junction – in conjunction with improvements to the eastern side of the gyratory - to accommodate transformational growth in the region.

5. Conclusion

5.1 National Highways has been working with the DCO Applicant to discuss the detail of the highway works proposed as part of the DCO (including the M1 Northbound to the A50 Westbound link) and is satisfied, subject to the approval of a small number of departures from standard, that the scheme would deliver the mitigation required, including resolving safety and congestion issues apparent in the baseline, and could in due course form part of a wider strategic solution for the junction. National Highways is therefore supportive of the proposals.