East Midlands Gateway
Phase 2 (EMG2)

Document DCO 8.3E/MCO 8.3E

Statement of Common Ground between the Applicants and North West Leicestershire District Council (relating to Noise and Vibration)

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 is prepared jointly by the applicant and another party.

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 applications for a DCO and a Material Change Order ("MCO") for the scheme known as East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 ("EMG2" or "the Scheme") comprising:

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); 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 Panel in examining the applications for the DCO and MCO by providing an understanding of the status of discussions or negotiations between the Applicants and another party.

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) 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 Applicants") and (2) North West Leicestershire District Council ("NWLDC").

2.2 NWLDC enters into this SoCG in its capacity as Local Planning Authority.

2.3 A record of the engagement between the Applicant and NWLDC in relation to noise and vibration is set out in the Appendix to this SoCG.

3 Structure of this SoCG

3.1 This SoCG has been structured with two clearly defined sections. The first section considers matters relevant to the DCO and the second section considers matters relevant to the MCO. Where a particular matter is common to both the DCO and the MCO this is clearly stated and recorded in both sections.

3.2 The areas covered by this SoCG are as follows:

3.2.1 The locations where baseline noise monitoring has been undertaken.

3.2.2 The results of the baseline noise monitoring as undertaken.

3.2.3 The outcome of the determination of representative background sound levels ($L_{A90,T}$) at the sensitive receptor locations as derived from the baseline noise monitoring as undertaken.

3.2.4 The sources of noise and vibration that have been included in the scope of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application, and those that have been scoped out of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application.

3.2.5 The selection/extent of sensitive receptors identified for inclusion in the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application.

3.2.6 The noise and vibration prediction methodologies adopted for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application.

3.2.7 The results of the noise and vibration predictions undertaken for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application.

3.2.8 The thresholds identified to assess whether adverse effects or significant adverse effects are predicted (referred to as the lowest observed adverse effect level, or LOAEL, and significant observed adverse effect level, or SOAEL, respectively) from the identified sources of noise and vibration at the identified sensitive receptors.

3.2.9 The conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application regarding the predicted noise and vibration effects, the proposed mitigation measures, and the overall conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application.

3.3 This SoCG records those matters which are agreed and, if appropriate, any matters that are not agreed and still under discussion between the Applicants and NWLDC in relation to noise and vibration.

3.4 Where this SoCG is identified as a draft, some matters may still be under discussion. If appropriate, a final version that confirms the final positions of the parties on relevant matters will be submitted before the close of the Examination.

3.5 Within the following tables a Red Amber Green ("RAG") status has been applied as follows:

(a) green indicates a matter agreed;

(b) amber indicates a matter that is under discussion and/or further work is being completed; and

(c) red indicates a matter not agreed.

4 DCO

Reference Number	Matter	Application Document	Applicants' Position	Interested Party's Position	Status	Date
Noise and Vibration						
4.1	Baseline Noise Monitoring Locations	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.5, Paragraphs 7.5.3 – 7.5.10, Table 7.14, Table 7.15 (Reference. REP3-010) Appendix 7E: Monitoring Plan (Reference APP-094)	The locations where baseline noise monitoring has been undertaken are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	The locations where baseline noise monitoring has been undertaken are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.2	Baseline Noise Monitoring Results	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.5 (Reference. REP3-010)	The results of the baseline noise monitoring as undertaken are representative of the sound environment where the monitoring was undertaken and are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	The results of the baseline noise monitoring as undertaken are representative of the sound environment where the monitoring was undertaken and are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.3	Representative Background Sound Levels	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.5 (Reference. REP3-010)	The representative background sound levels ($L_{A90,T}$) at the sensitive receptor locations have been robustly derived from the baseline noise monitoring undertaken.	The representative background sound levels ($L_{A90,T}$) at the sensitive receptor locations have been robustly derived from the baseline noise monitoring undertaken.	Agreed	07/04/2026

4.4	Scope of Assessment	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010)	The sources of noise and vibration that have been included in the scope of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES, and those that have been scoped out, is appropriate and proportionate.	The sources of noise and vibration that have been included in the scope of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES, and those that have been scoped out, is appropriate and proportionate.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.5	Sensitive Receptors	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010) ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Appendix 7D (Reference. REP3-032)	The selection/extent of sensitive receptors identified for inclusion in the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES is appropriate and representative.	The selection/extent of sensitive receptors identified for inclusion in the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES is appropriate and representative.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.6	Prediction Methodologies	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010)	The noise and vibration prediction methodologies adopted for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application is appropriate.	The noise and vibration prediction methodologies adopted for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application is appropriate.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.7	Prediction Results	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010)	The results of the noise and vibration predictions undertaken for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application and are agreed.	The results of the noise and vibration predictions undertaken for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application and are agreed.	Agreed	07/04/2026

4.8	Significance Thresholds	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010)	The thresholds identified to assess whether adverse effects or significant adverse effects are predicted (referred to as the lowest observed adverse effect level, or LOAEL, and significant observed adverse effect level, or SOAEL, respectively) from the identified sources of noise and vibration at the identified sensitive receptors are appropriate.	The thresholds identified to assess whether adverse effects or significant adverse effects are predicted (referred to as the lowest observed adverse effect level, or LOAEL, and significant observed adverse effect level, or SOAEL, respectively) from the identified sources of noise and vibration at the identified sensitive receptors are appropriate.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.9	Assessment Conclusions	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Sections 7.5 to 7.9 (Reference. REP3-010)	The conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 regarding the predicted noise and vibration effects, the proposed mitigation measures, and the overall conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 are robust.	The conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 regarding the predicted noise and vibration effects, the proposed mitigation measures, and the overall conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 are robust.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.10	DCO Noise Requirements	dDCO (Reference REP2-008D)	The proposed DCO requirements relating to noise and vibration during both the construction and operational phases cover the necessary elements and have suitable wording.	The proposed DCO requirements relating to noise and vibration during both the construction and operational phases cover the necessary elements and have suitable wording.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.11	Matters of Disagreement	n/a	There are no matters of disagreement between the Applicants and NWLDC.	There are no matters of disagreement between the Applicants and NWLDC.	Agreed	07/04/2026
4.12	Matters Under Discussion – PRTM 2023 Considerations	n/a	Following the submission at Deadline 1 of the NWLDC Local Impact Report ("LIR") (Ref. REP1-103/REP1-104/REP1-105) a technical note was submitted to NWLDC on 28th April 2026 (provided at Appendix 2) which	NWLDC has acknowledged the findings of the note. Notwithstanding this, NWLDC await confirmation from Leicestershire County Council ("LCC") and National	Under Discussion	16/06/2026

			provides an analysis of the potential changes that might occur when using data produced by PRTM 2023 in terms of the noise assessment included as part of the EIA. The technical note concludes that while there may be some minor differences between the predicted road traffic noise levels calculated using data produced by EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023, these are not expected to alter the conclusions as presented in Chapter 7 of the ES at the key receptor locations and therefore no updates to the assessment are required.	Highways ("NH") that the updated transport modelling has been completed and that the outcomes of such transport modelling do not alter the conclusions of the Noise and Vibration Assessment undertaken. This would be necessary before NWDLC could confirm acceptance of the conclusions presented in Chapter 7 of the ES and the technical note.		

5 MCO

Reference Number	Matter	Application Document	Applicants' Position	Interested Party's Position	Status	Date
Noise and Vibration						
5.1	Baseline Noise Monitoring Locations	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010) Appendix 7: Monitoring Plan (Reference APP-094)	The locations where baseline noise monitoring has been undertaken are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	The locations where baseline noise monitoring has been undertaken are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.2	Baseline Noise Monitoring Results	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010)	The results of the baseline noise monitoring as undertaken are representative of the sound environment where the monitoring was undertaken and are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	The results of the baseline noise monitoring as undertaken are representative of the sound environment where the monitoring was undertaken and are appropriate for the purposes of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.3	Representative Background Sound Levels	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.6 (Reference. REP3-010)	The representative background sound levels ($L_{A90,T}$) at the sensitive receptor locations have been robustly derived from the baseline noise monitoring undertaken.	The representative background sound levels ($L_{A90,T}$) at the sensitive receptor locations have been robustly derived from the baseline noise monitoring undertaken.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.4	Scope of Assessment	ES Chapter 7: Noise and	The sources of noise and vibration that have been included in the scope of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES, and those that	The sources of noise and vibration that have been included in the scope of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES, and those that have been	Agreed	07/04/2026

		Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010)	have been scoped out, is appropriate and proportionate.	scoped out, is appropriate and proportionate.		
5.5	Sensitive Receptors	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010) ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Appendix 7D (Reference. REP3-032)	The selection/extent of sensitive receptors identified for inclusion in the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES is appropriate and representative.	The selection/extent of sensitive receptors identified for inclusion in the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES is appropriate and representative.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.6	Prediction Methodologies	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 (Reference. REP3-010)	The noise and vibration prediction methodologies adopted for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES is appropriate.	The noise and vibration prediction methodologies adopted for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES is appropriate.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.7	Prediction Results	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.6 (Reference. REP3-010)	The results of the noise and vibration predictions undertaken for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES are agreed.	The results of the noise and vibration predictions undertaken for the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES are agreed.	Agreed	07/04/2026

5.8	Significance Thresholds	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Section 7.2 and 7.6 (Reference. REP3-010)	The thresholds identified to assess whether adverse effects or significant adverse effects are predicted (referred to as the lowest observed adverse effect level, or LOAEL, and significant observed adverse effect level, or SOAEL, respectively) from the identified sources of noise and vibration at the identified sensitive receptors are appropriate.	The thresholds identified to assess whether adverse effects or significant adverse effects are predicted (referred to as the lowest observed adverse effect level, or LOAEL, and significant observed adverse effect level, or SOAEL, respectively) from the identified sources of noise and vibration at the identified sensitive receptors are appropriate.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.9	Assessment Conclusions	ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, Sections 7.6 - 7.9 (Reference. REP3-010)	The conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES regarding the predicted noise and vibration effects, the proposed mitigation measures, and the overall conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES that accompanies the DCO application are robust.	The conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES regarding the predicted noise and vibration effects, the proposed mitigation measures, and the overall conclusions of the assessment included in Chapter 7 of the ES are robust.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.10	Matters of Disagreement	n/a	There are no matters of disagreement between the Applicants and NWLDC.	There are no matters of disagreement between the Applicants and NWLDC.	Agreed	07/04/2026
5.11	Matters Under Discussion	n/a	There are no matters still under discussion between the Applicants and NWLDC.	There are no matters still under discussion between the Applicants and NWLDC.	Agreed	07/04/2026

6 Conclusions

6.1 The Applicants and NWLDC confirm that all noise and vibration matters under discussion in relation to the Scheme have been agreed or are awaiting approval as recorded in the tables in sections 4 and 5 above.

SIGNATURES:

On behalf of the Applicants:

…….
Signature

…….
Name

…….
Position

On behalf of North West Leicestershire District Council:

…….
Signature

…….
Name

…….
Position

APPENDIX 1

RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

Date	**Form of engagement**	**Summary of matters dealt with**
26/04/2022	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Provided details of the proposed receptors and representative noise monitoring locations around the EMG2 Main Site that would inform the assessment (note that at this time, the Scheme was limited to the works taking place at the EMG2 Main Site).
06/05/2022	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmed that the information had been reviewed and that the proposed approach to the noise survey was acceptable (note that at this time, the Scheme was limited to the works taking place at the EMG2 Main Site).
05/2022	Noise and vibration section of Scoping Report produced by Applicant (original scheme)	Provided overview of proposed scope and methodology, including proposed baseline survey and receptor selection (note that at this time, the Scheme was limited to the works taking place at the EMG2 Main Site).
04/10/2022	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Queried whether there were any comments on the scoping report (note that at this time, the Scheme was limited to the works taking place at the EMG2 Main Site).
18/11/2022	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmed satisfied with the content of the scoping report (note that at this time, the Scheme was limited to the works taking place at the EMG2 Main Site).

02/12/2022	NWLDC comments included in Scoping Opinion (original scheme)	Confirmed that the contents of the scoping report, including the noise monitoring and receptor locations, were acceptable (note that at this time, the Scheme was limited to the works taking place at the EMG2 Main Site).
08/2024	Noise and vibration section of Scoping Report produced by Applicant (revised scheme)	Provided overview of proposed scope and methodology, baseline conditions, potential impacts, avoidance and mitigation measures, and anticipated residual effects
24/09/2024	NWLDC comments included in Scoping Opinion (revised scheme)	Confirmed that the approach proposed in the Scoping Report, including the noise monitoring and receptor plans, was acceptable.
01/11/2024	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Provided updated details of proposed receptors and representative noise monitoring locations around the Scheme that would inform the assessment. Also provided brief overview of the proposed scope of the assessment.
21/11/2024	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmed that the selection of receptors, monitoring approach and proposed locations, and elements to be considered within the assessment were all satisfactory.
03/02/2025	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmed that statutory consultation was taking place between 3rd February 2025 and Monday 17th March 2025 and provided link to consultation materials.

21/02/2025	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmed receipt of email and that contact would be made if there were any queries.
09/03/2025	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Requested any comments on draft materials provided for statutory consultation, as well as structure of draft ES chapter in the context of it providing a basis for a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) to be agreed.
14/03/2025	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmation that there are no comments at this preliminary stage, and that details provided for noise and vibration were satisfactory. Also confirmed that ES structure was acceptable.
05/05/2025	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Requested any comments on draft Statement of Common Ground, noting that the prediction and assessment of road traffic noise had not been completed at this stage.
23/05/2025	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmation of being happy with the draft Statement of Common Ground.
14/12/2025	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Requested any comments on updated Statement of Common Ground, following completion of noise and vibration predictions and assessment.

16/01/2026	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Requested confirmation that electric hook-up facilities for HGVs fitted with chiller units would be used.
16/01/2026	Email **from** Adam Mellor, Principal Planning Officer, NWLDC	Commented that the NWLDC Relevant Representation stated that the council had some issues with the proposed wording of the DCO requirements relating to the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), and noise during the operational phase.
03/03/2026	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC, **and** Adam Mellor, Principal Planning Officer, NWLDC	Suggested arranging a meeting to discuss the DCO requirement relating to noise during the operational phase, and provided some context on the proposed wording, i.e., that it mirrored the strategy used in terms of the EMG1 DCO requirement for operational noise and that this approach was agreed with NWLDC in August 2018.
11/03/2026	Email **to** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC, **and** Adam Mellor, Principal Planning Officer, NWLDC	Followed up on arranging a meeting as proposed in previous email. Also provided suggested text for a DCO requirement relating to the monitoring of complaints.
27/03/2026	Email **from** Anisa Badani, Environmental Health Practitioner, NWLDC	Confirmed as being satisfied with the proposed wording for the DCO requirement relating to the monitoring of complaints. Stated that they were looking in the proposed wording for the DCO requirement relating to noise during the operational phase.

February to June 2026	Examination	Discussion has continued during the examination by way of the ExP Questions, hearing sessions and responses to reach an agreement on all technical aspects.

Appendix 2 - Technical Note following additional traffic modelling

VANGUARDIA

A BURO HAPPOLD COMPANY

Project Note

Project	East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
Subject	NWLDC Relevant Representation: PRTM 2023 Traffic Modelling and Noise & Air Quality Assessments
Project no	0062108-0820
Date	23 April 2026

Revision	Description	Issued by	Date	Approved
02	Incorporating transport comments	CG	23/04/26	AT

1 Introduction

The North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) Relevant Representation (RR) for the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2) project was issued on 9th January 2026. In the section providing comments on the noise and vibration assessment that was submitted as part of the EMG2 Development Consent Order (DCO) application, the RR includes the following paragraph:

> *Notwithstanding the above, it is understood that further transport modelling is being undertaken in accordance with Leicestershire County Council's 2023 Pan Regional Transport Model (PRTM) to account for a post-Covid highway situation and such further modelling may therefore require the relevant noise and vibration assessments to be updated. The above position is therefore reserved depending on the relevant conclusions which arise from such modelling work.*

A similar paragraph is included in the section of the RR providing comments on the air quality (AQ) assessment submitted with the EMG2 DCO application, stating:

> *Notwithstanding the above, it is understood that further transport modelling is being undertaken in accordance with Leicestershire County Council's 2023 Pan Regional Transport Model (PRTM) to account for a post-Covid highway situation and such further modelling may therefore require the air quality assessment to be updated. The above position is therefore reserved depending on the relevant conclusions which arise from such modelling work.*

Both the noise and AQ assessments of the corresponding impacts of changes in road traffic flows as a result of the EMG2 Project were based on traffic data provided by the project's transport consultant. This data was based on the core modelling outputs of Leicestershire County Council's 2019 East Midlands Freeport Model (EMFM), which is a cordoned part of the larger Pan Regional Transport Model (PRTM). The EMFM had a base year of 2019.

Following the production of the traffic data and the completion of the related noise and AQ assessments associated with the EMG2 DCO application, the larger PRTM model was updated with a base year of 2023. Following a request by the local highway authority, Leicestershire County

Council (LCC), the project's transport consultant has considered the changes that may occur from use of data produced by PRTM 2023 when compared to that produced by EMFM 2019 in terms of transport. It should be noted that this is considered to be a sensitivity test and does not replace the assessment produced for the EMG2 DCO application environmental impact assessment (EIA), based on the EMFM 2019 data.

This note provides an analysis of the potential changes that might occur when using data produced by PRTM 2023 in terms of the noise and AQ assessments included as part of the EIA.

2 Noise

Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [AS-035] included predictions and assessment of the changes in road traffic noise associated with the EMG2 Project. The predictions were based on traffic flow data using the annual average weekday traffic (AAWT) metric as used by the relevant UK methodology, CRTN[1], for the hours of 06:00-00:00 and 23:00-07:00 representing the day and night-time periods, respectively.

PRTM and EMFM both produce traffic flow data for the typical morning (AM) and evening (PM) peak one-hour periods, from which AAWT data can be derived. However, for the purpose of the transport PRTM 2023 sensitivity test, only AM and PM peak hour data incorporating operational traffic from EMG2 has been produced.

Following discussions with the project transport consultant, it is considered that a robust evaluation of the potential changes that may occur with respect to changes in operational road traffic noise can be undertaken by comparing the peak hour data as produced by EMFM 2019 (i.e., the basis of the data used for the assessment as submitted) and the peak hour data produced by PRTM 2023, as used for the transport sensitivity test. This is because both models apply a generic factor to scale the peak hour data to produce AAWT data (and AADT data, as used for AQ), and therefore any changes in peak hour flows should also be reflected in any changes in AAWT/AADT flows.

On this basis, the following has been undertaken:

- The individual road links (i.e., sections of road) adjacent to the key road traffic noise receptors have been identified. These are primarily around J24 of the M1 and in/around Diseworth;
- The AM and PM peak hour flows for these links have been extracted from the EMFM 2019 data and the PRTM 2023 data for the relevant operational scenarios (see Table 7.8 of the ES). Note that the versions of the scenarios that do not include the allocations from the Regulation 18 draft NWLDC local plan (see paragraph 7.2.22 of the ES) have not been produced using PRTM 2023 and therefore have not been considered;
- The 1-hour basic noise levels (BNL) for the AM and PM peak hour periods for both the EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023 datasets have been calculated for each selected road link using the methodology from CRTN;
- The differences between the do-minimum (without development) and do-something (with development) scenarios have been calculated for both the EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023 BNL results, which is a key element of the assessment process presented in Chapter 7 of the ES;
- The two sets of differences have been compared.

[1] Calculation of Road Traffic Noise, Department of Transport (1988)

Based on the comparison of the results from the selected road links, while there are some minor differences in terms of the predicted values, no differences are indicated in terms of predicted operational road traffic noise effects, i.e., there is only one result that indicates a potentially significant effect and it is present in both the EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023 comparisons: this is the section of the A453 adjacent to the Radisson Blu Hotel for the 2028 scenario only, which is discussed in paragraphs 7.5.34 to 7.5.35 of the ES.

On the basis of this comparison, it can be concluded that while there may be some minor differences between the predicted road traffic noise levels calculated using data produced by EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023, these are not expected to alter the conclusions as presented in Chapter 7 of the ES at the key receptor locations and therefore no updates to the assessment are required.

3 Air Quality

Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [AS-037] included predictions and assessment of the changes in air pollutant concentrations at sensitive receptors associated with traffic changes as a result of the EMG2 Project. The predictions were based on traffic flow data using the annual average daily traffic (AADT) metric as used by the relevant UK methodology.

PRTM and EMFM both produce traffic flow data for the typical morning (AM) and evening (PM) peak one-hour periods, from which AADT data can be derived. However, for the purpose of the transport PRTM 2023 sensitivity test, only AM and PM peak hour data incorporating operational traffic from EMG2 has been produced.

Generally, a similar methodology adopted in the noise and vibration has been used to understand potential differences between the EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023 datasets. Due to the quantity of road links included in the air quality assessments, it was not considered practical or necessary to compare all road links between the datasets. Since the only non-negligible impacts were observed within the Castle Donington Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), this area was identified as the primary area for comparison. Moreover, only one highway-link, "Bondgate", was deemed relevant to receptors in the Castle Donington AQMA.

On this basis, the following has been undertaken:

- The AM and PM peak hour flows for these links have been extracted from the EMFM 2019 data and the PRTM 2023 data for the relevant operational scenarios (see paragraph 8.2.57 of the ES). Note that the versions of the scenarios that do not include the allocations from the Regulation 18 draft NWLDC local plan have not been produced using PRTM 2023 and therefore have not been considered;
- From an air quality point of view, if a traffic flow reduces, the overall air pollutant concentration at nearby receptors will also reduce, therefore no re-modelling would be required to quantify this change as the impacts would be less and hence the original modelling exercise would represent a worst-case scenario;
- The differences between the do-minimum (without development) and do-something (with development) scenarios have been calculated for both the EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023, for the peak hours;
- The two sets of differences have been compared.

Based on the comparison between the peak hours for the EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023 datasets, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The overall quantity of traffic on "Bondgate" has reduced between the EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023 datasets;
- There is no increase in development trips on "Bondgate" predicted in the PRTM 2023 compared to the EMFM 2019;
- The conclusions drawn from the EMFM 2019 dataset are a worst-case assessment of impacts on "Bondgate" in the Castle Donington AQMA.

On the basis of this comparison, it can be concluded that while there may be some minor differences between the predicted air pollutant concentrations calculated using data produced by EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023, these are not expected to alter the conclusions as presented in Chapter 8 of the ES at the key receptor locations and therefore no updates to the assessment are required.