



Planning Inspectorate

Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000
Email:
for the DCO:
emgateway2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
for the MCO:
EMG1MaterialChange@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

The applicants

Your Ref:

Our Ref: DCO: BC0410001
MCO: TR0510002

Date: 19 June 2026

Dear Sir/ Madam

**The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – rule 17
Application by SEGRO Properties Limited, for an order granting development
consent for a scheme comprising the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2)**

**The Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent
Orders) Regulations 2011 – regulation 44
Application by SEGRO (EMG) Limited, for an order making material changes to the
previously approved East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange and Highway
Order 2016**

Request for further information

We are writing as the Examining Panel (ExP) appointed under the Planning Act 2008 to seek additional information to assist us in writing our report to the Secretary of State for Transport relating to the above two applications.

We are writing under rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 and regulation 44 of The Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011.

Background to the request

The ExP issued a rule 17/ regulation 44 letter [[PD-021](#)] on 2 June 2026. This requested that the Environmental Statement (ES) was updated to amend the baseline to include the joint application and assess the “delivery scenario” and “non-delivery scenario” and disaggregate the effects relating to Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (and its associated development) from those relating to Part 2 (and its associated development).

Without prejudice to other interested parties (IPs) comments on the applicants' rule 17/ regulation 44 response letter accepted at deadline 4, that might be forthcoming at deadline 5, and the ExP's consideration of any comments that might be submitted therein, the applicants' proposed approach to updating the ES would seem generally acceptable.

However, the ExP would like to make a few clarifying points to assist the applicants in updating the ES pursuant to the efficient and effective submission of evidence and to ensure there is sufficient substance to inform the ExP's recommendation to the Secretary of State.

The request

1. As a general point, whilst updating the ES in table form is a useful way of delivering information, the applicants must ensure that there is sufficiently detailed assessment within the tables to support any conclusions drawn and that it is not treated as a summary exercise. For instance, the ExP made several requests in previous rule 17/ regulation 44 letters [PD-019] and ExQ2 [PD-022] to improve the format and substance of documents, such as statements of common ground (SoCG) and the Examination Issues Tracker, and encourage the use of hyperlinks and precise cross referencing. Any updates to the ES in this instance should be carried out in the same vein.
2. In relation to appendix 4B and 4C of the applicants' letter, copies of the relevant chapters of the joint application's ES, and any other relevant evidence, should be submitted into the examination for reference.
3. Columns two and three of the tables in appendix 4B and 4C of the applicants' letter should provide more information about the residual likely significant effects of the joint application. For example, in relation to socio-economic effects arising from the completed development, the applicants should explain more about how the effect on the local labour force from operational employment was assessed and why the significance of the effect was found to be moderate beneficial. Similarly, columns four and five should explain in sufficient detail the impact of the DCO scheme, including how and why the residual likely effects of the joint application might change.
4. In relation to the disaggregation table in the applicants' letter, it would be helpful to understand to what extent the disaggregated assessment might deviate from the original aggregated assessment in terms of significance of effect. For example, when considering socio-economic effects, does a disaggregated assessment of part 1 (and associated development) and part 2 (and associated development) of the dDCO ultimately result in different significance of effects compared to the existing aggregated assessment.
5. In relation to the disaggregation table in the applicants' letter the applicants should consider whether updated appendices need to be provided to support the disaggregated assessment. For example, the modelling data is currently aggregated, and presumably this would be disaggregated in order to undertake the required assessment of part 1 (and associated development) and part 2 (and associated development) of the dDCO. Consequently, this should be provided where it is fundamental to the ExP's understanding of the disaggregated assessment.

6. The legend of the plan showing the highways nationally significant infrastructure project (NSIP) and the commercial and business development within the applicants' letter identifies works no. 16 under both the highways NSIP and the commercial and business development, whereas presumably it should just be identified under the former as per the disaggregation table. Please ensure this is updated accordingly.
7. The applicants should review their case for compulsory acquisition in light of the updates to the ES and, particularly, consider any implications regarding their approach to the compelling case in the public interest test, updating their Statement of Reasons as appropriate. For example, the question of whether the non-delivery and delivery scenarios would change the public interest benefits or the balance of the compelling case in the public interest test is something that the applicants should explicitly address.

As previously set out in our rule 17/ regulation 44 letter [\[PD-021\]](#) updates to the ES, and any other interrelated actions relating to the case for compulsory acquisition, should be submitted at **Deadline 5, 30 June 2026**.

Change request

The applicants' covering letter submitted at deadline 4 addresses changes in relation to public rights of way, works no.14 active travel link (ATL) and works no.15 A453 EMA junction crossing. The ExP has not made a decision at this stage as to whether to accept any such changes. Please can the applicants review the guidance within [Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Changes to an application after it has been accepted for examination](#) and follow the change notification process, collating and summarising all relevant information in accordance with that guidance.

Yours faithfully

Robert Jackson

Robert Jackson
Lead member of the panel of Examining Inspectors

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our ['Privacy Notice'](#) before sending information to The Planning Inspectorate.