

East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2)

Document DCO 6.4B/MCO 6.4B

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Technical Appendices

Appendix 4B

Non Delivery Scenario

June 2026

04

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](https://www.segro.com/slpemg2)

SEGRO

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

**APPENDIX 4B – NON DELIVERY SCENARIO
(DOCUMENT DCO 6.4B/MCO 6.4B)**

Version	Date	Status of Version
0	June 2026	Deadline 5

APPENDIX 4B – Non Delivery Scenario

This appendix provides an assessment of the impacts of the non-delivery of the DCO scheme on a future baseline that the Examining Panel (ExP) consider might otherwise emerge as a result of development proposed by the Joint Application, should it be consented (i.e. assuming the DCO scheme is authorised but not delivered and its authorisation ‘sterilises’ and prevents delivery of the Joint Application and on the assumption that the Joint Application is approved).

It is considered that there is a high probability that the DCO scheme will be implemented if approved based on the track record of the Applicant and the investment already made. Accordingly, the probability of the effects of any non-delivery occurring is considered to be very low, as set out in the table below (marked with an *).

The land concerned is part of an emerging local plan allocation and any sterilisation effect would cease after the expiry of Compulsory Acquisition powers. All effects are therefore considered to be temporary as highlighted below (**).

The table below reports the findings of the Joint Application ES and specifically the likely significant effects identified at Section 16.3.1 of Chapter 16 for both the construction and completed development stages. It refers to a number of chapters and associated appendices submitted as part of the Joint Application ES. As requested, these documents have been provided by the Applicant to the ExP as a separate enclosure comprising:

- ES, Volume II, Chapter 7: Socio-Economics (October 2025)
- ES, Volume II, Chapter 8: Transport and Access (Addendum) (May 2026)
- ES, Volume II, Chapter 13: Built Heritage and Archaeology (October 2025)
- ES, Volume II, Chapter 16: Summary of Mitigation & Residual Effects (Addendum) (May 2026)
- ES, Volume III: Landscape & Visual impact Assessment (October 2025)
- ES, Volume III: Landscape & Visual impact Assessment – Appendices (October 2025)

With regard to the landscape and visual effects outlined below, it should be noted that in accordance with ES Volume III of the Joint Application, where moderate environmental effects have been identified, these can be either ‘significant’ or ‘not significant’ based on professional judgement and this is clearly stated below as per Chapter 13 of the Joint Application ES. The likely environmental effects are considered during construction, at completion, and after 15 years (residual effect). All effects listed at Section 16.3.1 are reported in the table below.

Table 4B.1: Assessment of Non-Delivery Scenario

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/ Temporary**
Construction						
Socio Economic						
Socio Economic 1	<p>Effects on Local and Regional Economic Activity – Construction GVA</p> <p>As detailed at Table 7.6.1 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application, the assessment is based on the Joint Applicant’s estimated construction costs for the minimum land use quantum scenario, which totals £174 million.</p> <p>The assessment estimates that the construction phase will support 94No. gross FTE construction employment opportunities annually or circa 186No. full-time construction opportunities over the course of the 33-month (2.75 years) construction programme.</p> <p>In the absence of GVA per filled job data for the construction sector in North West Leicestershire, the North West Leicestershire GVA per filled job of £64,728 (2023 value of £61,816 based on 2023 data, adjusted to 2025 values using GDP deflators) has been used to derive the estimated GVA arising from the gross construction costs based on the estimated number of FTE positions supported during the construction period.</p> <p>Based on the estimated gross direct construction employment, the estimated temporary gross construction GVA is circa £120 million during the course of the construction programme.</p> <p>Note – the DCO Applicant assumes that the £120m figures has been included in error. Based on the assumptions set out at Chapter 7 of the Joint Application ES, the figure would be</p>	<p>Moderate Beneficial (significant)</p> <p>Assessment of significance is based on criteria for sensitivity of receptor and impact magnitude defined at Table 7.2.2 and Table 7.2.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptor: NWL which is considered to be of medium sensitivity • Magnitude of impact: medium as change in GVA p.a. of between £25 – 50m 	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use.</p> <p>Section 7.3 of Chapter 7 of the Joint Application ES estimates that the economic benefits associated with the site’s agricultural land use comprises the production of small volumes (up to 90 tonnes) of arable crops, generating a gross margin of up to £10,000 per annum. These benefits are assessed to be small and set within the context of the UK being largely self-sufficient in grains, which are also grown for export.</p> <p>The significant effects on local and regional economic activity in terms of construction GVA identified within Chapter 7 of the Joint Application ES which would have arisen as a result of the Joint Application are not realised.</p>	<p>Adverse</p> <p>The moderate beneficial impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be adverse, but only for a temporary period.</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**																		
	£12m per annum or around £33.1m for the 33 month construction period.																							
Socio Economic 2	<p>Regional Labour Force – construction employment</p> <p>Table 7.6.1.1 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application provides an Additionality Assessment for annual construction employment over the construction duration. The table is replicated below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Additionality Steps</th> <th>Additionality Application</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gross direct construction employment</td> <td>186</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subtract deadweight (existing 5No. FTE supported by the existing agricultural business)</td> <td>181</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated leakage (25%)</td> <td>-45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gross direct construction employment to target area</td> <td>136</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less displacement (25%)</td> <td>-34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net direct construction employment to target area</td> <td>102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plus multiplier effects (1.5)</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net construction employment to target area</td> <td>153</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The assessment concludes that the proposed development would support the equivalent of 153No. FTE net temporary construction jobs at the regional level throughout the duration of the construction period, or broadly equivalent to 77No. per year.</p>	Additionality Steps	Additionality Application	Gross direct construction employment	186	Subtract deadweight (existing 5No. FTE supported by the existing agricultural business)	181	Estimated leakage (25%)	-45	Gross direct construction employment to target area	136	Less displacement (25%)	-34	Net direct construction employment to target area	102	Plus multiplier effects (1.5)	51	Net construction employment to target area	153	<p>Moderate Beneficial (significant)</p> <p>Assessment of significance is based on criteria for sensitivity of receptor and impact magnitude defined at Table 7.2.2 and Table 7.2.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receptor: regional construction labour market which is considered to be of medium sensitivity Magnitude of impact: medium as between 100 and 1,000 net FTE employment opportunities are generated 	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use.</p> <p>No construction jobs are provided on the site and the indirect and induced economic benefits arising from construction projects of this nature are lost.</p>	<p>Adverse</p> <p>The moderate beneficial impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be adverse, but only for a temporary period.</p>	Very low	Temporary
Additionality Steps	Additionality Application																							
Gross direct construction employment	186																							
Subtract deadweight (existing 5No. FTE supported by the existing agricultural business)	181																							
Estimated leakage (25%)	-45																							
Gross direct construction employment to target area	136																							
Less displacement (25%)	-34																							
Net direct construction employment to target area	102																							
Plus multiplier effects (1.5)	51																							
Net construction employment to target area	153																							
Transport																								
Transport 1	Pedestrian Delay	Major Adverse (significant)	There is no need to temporary divert footpath L45.	Beneficial	Very low	Temporary																		

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>Section 8.3.1 of ES Chapter 8 of the Joint Application notes that PRow Footpath L45 passes through the northeastern part of the application site, providing pedestrian connectivity between the village of Diseworth and the A453 near Finger Farm roundabout. From Diseworth, Footpath L45 follows the route of Hyam’s Lane.</p> <p>Footpath L45 will be temporarily closed during the construction phase with no diversion route to be provided as there are no viable alternative routes.</p> <p>The temporary closure of Footpath L45 will cause an increase in journey lengths as people divert to an alternate route.</p>	<p>Assessment of significance is based on criteria for sensitivity of receptor and impact magnitude defined at Table 8.2.4 and Table 8.2.9 of Chapter 8 of the Joint Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptor: users of footpath L45 which are considered to be of low sensitivity • Magnitude of impact: high as there will be a large increase (>500m) in journey length 	<p>Footpath L45 remains open to users of this PRow who continue to use the route as currently.</p>	<p>The major adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.</p>		
Archaeology						
Archaeology 1	<p>Effects on local non-designated archaeological deposits</p> <p>At Section 13.3.1 of ES Chapter 13 of the Joint Application, it is noted that a geophysical survey was undertaken which identified possible enclosures and other linear and curvilinear features of possible Iron Age or Roman origin. Agricultural features, including ploughing trends and former field boundaries, were also recorded. The geophysical survey was followed by a programme of trial trenching which indicated that the anomalies recorded on the geophysical survey related to Iron Age and Roman activity.</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 concludes that the construction of the proposed development will result in the complete removal of these archaeological remains.</p>	<p>Minor (not significant) to Moderate Adverse (significant)</p> <p>Assessment of significance is based on criteria for sensitivity of receptor and impact magnitude defined at Table 13.2.3 and Table 13.2.4 of ES Chapter 13 of the Joint Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptor: previously unrecorded archaeological deposits of low-medium sensitivity • Magnitude of impact: removal of archaeological deposits resulting in a medium to high magnitude of impact 	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use.</p> <p>There is no effect on archaeological deposit.</p>	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
		The impact significance is given as a range at Table 13.4.1, but it is not clear which archaeological deposits will result in a minor adverse effect and which lead to a moderate adverse effect.				
Landscape and Visual						
Landscape & Visual	<p>Landscape and Visual Impacts</p> <p>Section 1.6.1 of ES Volume 3 of the Joint Application states that the construction works are likely to give rise to some landscape and visual effects. These effects would however be temporary and would mainly arise through the excavation and re-profiling of the site to form plateaus and the installation of the building frames.</p> <p>These effects would be localised in extent and of short duration and therefore subservient to the main longer-term effects which would arise during the operational phase of the proposed development. Effects would therefore range from Negligible to those identified for the completed development set out below.</p>	Effects are considered further under ‘Completed development’	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Completed Development						
Socio-Economic						
Socio-Economic 3	<p>Effect on local labour force from operational employment</p> <p>Table 7.6.2.1 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application sets out the Joint Applicants’ assessment of the number of direct jobs that will be created by the proposed development.</p> <p>It has been assumed that between 115,556 sq.m. to 135,000 sq.m. of employment floorspace including 20% B2 will be delivered at the site.</p>	<p>Moderate Beneficial (significant)</p> <p>Assessment of significance is based on criteria for sensitivity of receptor and impact magnitude defined at Table 7.2.2 and Table 7.2.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application:</p>	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use.</p> <p>As set out at Section 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application, circa 5No. full-time equivalent employees are currently supported by the existing agricultural use.</p>	Adverse The moderate beneficial impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be adverse, but	Very low	Temporary

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>The following employment densities have been applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2 (industrial): 36 sq.m. per FTE job • B8 (warehousing): 97 sq.m. per FTE job <p>Based on these assumptions, the proposed development would generate between 1,643 and 1,919 FTE jobs.</p> <p>Table 7.6.2.2 provides an assessment of the potential additional (indirect and induced) employment generated by the proposed development at the local level.</p> <p>Accounting for the positive multiplier effects (1.1) and discounting for potential leakage (50%) and displacement (25%) effects results in an additional 676 to 790 job at the local level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptor: local labour force which is considered to be of medium sensitivity • Magnitude of impact: medium 	<p>The agricultural business will continue to operate and support these agricultural jobs, but the significant number of new job opportunities (estimated at between 1,643 and 1,919 FTE jobs from the Joint Application) will not be delivered.</p>	<p>only for a temporary period.</p>		
Socio-Economic 4	<p>Effects on local and regional economic activity – GVA</p> <p>As detailed at Table 7.6.1 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application, the assessment is based on the estimated <u>gross</u> direct employment associated with the minimum land use quantum scenario, which totals 1,643No. FTE.</p> <p>In the absence of GVA per filled job data for the manufacturing / transport and storage sectors in North West Leicestershire, the North West Leicestershire GVA per filled job of £64,728 (2023 value of £61,816 based on 2023 data, adjusted to 2025 values using GDP deflators) has been used to derive the estimated annual GVA contribution arising from the gross direct employment opportunities.</p> <p>The annual gross contribution to GVA from operational employment is estimated at approximately £106m per annum.</p>	<p>Major-Moderate Beneficial (significant)</p> <p>Assessment of significance is based on criteria for sensitivity of receptor and impact magnitude defined at Table 7.2.2 and Table 7.2.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptor: East Midlands which is considered to be of medium sensitivity • Magnitude of impact: large as change in GVA p.a. is over £50m 	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use.</p> <p>Section 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application ES estimates that the economic benefits associated with the site’s agricultural land use comprises the production of small volumes (up to 90 tonnes) of arable crops, generating a gross margin of up to £10,000 per annum. These benefits are assessed to be small and set within the context of the UK being largely self-sufficient in grains, which are also grown for export.</p> <p>The estimated annual gross contribution to GVA from</p>	<p>Adverse</p> <p>The major-moderate beneficial impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be adverse, but only for a temporary period.</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
			operational employment that could have been generated by the commercial uses on the site will be temporarily lost.			
Socio-Economic 5	<p>Effects on regional labour force from operational employment</p> <p>Table 7.6.2.1 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application sets out the Joint Applicants’ assessment of the number of direct jobs that will be created by the proposed development.</p> <p>It has been assumed that between 115,556 sq.m. to 135,000 sq.m. of employment floorspace including 20% B2 will be delivered at the site.</p> <p>The following employment densities have been applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2 (industrial): 36 sq.m. per FTE job • B8 (warehousing): 97 sq.m. per FTE job <p>Based on these assumptions, the proposed development would generate between 1,643 and 1,919 FTE jobs.</p> <p>Table 7.6.2.3 provides an assessment of the potential additional (indirect and induced) employment generated by the proposed development at the regional level.</p> <p>Accounting for the positive multiplier effects (1.5) and discounting for potential leakage (10%) and displacement (25%) effects results in an additional 1,658-1,938 job at the regional level.</p>	<p>Major-Moderate Beneficial (significant)</p> <p>Assessment of significance is based on criteria for sensitivity of receptor and impact magnitude defined at Table 7.2.2 and Table 7.2.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptor: regional labour force which is considered to be of medium sensitivity • Magnitude of impact: large as over 1,000 net FTE employment opportunities will be generated 	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use.</p> <p>As set out at Section 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 of the Joint Application, circa 5No. full-time equivalent employees are currently supported by the existing agricultural use.</p> <p>The agricultural business will continue to operate and support these agricultural jobs. However, the multiplier effects of significant new employment generation will be lost and the significant number of off-site jobs (estimated at between 1,658 and 1,938 FTE jobs) that would have been supported will not be realised.</p>	<p>Adverse</p> <p>The major-moderate beneficial impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be adverse, but only for a temporary period.</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>
Landscape and Visual						
Landscape 1	<p>Landscape Effects on the fabric of the site</p> <p>Section 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application considers that the fields within the application boundary would be lost during construction with the gently sloping</p>	<p>Major Adverse (significant)</p> <p>Due to the nature of the proposed development and the direct change to the landscape</p>	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the fabric of the site with its</p>	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The major adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>landscape substantially reprofiled to form development plateaus to facilitate the development. The land use would permanently change from farmland to commercial development comprising warehouse buildings and associated infrastructure (estate road, car parks, service yards etc.) during the operational phase.</p> <p>While the exact design of any landscape buffers would be part of a future detailed reserved matter applications, for the purposes of this assessment, it can be assumed that the minimum landscape depths specified in the site parameters plan and strategic landscape plan, outside of the defined maximum developable area, would be retained and these would include substantial blocks of woodland planting to provide additional screening.</p>	of the application, the change would be transformative and would be expected to be major adverse.	agricultural character remaining unchanged.	of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.		
Landscape 2	<p>Landscape effects on the Langley Lowlands Character Area</p> <p>Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application concludes that overall large scale effects on the character area are confined to the site with the areas around the site maintaining connectivity to the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The introduction of the development results in Moderate scale effects confined to the area immediately around the site where the surrounding trunk road and airport infrastructure are less apparent. This area is bounded by the A42 to the east and south, and the A453 to the north. These medium scale effects are confined to areas with visibility of the proposed development and filter out to a small and then negligible level to the west where existing development at the western end of the airport would become more prominent in the view.</p>	<p>Moderate Adverse (significant) on completion reducing to Moderate/Minor (not significant) after 15 years</p> <p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, the Langley Lowlands Character Area is considered to be of medium/low sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be moderate resulting in a moderate adverse effects at completion reducing to moderate/minor after 15 years.</p>	The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the landscape baseline.	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.</p>	Very low	Temporary
Landscape 3	<p>Landscape effects on landscape setting of Diseworth Conservation Area</p>	<p>Moderate Adverse (significant) on completion reducing to Moderate/Minor</p>	The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the landscape baseline.	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The moderate adverse impact will</p>	Very low	Temporary

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>As noted at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, the LVIA chapter only considers the effect on the landscape setting of the conservation area with the heritage impacts assessed separately within the Heritage chapter of the ES.</p> <p>It concludes that the proposed development would have a limited effect on the setting of the conservation area with the immediate rural setting of the village retained. The proposed development would not be visible from within the core of the conservation area with the key areas where the setting would be influenced to the north-east of Clements Lane and within long views across to the village from the south. Where visible, views of the proposed development would be softened through the use of a muted colour palette and design principles such as the use of barrel-vaulted roofs and the avoidance of large unbroken facades. In addition, as the proposed mitigation planting around the boundary begins to mature, it will further reinforce the separation between the village and the proposed development.</p>	<p>Adverse (not significant) after 15 years</p> <p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, the landscape setting of the Diseworth Conservation Area is considered to be of medium sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be moderate resulting in a moderate adverse effects at completion reducing to moderate/minor after 15 years.</p>		not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.		
Visual 1	<p>Visual effects on receptors at Hyams Lane (Viewpoint 2, 20 & 21) (PROW L45/1)</p> <p>Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application considers that whilst views into the site would altered, with views towards the proposed development set within the landscape strategy for the site which includes a new community park. The primary direction of views along the Lane looks out to the south and west and as such would be largely maintained post-development. The PRoW also crosses the application site at the eastern end of the site with the route requiring diversion as part of the proposals (closure of PRoW during construction phase and permanent diversion route to be formalised at reserved matters stage once layout</p>	<p>Major Adverse on completion (significant) reducing to Moderate/Major Adverse (significant) after 15 years</p> <p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, the Hyams Lane receptor groups is considered to be of high/medium sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be substantial resulting in a major adverse effects at completion reducing</p>	The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the visual baseline.	Beneficial The major adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.	Very low	Temporary

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>detail is fixed). While the intention would be to maintain some sort of setting for the footpath, it is likely to have to follow internal access roads as it passes through the urban landscape of the proposed development.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the scale of change would be large, and the effects would occur along the majority of the route from the A453 down to Diseworth. However, views on the approach from the village would offer the greatest level of mitigation through the use of bunding and mitigation planting</p>	to moderate/major adverse after 15 years.				
Visual 2	<p>Visual effects on receptors from viewpoint 1 (A453)</p> <p>Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application considers that the visibility of the proposed development would be extensive for the 1.5km stretch adjacent to the northern boundary with occasional glimpsed views to the west of this for a further 1km. For the main stretch of visibility to the north of the application site, the road is street lit with views through vegetation to the existing development on the southern edge of the airport.</p> <p>The proposed development on the application site would be visible along the whole northern boundary, with existing vegetation providing a screen to lower level that would be reinforced with new planting to further enhance the screen as it matures. Upper parts of the proposed building would still be visible.</p> <p>This section of the A453 would change from one that runs around the edge of the airport to one that runs through development associated with it.</p>	<p>Major/Moderate Adverse on completion (significant) reducing to Moderate Adverse (significant) after 15 years</p> <p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, the A453 key route is considered to be of medium sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be substantial resulting in a major/moderate adverse effects at completion reducing to moderate adverse after 15 years.</p>	The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the visual baseline.	Beneficial The major/moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.	Very low	Temporary
Visual 3	<p>Visual effects on PRow to the north-east of Diseworth (Viewpoints 4 & 20)</p> <p>These two public rights of way lead from Clements Gate in the village up to Hyam’s Lane across farmland used for grazing</p>	<p>Major/Moderate Adverse (significant) on completion reducing to Moderate Adverse (significant) after 15 years</p>	The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the visual baseline.	Beneficial The major/moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore,	Very low	Temporary

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>and keeping horses. Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application considers that the south western corner of the development would be visible from here with the potential for views towards the development along the majority of the route. The proposed strategic landscape buffer is widest at this corner which would provide the opportunity for the provision of screening through a combination of the screening bunds / fencing and a wider band of mitigation planting.</p> <p>The proposals would break the skyline. Whilst both the airport and A453/A42 exert some influence over the visual amenity, this is limited due to mature screen planting and topography, with only glimpsed partial views. The effect of the proposals would therefore be that larger scale development becomes more prominent in the view. Despite this, the proposals sit separate from the edge of the village with the proposed buffer and existing topography providing an appropriate offset. The proposed planting would also provide an increasingly effective screen to lower parts of the development with the selection of a muted, neutral colour palette with warm tones and avoidance of large unbroken facades aiding in softening the appearance of the proposed development where it breaks the skyline.</p> <p>Due to the proximity to the site, while ground level activity including vehicle movements would be largely screened, there is still the potential for street lighting and building mounted lighting to be visible from points along both of the routes.</p>	<p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, the PRoW to the north-east of Diseworth is considered to be of high/medium sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be substantial resulting in a major/moderate adverse effects at completion reducing to moderate adverse after 15 years.</p>		<p>the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.</p>		
Visual 4	<p>Visual effects on receptors from Viewpoint 3 (Grimes Gate and PROW to the west (L43/1))</p> <p>Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application considers that views towards the site are filtered by roadside and field edge vegetation. The extent of visibility would vary dependent on the height of the roadside vegetation and the time of year. The development is located to the left of the view and is not</p>	<p>Moderate Adverse on completion (significant) remaining at Moderate Adverse after 15 years but not considered significant for Viewpoint 3</p>	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the visual baseline.</p>	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>the main visual focus with the eye tending to be drawn towards the airport control tower when moving northwards, or towards the village when moving southwards.</p> <p>The extent of visibility towards the proposed development reduces moving towards the village as the extent of tree cover increases and the field and roadside vegetation becomes thicker and more expansive. Despite this, there are likely to be clear views towards the application site with the tops of buildings visible and breaking the skyline when viewed from many locations. While visible, the development retains a degree of separation from the village with the proposed landscape buffer creating a clear distinction between the two. Ground level activity would be largely screened by a combination of bunding and screen fencing. The level of screening of lower parts of any proposed buildings would increase over time as mitigation planting matures.</p> <p>Whilst ground level activity including vehicle movements would be largely screened, there is still the potential for street lighting and building mounted lighting to be visible from points along these routes. The proposed lighting would sit in the wider context of existing lighting at the airport which is visible in the baseline view.</p>	<p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, Grimes Gate and the PRoW to the west are considered to be of high/medium sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be moderate resulting in a moderate adverse effects at completion (significant) and remaining moderate adverse after 15 years (not significant).</p>		<p>will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.</p>		
Visual 5	<p>Visual effects on area to the south of Diseworth (Viewpoints 8, 9 & 18)</p> <p>Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application highlights that the village of Diseworth sits at the base of a small valley with the site located on the northern slope above it. To the south of the village, the land slopes up again which results in views back across the valley towards the site with the village sat below. The airport sits behind the site on a plateau but is largely screened from view by the existing screen planting that wraps around the southern edge. The exception to this is the control tower and high mast lighting which are both clearly</p>	<p>Moderate Adverse (significant) on completion remaining at Moderate Adverse (significant) after 15 years</p> <p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, the area to the south of Diseworth is considered to be of high/medium sensitivity. The</p>	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the visual baseline.</p>	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>visible. Moving up the valley slope in a southerly direction, existing development at East Midlands Gateway and the Ratcliffe on Soar power station also begin to come into view (VP18).</p> <p>When viewed across the valley the application site sits on the skyline with the proposed building parameters breaking the skyline. From further south these buildings would sit in front of development at East Midlands Gateway and the power station (VP18), but from closer to the site, the development would appear above and to the right of Diseworth with the buffer between the two less evident than elsewhere (VP8). Proposed mitigation planting would begin to further screen lower parts of the development as it matures.</p> <p>Whilst ground level activity including vehicle movements would be largely screened, there is still the potential for street lighting and building mounted lighting to be visible in longer views back towards the application site. The commitment to minimise light spill and to protect ecologically sensitive areas along this boundary would aid in mitigating the night time view and ensure that the visual effect would not exceed that assessed during day time. The proposed development would sit in the wider context of existing lighting along trunk road routes and at the airport, which are both often visible in the baseline view.</p>	<p>magnitude of change will be moderate resulting in a moderate adverse effects at completion (significant) and remaining moderate adverse after 15 years.</p>				
Visual 6	<p>Visual effects on Viewpoints 5, 7, 9, 10 and 18 (Cross Britain Way)</p> <p>The Cross Britain Way runs across the study area in an east / west direction. Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application considers that in terms of the potential visibility of the proposed development on the route, the ZTV suggests pockets of visibility from Hathern, through Long Whatton and Diseworth and then eastwards towards Tonge and Breedon on the Hill. Site assessment work helped to establish a reduced</p>	<p>Moderate Adverse (significant) on completion remaining at Moderate Adverse after 15 years but not considered to be significant</p> <p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, users of the Cross Britain Way are considered to</p>	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the visual baseline.</p>	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	<p>extent of visibility, with the site first becoming visible on the route approaching from the west around Woodhouse Farm to the west of Diseworth (VP18). From here, visibility would remain until the route drops down into Diseworth (VP7) with limited visibility within the core of the village. The proposed development would then become visible again as the route passes along Clements Gate (VP4), staying visible until the route passes over the A42 (VP5 & 9). To the east of the A42 there is unlikely to be more than occasional glimpsed views of parts of the development (VP10).</p> <p>To the west of Diseworth the proposed development would appear above the village on the opposite valley slope. For much of the route here the development parameters sit within the context of other development at the airport which is also visible on the horizon. It would however be more prominent in the view. The building would break the skyline along most of the route where visible.</p> <p>To the east of Diseworth the topography between the recreational route and the application site restricts visibility to lower parts of the development, however the top part of the building parameters would be visible and would break the skyline along much of this part of the route. Whilst proposed mitigation planting would begin to further soften views as is establishes, views towards the top part of buildings would remain.</p> <p>The development would result in large-scale development becoming more prominent along this section of the Cross Britain Way. It should however be noted that this section of the route also crosses two trunk roads at this location and from many locations also provides views towards other large scale regional developments such as the Ratcliffe on Soar power station, the airport and East Midlands Gateway, therefore reducing the potential visual impact on users of the route.</p>	<p>be of high/medium sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be moderate resulting in a moderate adverse effects at completion (significant) and remaining moderate adverse after 15 years (not significant).</p>		<p>only for a temporary period.</p>		

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/ Temporary**
	<p>For the portions of the recreational route to the south of the site, whilst ground level activity including vehicle movements would be largely screened, there is still the potential for street lighting and building mounted lighting to be visible. The commitment to minimise light spill and to protect ecologically sensitive areas along this boundary would aid in mitigating the night time view and ensure that the visual effect would not exceed that assessed during day time. This would sit in the wider context of existing lighting along trunk road routes that the Cross Britain Way crosses and other large infrastructure such as the airport and East Midlands Gateway, which are visible at points along the route in the baseline view.</p>					
Visual 7	<p>Visual effects on Viewpoint 3 (National Cycle Route 15)</p> <p>Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application notes that the route follows the road from Belton to Diseworth, cutting through the village along Hall Gate before heading up Grimes Gate to the airport entrance. From the A42 underpass onwards, with the exception of the part within the village, the proposed development would be visible with the proposed development parameters breaking the horizon. Close to the A42 crossing the proposed development would be visible alongside the Ratcliffe on Soar power station whereas for closer views either side of Diseworth the development would be visible primarily in isolation.</p> <p>Due to the proximity to the site, whilst ground level activity including vehicle movements would be largely screened, there is still the potential for street lighting and building mounted lighting to be visible from points along the route as it runs along Grimes Gate. The commitment to minimise light spill and to protect ecologically sensitive areas along the western boundary would aid in mitigating the night time view and ensure that the visual effect would not exceed that assessed during day time. This would sit in the wider context of existing</p>	<p>Moderate Adverse (significant) on completion remaining at Moderate Adverse after 15 years but not considered to be significant</p> <p>As set out at Table 1.6.2 of ES Volume III of the Joint Application, users of the National Cycle Route 15 are considered to be of medium/high sensitivity. The magnitude of change will be moderate resulting in a moderate adverse effects at completion (significant) and remaining moderate adverse after 15 years (not significant).</p>	<p>The Joint Application Site remains in agricultural use and there are no changes to the visual baseline.</p>	<p>Beneficial</p> <p>The moderate adverse impact will not occur. Therefore, the impact of the non-delivery of the DCO development will be beneficial, but only for a temporary period.</p>	<p>Very low</p>	<p>Temporary</p>

Topic	Residual Likely Significant Effects arising from “future baseline” assuming the Joint Application is approved and delivered (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Residual Effects of development pursuant to the Joint Application (as identified in Joint Application ES Chapter 16 Section 16.3.1)	Consequence of DCO non delivery/sterilisation effect	Impact of non-delivery of DCO development on residual likely significant environmental effects identified in Joint Application ES Adverse/Beneficial Impact?	Probability of Impact*	Permanent/Temporary**
	lighting along trunk road routes and at the airport which are both visible in the baseline view.					