

PLANNING ACT 2008

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES 2010

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

Deadline 6 Submission

ON BEHALF OF

EAST MIDLANDS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED

EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT PROPERTY INVESTMENTS (INDUSTRIAL) LIMITED

Interested Party References: [REDACTED]

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This is East Midlands International Airport Limited's ("**EMA**") ("**the Airport**", as appropriate) and East Midlands Airport Property Investment (Industrial) Limited's ("**EMIAL**") Deadline 6 submission provided in respect of SEGRO Properties Limited's ("**SEGRO**") application for a Development Consent Order ("**DCO**") for the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 ("**EMG2**") ("**the DCO Application**").
- 1.2 Terms used in this submission have the same definition as set out in EMA and EMIAL's Written Representation dated 7 April 2026 unless otherwise defined.
- 1.3 In view of the brevity of the substance of this document, a summary has not been provided.

2. ALIGNMENT WITH PROLOGIS

- 2.1 EMA and EMIAL continue to support the case being made to the Examination by Prologis UK Limited and Prologis UK 121 Limited (together, "**Prologis**") in relation to land north of Hyams Lane which is the subject of the Joint Application.
- 2.2 EMA and EMIAL:
 - 2.2.1 have had sight of the documents to be submitted by Prologis at Deadline 6;
 - 2.2.2 agree with and endorse the contents of those documents; and
 - 2.2.3 reserve the right to speak to and expand upon the matters raised in them in further written submissions or during hearings.
- 2.3 In light of the fact that EMA and EMIAL's position is on all fours with Prologis, EMA and EMIAL do not propose to repeat points made by Prologis. Rather, as set out above, EMA and EMIAL endorse and adopt those submissions.

3. MATTERS ADDRESSED

- 3.1 This document contains EMA and EMIAL's:
 - 3.1.1 Response to SEGRO's Deadline 5 submissions on traffic and transport;
 - 3.1.2 Comments on the ExP's schedule of changes to the dDCO; and
 - 3.1.3 Update on safeguarding matters.
- 3.2 EMA and EMIAL have separately submitted our responses to ExQ3.
- 3.3 A submission has been made by Prologis in relation to the ExP's notification of Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 dated 21 July 2026.

4. TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT

- 4.1 At Deadline 5, SEGRO submitted document REP5-033 (DCO 7.17), which contained their latest responses to a number of submissions on traffic and transport made by EMA and EMIAL at earlier deadlines. The paragraphs below seek to provide a summary of the current position.

CTMP

- 4.2 EMA welcomes the changes made by the SEGRO to the draft CTMP¹ which finally now recognises the significance of the Airport as one of a number of key stakeholders. However, the CTMP only commits SEGRO to obligations relating to communication, co-ordination and notification: even with its monitoring and escalation measures, it provides little comfort for EMA should issues arise, and even then, only after harm has been done.
- 4.3 EMA therefore submits that requirement 11 of the draft DCO (construction environmental management plan) should be revised to require the local planning authority to consult EMA as part of the discharge of that requirement. In this connection, please also see our response to ExQ3 13.0.1.

A453/Beverley Road Roundabout

- 4.4 It remains the case that no modelling results have been provided for this junction. As this forms the access point to the site it is critical the capacity of this junction is known as it could affect the operation of the Airport: this roundabout forms one of the key entry points to the Airport and business park and as such its operation is critical.
- 4.5 This junction formed part of the VISSIM model. The model results presented previously by SEGRO, showed results for each junction in the model except this one.
- 4.6 When this data was requested EMA's transport consultants SCP were informed that the *"Queue results are not readily available for the A453/Beverley Road Roundabout because they are embedded in the VISSIM model results"*. This is difficult to understand when this data is available for the other junctions in the model.
- 4.7 When SCP asked the same question again it received a response to indicate that *"the journey time results for Route 16 are relevant to the A453/Beverley Road junction and show a reduction in Stage 2A compared to Stage 1A, highlighting that there would be an overall betterment to the operation of the junction. The latent demand also improves, showing that more traffic is able to enter the VISSIM network in Stage 2A compared to Stage 1A"*. However, again this does not provide a response to the question asked.
- 4.8 It is unacceptable that at this late stage in Examination, SEGRO appear unable to provide the raw modelling results that would enable EMA to satisfy itself on the future operation of this key roundabout.

M1, Junction24

- 4.9 With regards to Junction 24 of the M1, the application demonstrates that the mitigation suggested can accommodate the development traffic which is not in dispute.
- 4.10 During issue specific hearings, BWB indicated that they had undertaken a series of assessments to understand if alternative (lesser) mitigation schemes could be implemented. It was stated that the other schemes assessed could not accommodate the development traffic and the scheme applied for was the only one that could accommodate the development.
- 4.11 SCP asked to see the assessment of those alternative solutions, but this assessment work has never been made available to verify BWB's statements. The ExP will recall that EMA/EMIAL consider this to be important given the weight that SEGRO place on the benefits generated by the junction improvements in their Planning Statement and Statement of Reasons. EMA/EMIAL explained this in more detail in their Deadline 3 submission: REP3-059, section 7 and especially paragraph 7.6.

¹ REP4-018 in the Examination Library, Version P11 of the CTMP dated 11 June 2026

5. EXP'S SCHEDULE OF CHANGES TO THE DDCO

- 5.1 In document REP5-008D the ExP proposes the following definition of "advanced manufacturing" should be included in Article 2(1):

"advanced manufacturing" means manufacturing within the automotive, aerospace, life sciences (pharmaceuticals and other biotechnology), clean energy or food and drink sectors."

- 5.2 EMA and EMIAL submit that the proposed definition is too broad. It is crafted by reference to sectors, not to the techniques that businesses in those sectors might use. For example, there may be techniques involved in food manufacture such as mincing meat that do not require any advanced methods of manufacturing.

- 5.3 A better definition may be found in the list of definitions in the Government's Industrial Strategy: [Industrial Strategy Sector Definitions List - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/61221/Industrial_Strategy_Sector_Definitions_List_-_GOV.UK.pdf)

Advanced Manufacturing comprises production processes that integrate advanced science and technology, including digital and automation, to manufacturing. These processes rely on:

- *research and development (R&D)*
- *innovation*
- *specialised knowledge*
- *knowledge networks*
- *a highly skilled workforce*

- 5.4 EMA and EMIAL submit that the above definition would be more effective in establishing the level of control that the ExP appears to be seeking.

- 5.5 EMA and EMIAL also have concerns about the enforceability of proposed new requirement 32 but will reserve their position until they have seen comments on it from North West Leicestershire.

6. OPERATIONAL MATTERS

- 6.1 EMA is continuing discussions with SEGRO in relation to operational matters including aerodrome safeguarding, protective provisions and the Active Travel Link to the east of the runway.

- 6.2 Further detail in relation to the protective provisions is provided in our separate response to ExQ3s, specifically in response to questions 8.4.1 and 9.0.2.

- 6.3 It is noted that SEGRO has submitted a change request in relation the Active Travel Link. It is further noted that the ExP has stated that Interested Parties should comment on this at the new Deadline 6A on the 18 August. EMA will therefore reserve its position for the time being.