



Planning Inspectorate

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

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

All Interested Parties

Your Ref:

Our Ref: DCO: BC0410001
MCO: TR0510002

Date: 20 August 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 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.

National Planning Policy Framework

On Monday 17 August 2026 the Government published an updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

All parties are asked to consider this document and set out if and how any changes in government policy from the December 2024 version of the Framework would affect the consideration of the applications. Information regarding the Framework 2026 can be found on [GOV.UK: National Planning Policy Framework](https://gov.uk/national-planning-policy-framework).

The publication of the revised Framework supersedes the draft version published in December 2025 which is now no longer relevant. Consequently, unless a party specifically states otherwise, the Examining Panel (ExP) will no longer take into account the responses to ExQ3 Q1.0.1 [\[PD-028\]](#) made at deadline (D) 6. For the avoidance of doubt this also includes paragraphs 4.60 to 4.62 of the Planning Statement accompanying the

DCO Application and the MCO Application submitted at D4 by the applicants [REP4-016]. If any party wishes the ExP to take their earlier response into consideration, they should explicitly set out why the earlier response remains material.

Traffic modelling

Following Protect Diseworth's D6 submission 'East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2) Transport Report' [REP6-099D] the ExP has been looking at the volumes of traffic on the A453 past the EMG2 main site. Notwithstanding the following, the ExP would expect the applicants to respond to Protect Diseworth's submission at D7.

Appendix 50 of the Transport Assessment [REP1-043, pdf page 98ff], VISSIM Forecast Modelling Report, sets out forecast traffic flow diagrams (AM and PM, 2028 and 2038, without development, with development and with development and mitigation). In the D6a submissions the applicant has submitted a 'VISSIM Additional Mezzanine Sensitivity Test Modelling Report' [REP6A-003D] which has similar traffic flow diagrams. It is noted that the latter report does not show any 2028 figures.

Comparing the 2038 traffic flows on the two diagrams the ExP would have expected that the 'without development' flows should be the same. However, they are not. This may be because Appendix 50 uses the 2019 Pan Regional Traffic Model (PRTM) figures and the latest submission uses the 2023 PRTM figures, or for some other reason.

The ExP asks the applicants to confirm the situation explaining in full if the figures should be different.

In the context of Protect Diseworth's representation (see above), it would be beneficial to confirm the applicants' position as to the vehicle flows (in Passenger Car Units) along the A453 to the north of the EMG2 main site, both east and west of the access roundabout in the following scenarios in both the 2028 and 2038 modelled years:

- without development,
- with development (both excluding and including mezzanines),
- with development (both excluding and including mezzanines) + mitigation

National Highways and Leicestershire County Council (LCC) are also asked to comment on the perceived inconsistency on the flows as set out above and any effect it may have in relation to the consideration of the effect of the proposed development on the highway network.

While appreciating the difficulties in providing the diagrams on, effectively, an A4 format, the ExP would appreciate these diagrams to be submitted in effectively an A1 format to allow the figures to be easily read.

Traffic in Kegworth and Castle Donington – implications for population and human health

In its D6a submission [REP6A-005D] LCC indicates that its concerns as set out could be resolved by "a monitor and manage requirement". Could LCC please provide the text for such a requirement.

Responses should be submitted by **deadline 7 (1 September 2026)**.

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.