East Midlands Gateway
Phase 2 (EMG2)

Document 8.4B

Statement of Common Ground between SEGRO and Leicestershire County Council (relating to highways & transport)

September 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 a Material Change Order ("MCO") for the scheme known as East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 ("EMG2" or "the Scheme") described in paragraph 1.3 below. This SoCG is prepared jointly 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 Applicant and (2) Leicestershire County Council ("LCC").

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 DCO and MCO applications for EMG2 which comprises:

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); significant 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 Authority in examining the applications for the DCO and MCO by providing an understanding of the status of discussions or negotiations between the Applicant and LCC.

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) the Applicant and (2) LCC.

2.2 LCC enters into this SoCG in its capacity as the local highway authority. The A453 across the site frontage of the EMG2 Main Site forms part of the local road network, where a new access is being delivered, as do a number of other off-site junctions assessed in the Transport Assessment (TA).

2.3 On-going engagement has been held on a regular basis with LCC in its capacity as Local highway Authority since April 2022, primarily focussing on the transport modelling, highway mitigation and the sustainable transport strategy. This has led to agreement on a number of technical matters. Engagement continues throughout the examination process to seek to resolve those which remain outstanding.

2.4 A record of the meetings between the Applicant and LCC is set out in the Appendix to this SoCG. It does not include the entirety of the historic and ongoing engagement between the Applicant and LCC which has also been by way of a considerable number of emails, telephone calls and Teams meetings.

3 Structure of this SoCG

3.1 Section 4 of this SoCG considers highways & transport matters relevant to the entire EMG2 Project for which LCC is the Local Highway Authority, which includes development across both the DCO and MCO applications. Reference to EMG2 Project' refers to development within both the DCO and MCO applications and reference to 'EMG2 Main Site' refers to development on land south of East Midlands Airport only.

3.2 Section 5 then covers details that are only relevant to the MCO application, where they have no relevance to the DCO application.

3.3 The areas covered by this SoCG are as follows:

- 3.3.1 Scheme overview
- 3.3.2 Pre-application engagement
- 3.3.3 Baseline conditions
- 3.3.4 Trip generation
- 3.3.5 Assessment methodology
- 3.3.6 EMFM 2019 – stage 1 modelling
- 3.3.7 Detailed junction modelling
- 3.3.8 Proposed highway works & EMFM 2019 stage 2 modelling
- 3.3.9 Site access

3.3.10 Active travel

3.3.11 Public transport

3.3.12 HGVs

3.3.13 Construction activity

3.3.14 Highway design

3.3.15 Road safety auditing

3.4 This SoCG records those matters which are agreed and any still under discussion between the Applicant and LCC in relation to highways & transport.

3.5 This SoCG is a document that will evolve during the Examination stage and will conclude with a version that confirms the final positions of the parties on relevant matters before the close of the Examination.

3.6 Within the following tables a Red Amber Green (RAG) status has been applied as follows: green – agreed, amber – a matter that is under discussion and/or further work is being completed and red – not agreed.

4 DCO

Reference Number	Matter	Application Document	Applicants' Position	Interested Party's Position	Status	Date
Highways and Transportation - LRN						
4.1	Scheme Overview	Parameters Plan. (Document REP6-006D)	The DCO application seeks permission for a new logistics and advanced manufacturing employment park on the EMG2 Main Site comprising 300,000sqm of B2/B8 use plus an allowance of 200,000sqm of B8 mezzanine floorspace, together with HGV parking and a bus interchange, an upgrade to the EMG1 substation and provision of a community park. The MCO application seeks permission for a new B8 warehousing unit of 26,500sqm plus a mezzanine allowance of 3,500sqm, together with works to increase the permitted height of the cranes at the rail terminal and improvements to the EMG1 public transport interchange and site management building and addition of a pedestrian crossing near the entrance to EMG1.	LCC understands this is an accurate representation of the scheme overview.		D1 7 April 2026
4.2	Pre-Application Engagement	Appendices 19 and 20 of the TA (BWB document ref EMG2-BWB-GEN-	BWB has been engaging with LCC and the wider TWG (involving National Highways (NH), LCC, Nottinghamshire County Council,	LCC agrees that the level of pre-application engagement was consistent with that which would		D1 7 April 2026

		XX-RP-TR-0002_TA-S2-P4). **Document REP1-033**	Leicester City Council, East Midlands County Combined Authority and Nottingham City Council), since April 2022 working collaboratively to develop the TA, Sustainable Transport Strategy, Framework Travel Plan and Transport ES Chapter. The level of engagement with LCC has been comprehensive and that LCC has provided an appropriate level of input to agree key details during the project. The meeting minutes appended to the TA accurately reflect the discussions held at the meetings since April 2022. In addition, there have been extensive email exchanges and calls.	be expected of an NSIP application. As agreed at TWG meetings, meeting minutes were taken by the Applicant team for their record purposes and action tracking.		
4.3a	**Baseline Conditions - surveys**	Section 4 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). (Document **REP6-023**)	New traffic surveys were undertaken in November 2022 and May 2023 to inform the transport modelling. The surveys were undertaken during a suitable period and obtained accurate data to inform the transport modelling outlined in further detail below. The traffic survey data is agreed.	LCC agrees that the baseline traffic surveys were undertaken suitably.		D1 7 April 2026

4.3b	**Baseline Conditions - PIC**	Highway Safety Position Statement (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0015_S2-P1) contained at Appendix 14 of the TA. **Document REP1-033** Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline **6 (REP6-045D**)	A comprehensive review of existing Personal Injury Collision (PIC) records has been undertaken to identify existing highway safety problems on the surrounding network and is reflected in the TA. It is understood that it is agreed that the review provides a detailed summary of all recorded PICs over the latest 6-year period. BWB purchased additional PIC records along Derby Road in Kegworth and in Castle Donington to understand whether there have been any highway safety problems along these parts of the network. This was at the request of LCC who asked for further detailed assessment to be carried out on these parts of the network following the PRTM 2023 modelling. The PIC data was issued to LCC within a report on 26 June 2026 and is included within the Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**DCO7.23**). It is understood that there are no disagreements on the baseline PIC conditions therefore this is now green.	LCC accepts the PIC data as presented in the Technical Note to be submitted into the Examination by the Applicant at Deadline 6.		D1 7 April 2026

4.3c	**Baseline Conditions - WCHAR**	Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment & Review (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0005_S2-P6) contained at Appendix 3 of the TA. (**Document REP6-023**) Highway Plans General Arrangement Sheet 1 **REP4-011D** Applicants Response to Deadline 2 and 3 Submissions **REP4-033** Annex A Draft DCO (**REP5-008D**)	It is agreed that BWB has carried out a thorough review of all existing opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of transport as part of a Walking Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) to inform where improvements are required as part of the TA and proposed Highway Works. The conclusions of the WCHAR are agreed. BWB has agreed to provide controlled pedestrian crossings at the A453/EMA junction at the request of LCC. It should be noted that the Applicant does not believe these works to be necessary for highway safety reasons. Plans relating to the provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing at Works No. 15 were submitted at D4. The provision of the controlled crossing was incorporated into the draft DCO submitted at D5 (**REP5-008D)** therefore this is now green	LCC has agreed with the Applicant that controlled pedestrian crossings will be installed at the A453/EMA junction. LCC welcomes submission of revised drawings and dDCO into the Examination.		D4 16 June 2026
4.4a	**Trip Generation – modal split assumptions**	Section 7 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-	Whilst modal split figures recorded at EMG1 in 2024 show that single occupancy car trips are lower, it has been agreed that, for robustness, the EMG2 Project adopts the original	The trip generation and modal split assumptions are agreed.		D1 7 April 2026

		BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). (Document **REP6-023**)	modal split assumptions from the EMG1 DCO TA for the core assessment, which are as follows: • 80% single occupancy car driver • 11% car share • 5% public transport • 3% active travel 2% other With the above assumptions, it is agreed the EMG2 Project could generate up to 125 car share trips, 57 public transport trips and 33 active travel trips in the peak hour periods, prior to the Framework Travel Plan measures being implemented. The trip generation and modal split assumptions are agreed.			
4.4b	**Trip Generation – trip rates**	Trip Generation Core Assessment Technical Note (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-00012_S2-P1) contained at Appendix 11 of the	The vehicle trip generation for the EMG2 Project is agreed and has been calculated using the previously agreed B8 trip rates from the EMG1 DCO TA, along with new B2 trip rates from the TRICS database. Using these trip rates, it is agreed the EMG2 Project could generate 929 vehicle trips in the morning peak hour and 1,065 vehicle trips in the evening peak hour, prior to the	Trip rates are agreed.		D1 7 April 2026

		TA. **Document DCO 6.6A** **REP1-033** Assessment of Residual Impacts on Local Road Network Technical Note included within the PRTM 2023 report **REP1-058** Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**) VISSIM Additional Mezzanine Sensitivity Test Modelling Report submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-046D**)	implementation of the Framework Travel Plan. It is agreed that the traffic generation calculations are acceptable and provide a robust set of parameters to test the worst-case impacts of the EMG2 Project on the surrounding network. LCC has asked for further details to be provided on the impact of the development along Derby Road, Kegworth (Local Road Network) based on the increase in flows. This has been done (see 4.6b below) however it is understood in any event there are no disagreements on the trip generation calculations therefore this should be green. -LCC also requested that the additional mezzanine floorspace be assessed further and this has been done and is set out in the VISSIM Additional Mezzanine Sensitivity Test Modelling Report submitted at D6 (**DCO7.24**). This note demonstrates that no further mitigation is required in respect of the additional mezzanine floorspace. It has been agreed with National Highways. It was sent to LCC on 14 July 2026. LCC have responded by saying that "it is positive" without confirming acceptance of the conclusions.			

4.4c	**Sustainable Transport Strategy and Framework Travel Plan**	Sustainable Transport Strategy **Document APP-084** and Updated and submitted at Deadline 6 (**DCO 6.6B**) **REP6-027** Framework Travel Plan **Document REP4-022** and Updated and submitted at Deadline 6 (**Doc 6.6C**) **REP6-029** Section 7 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023** Draft DCO (**REP6-008D**)	The principles of the successful existing Travel Plan at EMG1 are carried over to EMG2, in the Sustainable Transport Strategy which provides suitable targets and measures to reduce single occupancy car trips to the development. It is agreed that this would bring benefits to the operation and safety of the highway network and reduce the impacts of the EMG2 Project compared to what has been assessed and mitigated in the TA. A revised Framework Travel Plan was submitted at D4 to reference that the public can use the shuttle bus for free, and at D6 to reference the provision of a six-month ticket for employees, the payment of NH, LCC and NWLDC to attend the STWG meetings; and uplift to the Travel Plan Fund to account for these additional costs. These revisions were made to meet requests made by stakeholders and are included in revised STS and FTP submitted at Deadline 6 (DCO 6.6B and DCO 6.6C respectively). The DCO submitted at Deadline 6 **REP6-008D** included the relevant provisions to secure payment of these monies,	LCC has reviewed the revised dDCO [**REP6-008D**] and the revised Sustainable Transport Strategy [**REP6-028**]. Based on the following: • No travel plan funds or bus funds will pass to LCC • The Travel Plan fund has been increased to cover LCC staff costs • Schedule 2 Part 1 addresses the issue of indexation and has been amended to reflect the increase in the fund • Schedule 15 has been updated to identify members of the sustainable transport working group including LCC LCC are now content that matters are agreed.		13th August 2027

			LCC has reviewed the revised Sustainable Transport Strategy **[REP6-027]** and confirmed by email on 13 August 2026 that this has resolved all previous comments and is agreed.			
4.5a	**Assessment Methodology – EMFM 2019**	Section 8 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023** EMFM Base Year Model Review (AECOM document reference EMFM 2019 – East Midlands Gateway Phase 2: Base Year Model Review Addendum – update to May 2024 TAG data book, 19 August 2024) contained at Appendix 7 of the TA. **REP6-023** Appendix 1 of PRTM 2023 Sensitivity	The EMG2 Project has been assessed using EMFM 2019, which was the relevant model available when the modelling started on 10 October 2024. The EMFM 2019 model validates to an acceptable threshold. It was agreed with LCC that PRTM 2023 would be used to inform a sensitivity test of the VISSIM modelling originally carried out using outputs from PRTM 2019 which had been undertaken and included within the Transport Assessment.(see e mail of 11 September 2025 in Appendix 1 of PRTM 2023 Sensitivity Test Modelling Note (**REP1-058**))	LCC requested use of PRTM 2023 which the applicant agreed to undertake.		D1 7 April 2026

		Test Modelling Note (**REP1-058**)				
4.5b	**Assessment Methodology - PRTM 2023**	2023 PRTM Sensitivity Test Technical Note and Local Road Network Impact Assessment Note **Document REP1-058**	In addition to EMFM 2019 modelling, the development has also been assessed as a sensitivity test in PRTM 2023, post the model being formally approved for use by National Highways on 20 May 2025. The Applicant has completed the PRTM 2023 modelling in line with an agreed methodology.	LCC agrees with the methodology of the PRTM 2023 modelling.		D1 7 April 2026
4.5c	**Assessment Methodology – Forecast years**	TA & ES Chapter Assessment Methodology Technical Note (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0017_S2-P4) contained at Appendix 17 of the TA. **Document REP1-033** Uncertainty Log v7 and PRTM Proforma v14 contained at Appendix 8 of the TA. **REP6-023**	The impacts of the EMG2 Project have been tested at forecast years of 2028 (year of opening) and 2038 (10 years post year of opening), inclusive of committed developments and highway infrastructure schemes as detailed in the Uncertainty Log v7 and PRTM Proforma v14. It is understood this is agreed with LCC. Further scenarios without draft Local Plan allocations have been included in the PRTM assessment for the purposes of the EIA and thus do not form part of the core highways assessment for the TA.	LCC agrees with the modelling assessment years and scenarios.		D1 7 April 2026

4.5d	**Assessment Methodology - distribution**	Section 8 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023**	The distribution methodology applied to development trips is understood to be agreed.	LCC agrees with the distribution pattern applied to the development trips.		D1 7 April 2026
4.6a	**Stage 1 Modelling - models**	Stage 1 Modelling Forecast Report (AECOM document reference EMFM 2019 – East Midlands Gateway Phase 2: Forecasting Report, 04 February 2025) contained at Appendix 41 of the TA. **Document REP1-041** Uncertainty Log v7 and PRTM Proforma v14 contained at Appendix 8 of the TA. **REP6-023**	The Stage 1A forecast year modelling has been carried out in EMFM 2019 in accordance with the details in Proforma v14 and Uncertainty Log v7. A supplemental test has been carried out using PRTM 2023 in line with the details in Proforma 2023 v1 and Uncertainty Log v7.	LCC agrees with the planning data assumptions and modelling scenarios.		D1 7 April 2026
4.6b	**Stage 1 Modelling - analysis**	Section 8 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). (Document **REP6-023**)	The EMFM 2019 Stage 1A forecast year modelling results have been analysed to understand the impacts of the EMG2 Project across the existing highway network and at key junctions that would experience an increase of +/-5% Passenger Car	Following an additional 100,000sqm of floorspace being pursued over that assessed within the agreed PRTM 2023 assessment LCC welcome the applicant's manual analysis of this additional 100,000sqm on		D6 28/7/26

		2023 PRTM Sensitivity Test Technical Note and Local Road Network Impact Assessment Note **Document REP1-058** Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**)	Units (PCUs) or an increase of more than PCUs. BWB considered the impacts of the EMG2 Project at a total of 27 junctions and from that list it is agreed that 16 off-site junctions required further detailed modelling using appropriate modelling packages in the TA. The 16 junctions are located on key strategic routes, primarily along the A453 between the Walton Hill signal junction (west of East Midlands Airport) and M1 Junction 24, along with two other junctions on the A453 Remembrance Way and the Station Road/Broad Rushes roundabout to the north of Castle Donington. It is agreed that this is an appropriate study area for the TA and includes the key locations that are impacted by the EMG2 Project. In January 2026, PRTM 2023 was approved for use by National Highways and BWB agreed to commission additional modelling to supplement the core PRTM 2019 modelling. Following PRTM 2023 modelling being carried out, LCC requested further detailed assessment of Derby Road, Kegworth and Castle Donington High Street. BWB issued a Technical Note to LCC on 26 June 2026 summarising	the LRN. The Applicant and LCC have set out their respective positions in respect of the need for mitigation in the villages of Castle Donington and Kegworth. This is based on the impact of the development as a whole on the LRN, not just the additional 100,000sqm mezzanine applied for. LCC has suggested a Monitor and Manage Strategy, and proposed mitigation measures should the predicted impacts on the villages materialise. The Applicant does not accept LCC's position, and it is unfortunate that no resolution can be reached. To this end, LCC respectfully requests that the ExP consider inclusion of a Requirement within the DCO for a "monitor and manage" strategy to address LCC's outstanding concerns.		

			the detailed assessment and including more detailed VISSIM modelling, which concluded that improved signage could be provided at Castle Donington to encourage more traffic to use the bypass but that no mitigation is required along Derby Road in Kegworth. LCC responded on the modelling on 15th July querying the conclusions of the 26 June Technical Note. BWB has considered that response and concluded that it only serves to confirm that there is no evidence base to support mitigation at Kegworth and no evidence to support the need for a monitor and manage requirement. The 26 June Technical Note has been updated to include further analysis of journey times in response to the LCC comments. That updated note was sent to LCC on 22 July 2026 and was submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**). The reinforced conclusion following consideration of the LCC comments is that there remains no evidence base upon which to require mitigation at Kegworth or to justify a requirement to monitor and manage.			
4.7a	**Detailed Junction Modelling –**	Section 8 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-	The microsimulation modelling covers the following junctions:	LCC agree with the VISSIM network extent and for other junctions to be modelled using		D1 7 April 2026

	microsimulation modelling	BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). (**Document REP6-023**)	• A453/Hunter Road roundabout • M1 Junction 23a (Finger Farm roundabout) • A6 Kegworth Bypass/A453 roundabout (EMG1) • M1 Junction 24 All remaining junctions on the Local Road Network can acceptably be modelled using Junctions 11 software (an industry standard modelling software package for priority junctions) or LinSig (an industry standard modelling software package for signalised junctions).	Junctions 11 and LinSig software, as appropriate.		
4.7b	**Detailed Junction Modelling – Vissim model**	VISSIM Local Model Validation Report (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0006_S2-P7) **Document REP1-041**	BWB has produced a detailed VISSIM model covering the four key junctions, which has been validated against industry standard scoring criteria. It is agreed that the VISSIM model validates to an acceptable threshold and is an accurate tool to test the forecast year traffic flows and consider the impacts of the EMG2 Project.	LCC agrees that the VISSIM model validates to industry standards.		D1 7 April 2026

4.7c	**Detailed Junction Modelling – Junction 11 and LinSig models**	Base Model Validation Technical Note (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0007_S2-P4) contained at Appendix 5 of the TA. **REP6-023**	BWB has produced Junctions 11 and LinSig models for 12 junctions on the LRN, which have been validated in line with industry standard thresholds. It is agreed that all 12 junctions validate to an acceptable threshold and are accurate models to test the forecast year flows and consider the impacts of the EMG2 Project.	LCC agrees that all 12 standalone junction models validate to industry standards.		D1 7 April 2026
4.7d	**Detailed Junction Modelling - furnessing**	Modelling Furnessing Approach Technical Note (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0004_S2-P7) contained at Appendix 49 of the TA. **Document REP1-041**	The outputs from EMFM 2019 and PRTM 2023 have been furnessed alongside observed surveys to derive suitable turning movements for the detailed junction modelling. The methodology for the furnessing has been agreed with LCC	LCC agrees with the furnessing methodology to derive future forecast turning movements.		D1 7 April 2026
4.7e	**Detailed Junction Modelling - anaylsis**	VISSIM Modelling Forecasting Report (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0019_S2-P4) (contained at Appendix 50 of the	The detailed VISSIM, Junctions 11 and LinSig modelling of the Stage 1A scenarios in EMFM 2019 showed that there are existing capacity issues at M1 Junction 24, A6 Kegworth Bypass/A453 roundabout and M1 Junction 23A (Finger Farm), which are predicted to be worsened by the EMG2 Project.	Following an additional 100,000sqm of floorspace being pursued over that assessed within the agreed PRTM 2023 assessment LCC welcome the applicant's manual analysis of this additional 100,000sqm on the LRN.		D6 28/7/26

		TA **Document REP1-041** 2023 PRTM Sensitivity Test Technical Note and Local Road Network Impact Assessment Note **Document REP1-058** Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**)	Mitigation has been designed to resolve capacity issues on the Strategic Road Network at the above locations and the residual impacts on the local road network are being discussed with LCC. As summarised in Item 4.6b above, PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling has been undertaken and based on the outputs and further detailed VISSIM modelling, the Applicant has proposed signage improvements at Castle Donington but no mitigation along Derby Road, Kegworth. The rationale for this is set out in the Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6 **REP6-045D** (DCO 7.23). BWB has considered the comments of LCC on an earlier version of **REP6-045D** and, as set out in the final report concluded that the LCC comments only served to confirm that there remains no evidence base upon which to require mitigation at Kegworth or to justify a requirement to monitor and manage.	The Applicant and LCC have set out their respective positions in respect of the need for mitigation in the villages of Castle Donington and Kegworth. This is based on the impact of the development as a whole on the LRN, not just the additional 100,000sqm mezzanine applied for. LCC has suggested a Monitor and Manage Strategy, and proposed mitigation measures should the predicted impacts on the villages materialise. The Applicant does not accept LCC's position, and it is unfortunate that no resolution can be reached. To this end, LCC respectfully requests that the ExP consider inclusion of a Requirement within the DCO for a "monitor and manage" strategy to address LCC's outstanding concerns.		
4.8a	**Proposed Highway Works - content**	Sections 12 and 13 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-	The proposed Highway Works include significant improvements at M1 Junction 24. The key piece of infrastructure comprises a new free flow link between M1 northbound	LCC supports the strategic highway works proposed. The Applicant and LCC have set out their respective positions in		D6 28/7/26

		BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023** 2023 PRTM Sensitivity Test Technical Note and Local Road Network Impact Assessment Note **Document REP1-058** Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**)	and A50 westbound that allows traffic to avoid M1 Junction 24. There are also other Highway Works at M1 Junction 24, as well as improvements at the A6 Kegworth Bypass/A453 roundabout (EMG1) and M1 Junction 23A (Finger Farm). It is agreed that the proposed Highway Works are comprehensive and have been designed in collaboration with LCC (where relevant) and the wider TWG. The only outstanding disagreement is whether there is a need for mitigation requirements at Castle Donington and Kegworth. The Applicants position is set out in the Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**) and summarised at Item 4.6b.	respect of the need for mitigation in the villages of Castle Donington and Kegworth. This is based on the impact of the development as a whole on the LRN, not just the additional 100,000sqm mezzanine applied for. LCC has suggested a Monitor and Manage Strategy, and proposed mitigation measures should the predicted impacts on the villages materialise. The Applicant does not accept LCC's position, and it is unfortunate that no resolution can be reached. To this end, LCC respectfully requests that the ExP consider inclusion of a Requirement within the DCO for a "monitor and manage" strategy to address LCC's outstanding concerns		
4.8b	**Proposed Highway Works - analysis**	Sections 12 and 13 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023** Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023	The proposed Highway Works were initially tested in EMFM 2019 as part of the Stage 2A modelling scenarios and identify the following improvements: • The new M1 northbound to A50 westbound free flow link would reduce northbound	LCC supports the strategic highway works proposed. The Applicant and LCC have set out their respective positions in respect of the need for mitigation in the villages of Castle Donington and Kegworth. This is based on the impact of the		D6 28/7/26

		sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**)	traffic on the A453 which would instead use the M1 motorway. • The M1 Junction 23A (Finger Farm) gyratory operates within capacity because of reduced traffic flows on the A453. • The northbound diverge slip road at M1 Junction 24 would experience significantly less queueing that could be accommodated within the slip road compared to existing queues which extend onto the motorway. • The circulatory links at M1 Junction 24 would overall operate with greater levels of capacity, particularly along the western side of the junction. The EMFM 2019 modelling shows the proposed Highway Works provide capacity benefits to the Strategic Road Network and mitigate the impacts of the EMG2 Project on the SRN. The proposed mitigation has been tested in PRTM 2023 and the Applicant remains in discussion	development as a whole on the LRN, not just the additional 100,000sqm mezzanine applied for. LCC has suggested a Monitor and Manage Strategy, and proposed mitigation measures should the predicted impacts on the villages materialise. The Applicant does not accept LCC's position, and it is unfortunate that no resolution can be reached. To this end, LCC respectfully requests that the ExP consider inclusion of a Requirement within the DCO for a "monitor and manage" strategy to address LCC's outstanding concerns		

			with LCC to agree mitigation requirements along Derby Road, Kegworth and Castle Donington bypass. The only outstanding disagreement is whether there is a need for mitigation requirements at Castle Donington and Kegworth. The Applicants position is summarised at Item 4.6b and set out in the Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**).			
4.8c	**Proposed Highway Works – EMG 2 Main Site access**	Section 6 and Appendix 26 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4) **Documents REP6-023** and **REP1-035** LCC – Responses to ExQ2 – Second Questions and actions CAH2,ISH3 (**REP4-060D**) Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (**REP5-033**)	The A453 across the frontage of the EMG2 Main Site forms part of the local highway network under the jurisdiction of LCC. It is generally agreed that an appropriate form of access is deliverable from the A453/Beverley Road roundabout as shown on the Geometry Plan at Drawing Number EMG2-BWB-HGN-1453-DR-H-0101_S2-P02. LCC has responded to the ExP questions about requirements for dualling to the west of the A453/Beverley Road roundabout (REP4-060D). That document (in the section relating to Requirement 31) contains no technical substantiation of the need	LCC raise no objection to the access design proposed however request land safeguarding along the entire site frontage of the A453 to be dedicated as public highway in line with policy EMP90 of the North West Leicestershire District Council Regulation 19 Local Plan. .		D6 28/7/26

			for dualling across the entirety of the frontage. The only technical work the Applicant is aware of does not substantiate that need – as set out in the response to REP4-060D submitted by the Applicant at D5 (**REP5-033**). Technical information from the Growth Point modelling was provided to the ExP, with the agreement of the consortium, at Deadline 5 (Response to LCC D4 Reps **REP5-033**)			
4.9	**Public Transport**	Section 6 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023** Sustainable Transport Strategy). **Document APP-084** Updated and submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-027**) Framework Travel Plan **Document REP4-022** Updated	It is agreed that the sustainable transport strategy will provide enhancements to the public transport provision. This includes a new dedicated bus interchange on the EMG2 Main Site that would be served by existing public bus services and well as internal shuttle bus services that will transport employees from the bus interchange to all of the warehousing units across the EMG2 Main Site. This follows the successful EMG1 model and will encourage employees to travel by public transport modes. A revised Framework Travel Plan was submitted at D4 to reference that	LCC agrees with the general principles of the public transport strategy. As above, outstanding maters with delivery and funding mechanisms have been resolved with amendments to the Sustainable Transport Strategy [REP6-028] and the dDCO [REP6-008D].		D7 1 September 2026

		and submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-029**)	the public can use the shuttle bus for free, and at D6 to reference the provision of a six-month ticket for employees, the payment of NH, LCC and NWLDC to attend the STWG meetings; and uplift to the Travel Plan Fund to account for these additional costs. These revisions were made to meet requests made by stakeholders and are included in revised STS and FTP submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-027** and DCO **REP6-029** respectively). The DCO submitted at Deadline 5 (**REP5-008D)** included the relevant provisions to secure payment of these monies,			
4.10	**Active Travel**	Section 6 of the TA (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023** Sustainable Transport Strategy **Document APP-084** Updated and submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-027**	It is agreed that a comprehensive sustainable transport strategy has been developed that includes new segregated footway/cycleway and crossing facilities, improvements to the existing Public Rights of Way network (including Public Footpath L45 'Hyam's Lane' Public Footpath L57 between Castle Donington and EMG1 and upgrading Long Holden to a bridleway and restricting vehicular access) that will encourage employees to travel by active modes of travel.	LCC welcomes the submission of revised drawings at Deadline 4, and the revised dDCO at Deadline 5.		D6 28/7/26

		Framework Travel Plan Revised at D4 – **REP4-022** Updated and submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-029** Revised ROW Plans **REP4-008D** and **REP4-009D** Note on changes to Public Rights of Way and Works Nos. 14 and 15 (**REP5-034D**) Draft DCO submitted at D6 (**DCO 3.1**)	The two concerns raised by LCC have been resolved – • Revised wording was included in the DCO submitted at D5 (**REP5-008D**) to provide for both a footpath and cycle track which will ensure there is no loss for the definitive map • Revised PROW plans were submitted at D4 (REP4-08D and REP4-09D) confirming the path to be a permissive path) • Accordingly this is now green			
4.11	**HGVs**	HGV Route Plan (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0016_S2-P3) contained at Appendix 15 of the TA. **Document REP1-033**	It is agreed that the local roads between the EMG2 Project and nearby villages all have appropriate weight restrictions that will restrict HGVs from travelling along them (except for access). It is agreed that the layout of the Strategic Road Network ensures that HGVs can access the EMG2 Project via appropriate routes which will ensure there are no significant or unacceptable impacts from HGVs on the sensitive parts of the network. It	LCC agrees with the details in the HGV Route Plan.		D1 7 April 2026

			is therefore agreed that no specific management measures are required to control the routes that HGVs use. It is agreed that a route plan has been developed that demonstrates how HGVs associated with the EMG2 Project could continue to access the site using suitable roads when there are temporary closures on the Strategic Road Network. It is understood that it is also agreed that the road network around the EMG2 Project is suitable to accommodate HGVs from all directions.			
4.12a	**Construction Activity – highway impact**	Construction Traffic Calculations Technical Note (BWB document reference) EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0013_S2-P3) contained at Appendix 12 of the TA. **Document REP1-033** EMFM 2019 Forecasting Report (AECOM document reference EMFM 2019 – East Midlands Gateway	The EMG2 Project is expected to generate 108 vehicle trips in the morning peak hour and 107 vehicle trips in the evening peak hour during the busiest phase of the construction programme. This is agreed and is based on a number of robust assumptions using historic survey data from SEGRO construction sites. The additional construction trips have been tested using the EMFM model and it is understood that it is agreed that traffic from the construction phase of the EMG2 Project can be accommodated on the existing highway network	LCC agrees with the construction traffic calculations for peak hour impact.		D4 16 June 2026

		Phase 2: Forecasting Report 1a Construction Traffic) contained at Appendix 74 of the TA. REP6-025	without causing any significant problems and therefore no mitigation is required. It is agreed that the updates to the Minerals & Waste ES Chapter have no impact on the construction traffic calculations, which are now agreed.			
4.12b	**Construction Activity – traffic management**	Construction Traffic Management Plan (Revised at D4) Appendix 03 to the Construction Environmental Management Plan (**REP4-018D**) Updated and submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-020D**)	A Construction Traffic Management Plan has been produced setting out measures that will be adopted during the construction phase of the development to limit impacts of construction traffic on other road users. It is generally agreed that the details within the Construction Traffic Management Plan are acceptable and that a requirement to produce and comply with phased plans is included in the Draft DCO (Requirement 11). A revised CTMP was submitted at D4 to respond to LCC's request for phased plans to be developed and agreed and for consideration to be given to events, such as Download Festival, Christmas Moratorium and EMA related traffic. A revised CTMP	LCC remains concerned with the associated proposed disapplication of section 141 of the Highways Act 1980 as set out in Schedule 14 of the dDCO and as documented in LCC's submissions at deadline 1 [REP1-087] and deadline 4 [REP4-060D]. LCC may require this power to implement works for the dualling of the A453. In addition, LCC remains concerned about the proposed disapplication of sections of the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 as documented in LCC's submissions at deadline 1 [REP1-087], deadline 4 [REP4-060D] and deadline 6 [REP6-089].		D6 28/7/26

			has been submitted at D6 but it does not affect the above. The disapplication of section 141 of the Highways Act 1980 ("1980 Act") (restriction on planting trees etc. in or near a carriageway) is limited to trees and shrubs planted in the course of the authorised development before completion of construction (see Schedule 14, paragraph 2(1) of the draft DCO). The disapplication is necessary because the authorised development includes a comprehensive landscaping scheme that has been the subject of detailed assessment within the Environmental Statement and is secured through Requirements 9 and 10, the LEMP and the certified landscape plans. Given that some planting may be located in proximity to existing or new carriageways, retaining section 141 could create uncertainty as to whether planting authorised and secured by the DCO could nevertheless be constrained by a separate statutory restriction applying to planting near carriageways. The proposed disapplication avoids that			

			uncertainty while preserving appropriate safeguards. The planting is controlled through the DCO requirements and certified plans, and highway safety considerations are addressed through the detailed design process for the highway works and the protective provisions for National Highways (Schedule 13, Part 1) and LCC as the local highway authority (Schedule 13, Part 2), which require approval of detailed design information for highway works, including landscaping where relevant. The LCC response suggesting that the disapplication of s.141 may affect any future dualling of the A453 is not accepted. Aside from the issue of the technical basis for any need for future dualling, if any such dualling were to be carried out then the disapplication of s.141 would not prevent it. See response to Action Point 64 (**REP4-035** page 30)			
4.13	**Highway Design – design approval**	**Document DCO APP-042D and APP-043D** and the cross sections and long	The highway design on the local road network has been agreed (including departures) with LCC subject to closing out the PRTM 2023 modelling work.	The Applicant and LCC have set out their respective positions in respect of the need for mitigation in the villages of Castle Donington and Kegworth. This is		D6 28/7/26

		sections **2.9 2.10** (relevant to LCC) Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**)	The only outstanding issue is whether there is a need for mitigation requirements at Castle Donington and Kegworth. The Applicants position is summarised at Item 4.6b and set out in the Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**). There is no evidence base to support the need for mitigation at Kegworth nor is their evidence to justify a monitor and manage requirement.	based on the impact of the development as a whole on the LRN, not just the additional 100,000sqm mezzanine applied for. LCC has suggested a Monitor and Manage Strategy, and proposed mitigation measures should the predicted impacts on the villages materialise. The Applicant does not accept LCC's position, and it is unfortunate that no resolution can be reached. To this end, LCC respectfully requests that the ExP consider inclusion of a Requirement within the DCO for a "monitor and manage" strategy to address LCC's outstanding concerns		
4.14	**Road Safety Auditing**	Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Brief (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-CH-0016_S4-P03) (**Document REP1-056**) Stage 1 Road Safety Audit response report (BWB document	The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit process has been agreed with LCC and no changes to the highway design are required as a result. Whilst not considered necessary, the Applicant has agreed to include controlled pedestrian crossings at the A453/EMA junction the plans for which have been submitted at D4. The only outstanding issue is whether there is a need for	The Applicant and LCC have set out their respective positions in respect of the need for mitigation in the villages of Castle Donington and Kegworth. This is based on the impact of the development as a whole on the LRN, not just the additional 100,000sqm mezzanine applied for. LCC has suggested a Monitor and Manage Strategy, and proposed mitigation measures		D6 28/7/26

		reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-CH-0020) (**Document REP1-057**) Technical Note on EMG2 PRTM 2023 sensitivity – Kegworth and Castle Donington submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**)	mitigation requirements at Castle Donington and Kegworth. The Applicants position is summarised at Item 4.6b and set out in the Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6 (**REP6-045D**). There is no evidence base to support the need for mitigation at Kegworth nor is their evidence to justify a monitor and manage requirement.	should the predicted impacts on the villages materialise. The Applicant does not accept LCC's position, and it is unfortunate that no resolution can be reached. To this end, LCC respectfully requests that the ExP consider inclusion of a Requirement within the DCO for a "monitor and manage" strategy to address LCC's outstanding concerns		

5 MCO

Reference Number	Matter	Application Document	Applicants' Position	Interested Party's Position	Status	Date
Highways and Transportation - LRN						
5.1	**Traffic Impact** **Rail freight terminal only (Gantry crane)**	EMG1 Rail Freight Terminal Technical Note (BWB document reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-CH-0011_S2-P01) contained at Appendix 10 of the TA. **Document REP1-033**	It is agreed that the proposed works associated with the EMG1 Rail Freight Terminal will have no impact on the consented traffic generation for EMG1, nor cause any changes to the assessment work for the EMG2 Project.	LCC agrees that the EMG1 rail freight works would not have a material impact on the Local Road Network.		D1 7 April 2026
5.2	**Scheme Overview**	Parameters Plan **Document REP1-013M**	It is agreed that the MCO application seeks permission for a new B8 warehousing unit of 26,500sqm plus a mezzanine allowance of 3,500sqm, together with works to increase the permitted height of the cranes at the rail terminal and improvements to the EMG1 public transport interchange and site management building and addition of a pedestrian crossing near the entrance to EMG1.			D1 7 April 2026
5.3	**MCO traffic impacts**	Section 7 of the TA (BWB document	The peak hour traffic generation associated with the EMG1 proposed additional floorspace has been	LCC has reviewed the MCO Note [REP5-031M]. LCC accepts the conclusions reached.		D6 28/7/26

		reference EMG2-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_S2-P4). **REP6-023** 2023 PRTM Sensitivity Test Technical Note and Local Road Network Impact Assessment Note **Document REP1-058** MCO Note – Transport Technical Note with further assessment of Plot 16 impacts which has been updated and submitted at D5 (**REP5-031M**)	established and is being assessed as part of the entire EMG2 Project (inclusive of EMG1 Works). BWB has provided an updated MCO Note (**REP5-031M**). It was submitted to LCC and NH on 28 May 2026. The note explains that physical highway works to the A453/A6 Kegworth Bypass/EMG1 roundabout are not required for the MCO and are required as mitigation for the DCO application only. NH confirmed they were content with an earlier version of the note which arrived at the same conclusion (**REP1-283M**) and this confirmation was first contained in the NH SoCG submitted at Deadline 2 (**REP2-037**) . A response is awaited from LCC. In the absence of a response from LCC the updated note was submitted at D5 (**REP5-031M**). A response from LCC is still awaited.			

6 Conclusions

6.1 The Applicant and LCC confirm that the final position on all highways matters under discussion in relation to the Scheme have been recorded in the tables in sections 4 and 5 above.

SIGNATURES:

On behalf of the Applicant:

.....
Signature

[redacted]

Name

Paul Wilson

.....
Position

Director – Transport & Accessibility Planning

On behalf of LCC:

[redacted]**24.08.2026**

Signature

Ann Carruthers

……

Name

Director of Growth, Environment and Transport

……

Position

APPENDIX

RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

Date	**Form of engagement**	**Summary of matters dealt with**
28/04/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Introduction meeting
27/07/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Initial transport scoping meeting
11/08/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Initial steps for the PRTM modelling
08/09/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM proforma details
13/10/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM methodology and proposed access arrangements
10/11/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM methodology, PRTM base year model review, traffic distribution pattern and traffic survey requirements
08/12/22	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM planning data assumptions and uncertainty log details
12/01/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM modelling update, introduction to VISSIM modelling and discussion on the public transport strategy
09/02/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM planning data assumptions, traffic flow furnessing and VISSIM scoping
09/03/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Development distribution pattern, PRTM Uncertainty Log and VISSIM scoping

13/04/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	VISSIM LMVR, PRTM Stage 1 outputs and sensitivity test modelling considering all draft Local Plan sites (since superseded)
11/05/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM forecasting report (Stage 1), traffic flow furnessing methodology & VISSIM base model validation
08/06/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM forecasting report and study area, traffic flow furnessing and forecast traffic flows and VISSIM base model validation
20/09/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sensitivity test PRTM modelling approach considering all draft Local Plan sites (since superseded), traffic flow furnessing and forecast traffic flows and VISSIM base model validation
14/12/23	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Transport modelling scenarios / methodology discussion
11/01/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Junctions 11 and LinSig model validation, initial review of transport modelling results and impacts, review of Isley Woodhouse Scoping Opinion
08/02/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Junctions 11 and LinSig base model validation, traffic flow furnessing methodology, initial review of transport modelling results and impacts, review of emerging NWLDC Local Plan
15/03/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	NWLDC Local Plan modelling work and Junctions 11 / LinSig base model validation.
18/04/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing and VISSIM base model validation review

09/05/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Assessment methodology for EMG1 core scenario, forecast year requirements and vision and validate methodology
13/06/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sustainable transport strategy, Junctions 11 and LinSig base model validation and trip rates for mezzanine floorspace. Initial review of proposed highway mitigation and Covid-19 sensitivity testing
11/07/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM proforma updates, proposed site access and public transport strategy update, Covid-19 PRTM sensitivity testing and vision and validate assessment methodology (relating to EMG1 surveyed trip rates and mezzanine floorspace uplift)
08/08/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sustainable transport strategy, PRTM modelling update including proforma and uncertainty log details, introduction to wider strategic modelling relating to the wider growth sites near East Midlands Airport
05/09/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing demand matrices, Stage 2 modelling related matters, PRTM 2023 sensitivity test, VISSIM modelling and construction traffic modelling
12/09/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM modelling update, approach for Statements of Common Ground / sign off sheets, vision and validate assessment requirements and wider strategic modelling approach
03/10/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	EMG1 rail freight terminal and impacts on trip generation, PRTM modelling scenarios and forecast years, strategy for wider strategic modelling
10/10/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Sustainable transport strategy, initial overview of proposed mitigation strategy, PRTM proforma update

06/11/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 1 PRTM modelling update, vision and validate assessment requirements
14/11/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Wider strategic modelling update and EMG2 modelling related discussion
05/12/24	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Wider strategic planning modelling requirements including planning data assumptions, PRTM 2019 Stage 1 and 2 modelling update, VISSIM base model updates
12/12/24	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 vs 2023 discussion, requirements for public consultation, wider strategic modelling methodology and PRTM assessment requirements, sustainable transport strategy / framework travel plan update, vision and validate update and Covid-19 sensitivity test update
02/01/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 vs 2023 discussion and mechanism for delivering the wider strategic mitigation associated with East Midlands Growth Point schemes
09/01/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 vs 2023 model comparison, highway design update and overview of mitigation scheme, PRTM Stage 1 modelling outputs, sustainable transport strategy, mezzanine floorspace and impact on trip rates, construction traffic assessment requirements
06/02/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 1 and 2 PRTM modelling outputs and update on wider strategic modelling, including suitability of PRTM 2023, planning data assumptions and quantum of development to be assessed. The base VISSIM model updates were also discussed as well as the current position with sign off sheets

13/02/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Statutory consultation programme and approach, PRTM modelling outputs review, wider strategic modelling assessment requirements using PRTM 2023, VISSIM base model update and review of sign off sheets
06/03/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Development trip distribution and assessment methodology, traffic flow furnessing and PRTM outputs for Stage 1b modelling and overview of proposed study area for the Transport Assessment
13/03/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Statutory consultation overview / summary of responses, PRTM modelling update, VISSIM base model update, mezzanine floorspace discussion and expected operational use, construction traffic calculations, HGV route plan requirements, update on sign off sheets, sustainable transport strategy update and overview of Personal Injury Collision assessment
03/04/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 forecasting report and discussion over core scenario vs policy requirements, traffic flow furnessing and Stage 2 modelling, construction traffic calculations and assessment requirements, vision and validate assessment using surveyed trip rates from EMG1
10/04/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing update, Stage 2 PRTM modelling requirements, sustainable transport strategy update, highway design update, construction traffic calculations and assessment requirement, Highway Safety Position Statement and discussion over highway safety issues / areas of mitigation and COBALT Assessment methodology
01/05/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Assessment scenarios to be tested in TA and ES Chapter and how this complies with current policy, VISSIM model furnessing calculations, Stage 2 PRTM modelling update, construction traffic calculations and vision and validate / mezzanine discussion plus an update on sign off sheets

08/05/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 2 modelling PRTM outputs and discussion over results of mitigation, assessment methodology for TA and ES Chapter and compliance with current policy, sustainable transport strategy update, highway design update and overview of drawings, construction traffic calculations and discussion over highway safety position statement
05/06/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Discussion over comments received from NH on PRTM modelling, Stage 2 PRTM modelling, construction traffic PRTM modelling and approach for PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling
12/06/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Traffic flow furnessing, stage 2 PRTM modelling update, assessment requirements of additional mezzanine floorspace, sustainable transport strategy, highway design update, review of highway safety (highway safety position statement and COBALT assessment) and update on sign off sheets. Initial conversations held over the requirement for PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity tests.
03/07/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 2A PRTM forecasting report and traffic flow furnessing and technical note for Stage 2 modelling.
10/07/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Non-statutory consultation overview, Stage 2 PRTM forecasting report, overview of transport modelling work in TA (Junctions 11, LinSig and VISSIM) and assessment of impacts / focus of mitigation, construction traffic modelling and PRTM forecasting report, comparison of PRTM 2019 and 2023.
07/08/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	VISSIM related work, traffic flow furnessing and demand matrices for Stage 2 modelling, Stage 2A/2B PRTM forecasting reports, PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity test, construction traffic PRTM forecasting report and overview of standalone junction modelling results.

14/08/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Proposed access strategy and number of access points, transport modelling update, PRTM 2023 sensitivity test, WCHAR Assessment, sustainable transport strategy update and sign off sheet update.
04/09/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Stage 2A and 2B modelling matters, including PRTM forecasting reports, comments from NH and traffic flow furnessing, PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity test update, VISSIM modelling update and overview of construction traffic modelling in PRTM.
11/09/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 modelling update, highway design discussion, WCHAR Assessment, COBALT assessment, sign off sheets and PRTM 2023 modelling requirements / approach.
02/10/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 stage 2 modelling, including furnessing note update, response to comments from NH and LCC and sensitivity test with unconstrained A50 merge. Discussion on updates to standalone junction models to address LCC comments and update on PRTM 2023 modelling sensitivity test, as well as any update on agreement for the mezzanine legal wording.
09/10/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 modelling update and review of Stage 2 results, PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling timescales update and sign off sheet update.
06/11/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Update on PRTM 2019 core modelling, PRTM 2019 sensitivity test modelling and PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling. Agreement reached with NH on mezzanine legal wording.
13/11/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2019 modelling update including A50 unconstrained merge sensitivity test, PRTM 2023 modelling update, mezzanine legal wording confirmation, highway design update.

04/12/25	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Update on the PRTM 2019 core modelling, the PRTM 2019 sensitivity test and PRTM 2023 sensitivity test
11/12/25	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Highway design update, including departure from standard process, Stage 1 Road Safety Audit update and discussions on transport modelling including PRTM 2019 core, PRTM 2019 sensitivity test and PRTM 2023 sensitivity test.
08/01/26	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Confirmation of final steps required to close out the PRTM 2019 core modelling and continued discussions on the PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling.
15/01/26	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling and discussion on initial drafts of the Statements of Common Ground.
05/02/26	Modelling Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Continued discussions on the PRTM 2023 sensitivity test modelling as well as conversations as to whether additional assessment of the MCO application is required.
12/02/26	TWG Meeting – Teams (minuted)	Update on the DCO application and discussion on PRTM 2023 sensitivity test outputs and next steps.
February to August 2026	Meetings and Correspondence	Whilst there have been no formal TWG or modelling meetings since February 2026, meetings and correspondence have continued to be held with LCC to discuss key items that remain under discussion seeking to reach an agreement on the technical details.