



National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000
e-mail: EMG1MaterialChange@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

To the applicant
(By email only)

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR0510002

Date: 12 November 2025

Dear Mr Thurling

Planning Act 2008 – section 51

Application by SEGRO (EMG) Limited for an order granting development consent for the East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Material Change

Advice following applicant's submission of application documents for a Material Change Order

In undertaking checks at the acceptance stage, the Inspectorate has made some initial observations in relation to the application. This letter comprises advice to the applicant provided under section 51 of the PA2008 in respect of these initial observations. The applicant should pay attention to its content and consider how appropriate action might be taken in response.

Minor errors and omissions

All documents

A number of typographical and grammatical errors, inconsistent naming conventions across documents, missing hyperlinks, and other evident mistakes have been identified. While some of these were noted during the acceptance checks and referenced in advice, it should be emphasised that the Planning Inspectorate does not undertake a quality assurance role. Accordingly, the applicant is advised to carry out a thorough review of all submitted documentation and make any necessary amendments.

Guide to the Application

- Page 18 of the guide to the application should read Appendix 2 instead of Appendix 3

Draft Material Change Order (MCO) (MCO 3.1)

- Article 39A(1) CERTIFICATION OF PLANS (a) Additional Works Plan should be MCO 2.3 rather than MCO 2.2
- Illustrative Landscape Masterplan MCO 2.6 should be added to Article 39A(1)
- Review Works No. 8A(23) wording as current wording is unclear
- The plan associated with SCHEDULE 1 AUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT WORK - Works 3B are missing the parameters referenced in schedule 1 (document MCO 2.5 Parameters Plan)

Appendix B LVIA Figures (MCO 6.10B)

The image of the existing view from the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) on top of the existing landscaped mound which overlooks Plot 16 (EMG1d, Figure 9.29). It would be helpful to turn this into a photomontage showing the proposed warehouse at various periods from completion.

It would also be helpful to have photomontage views from the east-west stretch of the realigned PRoW to the south of Plot 6.

Photomontages EMG1b (Fig11.29) and EMG1e (Fig 11.31) show only Year 0. It would be helpful to have images depicting subsequent years after landscape growth.

Environmental Statement Chapter 3 (MCO 6.3)

The applicant has confirmed in its 'Updates to the application' document for the Development Consent Order (DCO) (DCO 1.7) in response to s51 advice from the Planning Inspectorate that drawings are based on Ordnance Survey and that the draft DCO has been updated to ensure that the base level is clear. The applicant's response and stated amendments relate to the DCO application only. Please clarify the MCO drawings/ base levels.

It is noted that Works 3B in the draft MCO (MCO 3.1) also allows for 'roof mounted photovoltaics'. These are not explicitly described in ES chapter 3 (MCO 6.3). Please confirm the capacity and whether the design has accommodated the potential for PVs on these works as well.

Environmental Statement - all chapters

For ease of reference, signposts should be provided to the specific sections or paragraphs in documents, chapters and/ or sections where documents outside of the ES are being referred to, particularly where these are documents comprised of multiple files or sheets.

The applicant is recommended to consider the advice given in relation to the application for the MCO where it may reasonably apply to the DCO order

Several appendices are labelled as both DCO / MCO documents but in fact are only relevant to the DCO application. Further clarification as to which parts of the submission do not apply to the MCO application is needed.

Each aspect chapter includes details of the methodology applied and identifies the magnitude of impact and sensitivity of the receptors in each case and how these combine to provide a judgement of whether effects are significant or not significant. However, there are some conclusions that are unclear as to whether they are significant or not significant, this should be checked and clarified.

Please also provide hyperlinks to allow navigation from the contents page to the relevant section of each ES chapter

Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (MCO 6.10)

Figure 7 (Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)) (MCO 6.10B) also includes areas shaded in green. This is assumed to be the ZTV from the DCO and MCO combined; however, the legend states that this is 'EMG2'. An update to this figure is needed to clarify.

The applicant is recommended to consider the advice given in relation to the application for the Development Consent Order (DCO) where it may reasonably apply to the MCO order.

Please pay close attention to the advice set out in this letter and act on it accordingly, prior to commencing opening the Relevant Representation period for Interested Parties.

We trust you find this advice helpful, however if you have any queries on these matters please do not hesitate to contact our office using the contact details at the head of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Karl-Jonas Johansson

Karl-Jonas Johansson
Case Manager

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

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