



Event Transcript

Project:	East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
Event:	Preliminary Meeting (PM) – Part 3
Date:	10 March 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the event.

Preliminary Meeting 10_3_26 Session 3

 Tue, Mar 10, 2026 12:12PM  19:57

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Preliminary meeting, preliminary hearing, site inspection, unaccompanied site inspection, environmental statement, socio-economic matters, rule six letter, rule eight letter, six-month process, applicant's status, land rights tracker, examination issues tracker, artificial intelligence, professional code of conduct, planning inspectorate guidance, North West Leicestershire district councillor.

SPEAKERS

Speaker 2, Eventurous AV Team, Speaker 3, Speaker 1

 00:25

In case anybody we are going to wait for another couple bits, just in case anybody who was all right went off and got themselves A cup of tea and came back again. So

 01:30

you is, hold on Thank you.

 02:13

The hearing is resumed. We have very carefully listened to everything that's been said and that which was put in writing before it was here today. And we've concluded that when we have done the other items on the agenda tonight, we as this morning, it's our intention to close this preliminary meeting. We're very careful. We've looked at all the stuff that we've had, received the information to date, and we've listened to it very carefully. We also note that there are opportunities, normally during an exam that there when applicants need need to make changes to applications during the process, perfectly legitimate reasons, and there are arrangements in place to allow that to take place in an entirely procedurally fair way. We consider this in one sort of sense, is no different to that, in that the information we have yet to get, but it could well, it will be made into the examination, and there will be opportunities for those, for that to be responded to in the normal six month process that we have, and that allows there to be openness, fairness and there to be no prejudice involved. We consider that would be the very similar would apply in this particular case to this information. We are very we've taken the comments about the environmental statement, and clearly it has been deemed to be acceptable for acceptance. Now we will look on that further, and there are questions that we have on that, and we will also include ask information further questions on socio economic matters when we get to them. Are in our aim is that we would issue the our hope, can I put it? It's a fairly strong hope that we're going to be able to issue the rule eight letter and ex q1 and some other matters on Wednesday of next week. I week tomorrow, so that therefore be very quick turn around, following, following. This preliminary meeting and the hearings. So we're hoping that that will ensure that all those matters are expedited as far as best as possible. I think those are the reasons why we feel that we feel confident that we would be able to complete the examination within a six months time to give a satisfactory recommendation to the Secretary of State, we know particularly the applicant. The applicant is put at that no statutory bodies are seeking an adjournment, and that the applicant is confident that they believe that they can do it. It is their risk in one sort of sense, in in that it should the application. It transpire that the application is wanting, for what? Any, for any reasons, then it may, will be recommended refusing. The Secretary of State may take that conclusion as well. Do other my colleagues wish to add anything on to that? No, in which case, thanks. I'm don't want to go into the further discussion about it, as you'll understand, on the item five in the agenda we were looking at accompanied site inspections. This was item five. You'll have seen that we made the notes of the unaccompanied site inspections we made in December from the public vantage points, and we now believe we have a good understanding of the development control site. However, at that point, we have been appointed to examine the material change application so unable to visit that site, we appreciate we'll need to do that at some point in the not too distant future. The question we do have for the applicant today is whether we able to visit the site on an unaccompanied basis using public vantage points, particularly the public right of way that goes through the site, whether we want for a better expression, will need to be let in, either or accompanied around the site. If that, I'm sure the applicants will understand that others may wish to assist. Can you help? Can you help us?

 06:13

Alexander booth, the applicant, sir, I believe, and I'm being told that there should be no difficulty with you undertaking an unaccompanied side.

 06:20

We just turn up and walk through and there won't be any we won't be any problems with it, won't be challenged or anything.

 06:27

Yes, fine. So

 06:29

in in our rule six letter, we asked if there are any other locations which we should visit, and thank you for those comments. What we've read of the material change site, there are no additional locations that have been suggested, apart from the control tower at the airport and and obviously that the at the site more generally, in in the proposed of the proposed access, with the joint application slightly further to the west of the current proposed access, given we're Going to be doing an unaccompanied site inspection for the for the latter one, Id the access point for the joint application. We can do that at the same time, much as we would like to be able to justify going up the controls out, we think that might be going a step too far. It would also probably make a security problems the very few people will be able to go and which means to fairly set as much we would like to for as purely as human beings, and it would be find it interesting. Thank you very much for the kind offer. But, but no does any other anybody else have any other points or queries about either an unaccompanied, accompanied or access required site inspection from the points that haven't been raised writing to date, Mr. Warren, west wall and Smith.

 07:46

So I was actually just throwing my glasses around then, but, but Mark, we'll move straight on. Well, may I just say that I heard what you said. I had the benefit of going up the control tower yesterday, and you're right, it is interesting and good fun, but a visit might not be purely gratuitous, because it was actually quite useful to get that view from on high. And one can see the relationship of EMG one the proposed site, including the pro lodgers and Ema application. So you do get a good view of the site and of the general area and how everything relates to each other. So if you change your mind, we're here, and I say that, yes, there is a small amount of security to go through, but I navigated that without incident, so it's not burdensome. So if you want to change your mind, we're here if you if you do,

 08:48

thank you. Anybody else on Yes? Could you provide a mic please? Could you please remember to introduce yourself, Mr. Ray Sutton. Mr. Ray Sutton, resident member of Kegworth parish council, and less important, but perhaps to declare it, a North West Leicestershire district councillor. I only come in here as a resident in the site inspections. I've seen your good tour by road in December, and you will

have passed junction 24 at least once on that trip. But from a local point of view, in regard to the material change order the MCO, you might like to pause next time, although getting on foot onto that roundabout, and you can do it takes some doing to take in the impact of the existing EMG one and potentially any other changes. It may give you a flavour overall in terms of the heritage and the location. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Sutton, we'll take that on board when we the reality is, when we do the EMG one, the the go into the MCO site, the chances are we're going to do some revisiting, at least a few things, and clearly, it's going to be at a different time. Different time of year to that when we saw it in December. So the phone need to be very different. So we will get that impression anyway. The next item relates to submissions. As everyone will be aware, this examination is more complicated, complicated than most n sips. There are two applications being considered under their own procedure rules and regulations. We also appreciate that some interested parties are interested in one application and not the other and vice versa, and therefore be only making representations on the one application. Some, however, will be on both. We have therefore made a procedural decision to ask that where document relates to one application only that is submitted via that application's website, how they should relate to both then please submit it via the EMG to website. All submissions should be annotated at the top, whether they relate to one the other or both, and obviously which one of the which application of the one or the other, where interested parties, including the applicant, are submitting multiple documents, then it would be really useful to have a cover letter or a similar document setting out the documents that have been submitted and which or both application the document refers to. It also should briefly and very high level, set out what the document updates are seeking to address, just say we know what. It's a sign posting document within of what what we're being submitted. Does anybody have any comments on that? Okay, next one, moving on provisions and status of applicants. Examination documents. As I set out an ex effort, the rule six letter, we made a request that, with the exception of a single document, that all revised documents submitted in the app submitting the applicant submitted should be in clean and track changed versions. That's allow all interested parties to quickly understand and reference each and all change since the document was last submitted. Where a document is partially changed, for example, the main body of the document is amended, but the appendices see the same then the whole document, including the appendices, needs to be submitted, submitted, otherwise we end up with confusion. Can I take an example in response to the section 51 of advice and acceptance, the applicants only revised the main body of the construction Environment Management Plan and didn't include its appendices in the resubmitted document, where, if you look at the guide to the application submitted with the application as 079, on PDF page 21 that indicates that the whole of the original document should be considered superseded. Which would if, which would also mean the appendices have been superseded. We think that's incorrect. So could you just have a look at that, please? And could you also have a look at look at it when the whole and any other documenting similarly, I can see this game particularly badly for the transport assess, transport assessment, with its 70 appendices, if you so. But could you please make sure that there are other if you make sure the whole document is resubmitted in due course, and there may be others. And just a spoiler alert, we picked up some other issues with the with some of the appendices as well, which you will get in the exact ex Q ones when they're published next week. So don't do it too quickly. Can I also to any other interested parties if you wish to use track, change and clean approach? We're very happy to do that, but there's no obligation on you to do so. We've also made a procedure decision for ask the applicant provided each deadline an updated status the applicant's examination Documents, Document to provide list of the most up to date status of the document submitted. We've already had the comment about some superseded documents. So does anybody else have any comments or queries about that. Thank you. Land rights tracker, procedural agenda six, the applicant is very useless. Pre application. Land rights negotiation tracker, AV, P, 02, 2d, however, this will be, need to be kept up to date. Should also include further information related to the examining, examination library references for the representations of the affected persons. We've made a procedural decision on that with the information set out in the form, hopefully that's straightforward. Applicant happy with that. Thank

you. Likewise, we've made a procedural decision to ask the applicant to maintain an examination issues tracker throughout the course of the examination has included such provision within the draft examination timetable, similar to the potential main issues for examination, AV, P, hyphen, 222-522-5225, the GCC what it should contain are set out in Annex after the rule six letter any queries about that eighthly, parties at this rates to everybody submit a summary and sign posting document towards the end of the examination. They should not be closings and might be given a planning public inquiry. Rather, they should sit out concisely the Party's position prior to the close of the examination, particularly where there are areas of disagreement. It should not bring seek to bring in new evidence, but rather signposts to us and the Secretary of State as to where we can find the relevant information previously submitted. We've had those in the past, and they've been very useful in writing up, writing up reports, particularly when they're myriad areas which aren't haven't been closed out. Does anybody have any comments on that? Thank you. Next on the agenda item, we've recorded additional submissions which we've accepted, the late representations by the national grid electricity distribution East Midlands PLC, and correspondence which was and revised the documents made response to Section 51 advice issued upon exceptions, but the application submitted by the applicant, applicants, any comments on those? There are a couple of additional matters which weren't in the rule six letter, which we would like to raise. Obviously, we will reiterate these in the rule eight letter. Since the rule six letter was published, the planning Inspectorate has issued revised guidance on the use of artificial intelligence, whilst we have some declarations of the use of AI, can we put all parties on notice that it's part of our written questions? We'll be asking all parties to confirm if and if so, where AI has been used and the tools used for its creation. You may wish to get ahead of matters by looking at the guidance sooner rather than later, and thus be in a better position to respond. We we know there are slightly different positions between the use of AI professionals and members of the public more generally. Clearly, if you're a member of the public and but but are subject to professional code of conduct, then the professional code of conduct would apply. For example, somebody living in dysworth who happened to be a chartered town planner and making representations would be covered by the Royal Town Planning Institute code of conduct. So they should therefore follow the professionals guidance in in the guidance from planning Inspectorate. I'm sure that this won't be necessary, but if a party does not declare the use of AI in any evidence submission where it's been used or removed evidence of AI authorship shuts as watermarks, we, as examining panel, reserve the right to reject the submission and could it and it could be considered to be unreasonable behaviour leading to an A cost award. So please declare it. Does anybody have any comments on use of AI?

 18:37

We've since we issued the rule six letter, we had a request from the Member of Parliament for North West Leicestershire, Amanda Hack MP, to be involved in the examination process. We're content to do that as another person. So she's been brought in under that hat, and we have made a procedural decision to that effect, I think that completes item five. Does anybody else have any further comments on any of the procedure decisions? No item six, any any other matters? Does anybody else have any of today? We haven't anything else raised. I don't think so. That completes our position for the morning. Thank you very much for your contributions, patience and participation today, a digital recording and transcript of this meeting will be added to the project pages of the planning infrastructure, national infrastructure website as soon as possible after the close of the meeting, the next session is this afternoon, at two o'clock for the compulsory acquisition hearing, the arrangements conference for those who are involved with that will open at half past one. It In the meantime, is now for me to formally close this preliminary meeting and look forward to seeing some of you this afternoon. Thank you.