



# Planning Inspectorate

**Application by SEGRO Properties Limited, for an order granting development consent for a scheme comprising the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2)**

**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**

## ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 1

**Date:** 11 March 2026

**Venue:** Hilton Hotel East Midlands Airport and MS Teams

## ACTION POINTS

AP No.	Action	Action By:	Response Due By:
5.	<p>To provide a written explanation setting out its justification for the view that the EMG1 development was 'substantially complete' in October 2024. This explanation should address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• how the concept of 'substantial completion' applies to a multi-phase development, including whether completion should be assessed building-by-building or at the point of overall site completion</li><li>• whether the absence of the authorised lower gantry cranes affects the assessment of substantial completion, and if so, how.</li></ul> <p>Interested parties are also invited to make comment</p>	<p>The applicants All Interested Parties</p>	<p>Deadline 1 (D1) Tuesday 7 April 2026</p>
6.	<p>To provide written submissions addressing the regulatory and policy framework relevant to the</p>	<p>The applicants</p>	<p>D1</p>

AP No.	Action	Action By:	Response Due By:
	<p>determination of the MCO application, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether the determination of the MCO should be undertaken against current legislative and policy standards (including environmental and aerodrome safety standards), and whether doing so may require consequential updates to elements of the original DCO</li> </ul>		
7.	<p>To provide a written note in relation to the highway works (Part 2 of Schedule 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)), including whether those works are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>necessary as a consequence of the commercial and business development in Part 1</li> <li>required in their own right due to existing and/ or future traffic conditions in the area absent the proposed development in part 1</li> <li>necessitated by any planning permission that may be forthcoming on the northern part of the site</li> <li>required in relation to other forthcoming developments</li> <li>in combination, whole of part, of the any of above or</li> <li>for any other identified reason.</li> </ol>	<p>The applicants National Highways (NH) Leicestershire County Council (LCC)</p>	D1
8.	<p>To provide written submissions addressing the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the EMG2 project as a whole, whether it should be considered under section 104, section 105, or a 'split' approach; and, if a split approach is considered appropriate, where and how the dividing line should properly be drawn.</li> </ol>	<p>The applicants All Interested Parties</p>	<p>D1  Deadline 2 Tuesday 21 April 2026 D2 (Only for '5<sup>th</sup> subpoint')</p>

AP No.	Action	Action By:	Response Due By:
	<p>2. Whether the distinction between s104 and s105 materially affects the SoS's decision-making in this case.</p> <p>3. How associated development should be treated.</p> <p>4. What the implications are of the Environmental Statement's structure when compared with the structure of the draft DCO, and how these two should be reconciled.</p> <p>5. If necessary, submission of revised draft DCO, draft EM and relevant and applicable ES documents</p>		
9.	<p>To explain the implications of EMG1 DCO article 5(2) on the DCO and MCO, to ensure that any planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA) would not result in either incompatibility with the EMG1 DCO</p>	<p>The applicants  North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC)</p>	D1
10.	<p>To assess the Millbrook Gas Fired Generating Station Order 2019 and its provisions modifying the Rookery South (Resource Recovery Facility) Order 2011, particularly the cross-order protective provisions.</p> <p>To consider whether similar drafting may be necessary or appropriate in this case and, if so, provide such provisions within the draft DCO and MCO.</p>	<p>The applicants</p>	D1
11.	<p>To ensure the updated MCO transport assessment is reflected across the ES particularly in relation to the air quality and lighting etc. Furthermore, each chapter of the ES should be reviewed and updated to ensure each application within the EMG2 project (the DCO application and the MCO application) is</p>	<p>The applicants</p>	D1

AP No.	Action	Action By:	Response Due By:
	assessed discretely and not just collectively as part of the EMG2 project as a whole.		
12.	To provide a written note on Freeport designation, with regards to how the proposed development meets the criteria to ensure the benefits are realised.	The applicants	D1
13.	To provide a note on detailing the construction programme and whether it is realistic and information about the EMG1 construction programme in its use as a proxy indicator.	The applicants	D1
14.	To provide a written note detailing the operational dependencies between the proposed development and existing rail freight interchange and the East Midlands Airport.	The applicants	D1
15.	<p>Note on the positioning and function of the carbon neutral campus which was part of SoS's s35 direction for the proposed development and how it would be secured within the dDCO and if not, why.</p> <p>More generally, the note should also explain the extent to which the contended benefits are likely to materialise in a free market economy, and whether the draft DCO and draft MCO need to contain requirements to secure such benefits and mitigate any market uncertainty.</p>	The applicants	D1
16.	To provide a technical analysis as to whether the highway works would be strategically important and support wider cumulative economic growth at other strategic/ additional sites.	The applicants	D1

AP No.	Action	Action By:	Response Due By:
17.	To provide contextual information about the relationship between plot 16 and High Speed 2 (HS2) and why it was effectively left as 'white land' within the EMG1 DCO (plans would be useful to illustrate this).	The applicants	D1
18.	To provide clarification on whether the development of the EMG2 site would affect the modelled and/ or surveyed traffic results for the EMG1 site, including how traffic flows between the rail freight interchange and EMG2 have been accounted for, and confirmation that no double-counting of traffic into the wider network occurs.	The applicants LCC	D1
19.	To clarify, with reference to paragraph 8.11 of the Highways Design Approach document <a href="#">[APP-221]</a> , what is meant by the statement that the A6 Kegworth bypass / A453 junction capacity improvement would 'cater for the additional development within the EMG1 site', and to explain how this relates to the MCO proposal.	The applicants	D1
20.	To confirm the position regarding the use of the EMGP1 zone as the most appropriate proxy for the EMFM Construction Traffic Forecasting assessment, given paragraph 2.3.4 of Appendix 74 of the Transport Assessment (TA) <a href="#">[APP-083]</a> states that there is no EMFM zone in the immediate vicinity of M1 Junction 24.	The applicants LCC NH	D1
21.	Current position and future implications for the proposed development in the context of dualling of the section of road north of the EMG2 site including mechanisms for delivery	The applicants LCC Prologis (Prologis UK Limited and/ or	For Prologis and LCC: D1  For applicants: D1 for explanation D2 for

AP No.	Action	Action By:	Response Due By:
		Prologis UK 121 Limited as appropriate)  EMIA (East Midlands International Airport Limited and/ or East Midlands Airport Property Investments (Industrial) Limited as appropriate)	inclusion of new requirement in dDCO
22.	To provide the road safety audits and responses with necessary amended drawings	The applicants	D1
23.	In table 3 of the TA <a href="#">[APP-080]</a> it is noted that percentage of employees driving alone to the EMG1 site has increased in 2023 and 2024 and the percentage of employees sharing cars has reduced.  Provide 2025 figures, and analysis of why the 2023/ 2024 change occurred, what measures have been introduced to reverse this, and any implications for the operation of the Sustainable Transport Strategy for EMG2.	The applicants	D1
24.	To provide an update on the Framework Travel Plan, including clarification on the intended duration of travel plans for individual units, how 'lifetime of the development' is to be interpreted, and how travel plan obligations would operate when building occupier changes one or more times.	The applicants	D1

AP No.	Action	Action By:	Response Due By:
25.	Submit new evidence to address the contended gaps as set out in relevant representations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• viability and funding evidence justifying the case for compulsory acquisition</li> <li>• socio-economic evidence assessing the likely significant environmental effects of preventing the delivery of the joint application</li> <li>• transport modelling evidence based on the latest PRTM model</li> </ul>	The applicants	D1