

**EAST MIDLANDS GATEWAY PHASE 2 –
EAST MIDLANDS GATEWAY RAIL FREIGHT
INTERCHANGE MATERIAL CHANGE**

Response to Deadline 1:

Summary of Written Representations

Leicestershire County Council

April 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: BC0410001/TR0510002

1.0 Summary of Written Representations

- 1.1 Leicestershire County Council's (LCC) Written Representation is submitted in response to Deadline 1 of the Examination for SEGRO Properties Ltd.'s application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) for East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2) and a Material Change Order (MCO) for East Midlands Gateway Phase 1.
- 1.2 LCC structures its concerns around the Examining Panel's principal issues.
- 1.3 On traffic and transport, LCC describes extensive engagement since 2022 through a Transport Working Group. LCC notes that the DCO application has evolved (to include an additional 100,000 sqm of mezzanine floorspace) and raises concern about the Applicant's approach to the assessment of this impact and an associated DCO requirement, which LCC does not agree is enforceable.
- 1.4 LCC welcomes supplemental testing using post-covid transport modelling (PRTM 2023) but reserves its position pending submission and outcomes.
- 1.5 LCC is generally content with elements of highway design on the Local Road Network, subject to final modelling and formal submission of drawings.
- 1.6 LCC seeks safeguarding of land along the EMG2 main site frontage with the A453 for future dualling.
- 1.7 LCC raises specific active travel and Public Right of Way concerns.
- 1.8 LCC requests that the Applicant identifies funding mechanisms for travel plan and public transport measures (preferably via a s106 agreement).
- 1.9 On materials and waste, LCC maintains that the Environmental Statement (ES) should be based on the Environment Agency's 2024 Waste Data Interrogator data. LCC also flags potential confusion between landfill and general capacity and requests re-wording of DCO requirements for the Site Waste Materials Management Plan.
- 1.10 On flood risk and drainage, LCC supports the general surface water strategy

but raises concerns with the DCO wording that commits only to submission of details rather than implementation of works.

- 1.11 On population and human health, LCC states health and equality conclusions are not robust because they rely on incomplete/unagreed transport modelling data, and the embedding of Health Impact Assessment content within the ES remains incomplete and unclear.
- 1.12 On ecology, LCC raises unresolved issues around skylark breeding habitat provision, requests further information submission on Biodiversity Net Gain, and seeks a more sensitive lighting scheme.
- 1.13 On heritage and archaeology, LCC is broadly satisfied with the Applicant's assessment and considers archaeological impacts can be mitigated through agreed measures secured by a DCO requirement.
- 1.14 Overall, LCC continues to engage proactively but highlights multiple outstanding matters to be resolved during the Examination.

Word count: 405