

Document DCO 8.4C / MCO 8.4C

Statement of Common Ground between SEGRO and Leicestershire County Council (relating to Archaeology)

APRIL 2026

The East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
and Highway Order 202X and The East Midlands Gateway
Rail Freight and Highway (Amendment) Order 202X

CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Parties to this SoCG	4
3. Structure of this SoCG	4
4. DCO Matters agreed Matters not agreed Matters under discussion	5
5. MCO Matters agreed Matters not agreed Matters under discussion	6
6. Conclusions	8
Signatures	8
Appendix – Record of Engagement	9

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 clause 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	<p>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.</p> <p>Together with an upgrade to the EMG1 substation and provision of a Community Park.</p>	<p>DCO Works Nos. 1 to 5 including Further Works as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).</p> <p>DCO Works Nos. 20 and 21 including relevant Further Works as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).</p>
Highway Works	<p>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.</p>	<p>DCO Works Nos. 6 to 19 including relevant Further Works as described in the draft DCO (Document DCO 3.1).</p>

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 another party.

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 archaeological advisors to the local planning authority.

2.3 A record of the engagement between the Applicant and LCC in relation to archaeology is set out in the Appendix to this SoCG.

3 Structure of this SoCG

3.1 This SoCG has been structured with two clearly defined sections. The first section considers matters relevant to the DCO and the second section considers matters relevant to the MCO. Where a particular matter is common to both the DCO and the MCO this is clearly stated and recorded in both sections.

3.2 The areas covered by this SoCG are as follows:

3.2.1 The methods employed for desktop data analysis and methods of impact assessment.

3.2.2 The scope and methodology of the programme of archaeological evaluation surveys.

3.2.3 The baseline characterisation formed from the desktop survey and programme of archaeological evaluation surveys.

3.2.4 Whether Archaeological impacts have been appropriately assessed and identified.

3.2.5 The scope of archaeological mitigation measures required.

3.2.6 The content of an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) document.

3.3 This SoCG records those matters which are agreed and, if appropriate, any matters that are not agreed and still under discussion between the Applicant and Leicestershire County Council in relation to archaeology.

3.4 Where this SoCG is identified as a draft, some matters may still be under discussion. If appropriate, a final version that confirms the final positions of the parties on relevant matters will be submitted before the close of the Examination.

4 DCO

Matters agreed		
Ref	Matter	RAG status and any additional comments
4.1	The data from the archaeological evaluation surveys made available to facilitate the characterisation of the archaeological baseline environment has been collected and incorporated into the archaeological assessment exercise.	
4.2	The desk based, geophysical surveys, fieldwalking, geoarchaeological monitoring, and trial trenching evaluations undertaken to date were undertaken in line with current best practice and the appropriate professional standards and guidance, and that their reporting represents an accurate reflection of the work undertaken.	
4.3	Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to characterise the archaeological baseline environment for the purposes of EIA within Chapter 12: Heritage.	
4.4	The methodologies used within Chapter 12: Heritage are appropriate for assessing the potential archaeological impacts for the Scheme.	
4.5	The potential impacts identified within Chapter 12: Heritage represent a comprehensive list of potential impacts in relation to archaeology.	
4.6	No significant adverse residual effects (in EIA terms) on below-ground archaeology remains are predicted to arise from the Scheme alone or cumulatively.	

4.7	The archaeological mitigation measures identified within Chapter 12: Heritage are appropriate in their location and extent, and ensure significant effects are avoided.	
4.8	The wording of Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (Document 3.1) is considered appropriate and agreed.	
Matters not agreed		
4.9	There are no matters of disagreement between the Applicant and LCC	
Matters still under discussion		
4.10	The content of the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) prepared by the Applicant and submitted to the Archaeological Officer is considered, in principle, to be appropriate in order to inform a programme of archaeological mitigation measures to be undertaken post-consent subject to further discussions as to potential amendments to the cope of works proposed.	

5 MCO

Matters agreed		
Ref	Matter	RAG status and any additional comments
5.1	The desk based assessment undertaken to date was undertaken in line with current best practice and the appropriate professional standards and guidance, and that their reporting represents an accurate reflection of the work undertaken.	
5.2	Sufficient primary and secondary data has been collated to characterise the archaeological baseline environment for the purposes of EIA within Chapter 12: Heritage.	
5.3	The methodologies used within Chapter 12: Heritage are appropriate for assessing the potential archaeological impacts for the Scheme.	

5.4	The potential impacts identified within Chapter 12: Heritage represent a comprehensive list of potential impacts in relation to archaeology.	
5.5	No significant adverse residual effects (in EIA terms) on below-ground archaeology remains are predicted to arise from the of the Scheme alone or cumulatively.	
5.6	Following the implementation of mitigation measures associated with the MCO Scheme comprising a programme of archaeological works, it is considered that there will be no significant effects upon archaeological receptors. A programme of works will offset the physical loss of potential archaeological remains within the MCO Order Limits. The programme of works will be secured by Requirement 13 in the consented East Midlands Gateway Phase1 DCO (EMG1 DCO).	
5.7	The mitigation measures will be secured through the discharge of requirements process under the EMG1 DCO which will require an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) to be approved (see Requirement 13 of the EMG1 DCO).	
5.8	The wording of Requirement 13 of the EMG1 DCO is considered appropriate and agreed.	
Matters not agreed		
5.9	There are no matters of disagreement between the Applicant and LCC	
Matters still under discussion		
5.10	The content of the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) prepared by the Applicant and submitted to the Archaeological Officer is considered, in principle, to be appropriate in order to inform a programme of archaeological mitigation measures to be undertaken post-consent, subject to further discussions as to the potential amendments to the scope of works proposed.	

6 Conclusions

- 6.1 The Applicant and LCC confirm that all archaeological matters under discussion in relation to the Scheme have been agreed as recorded in the tables in sections 4 and 5 above.
- 6.2 The Applicant and LCC will continue to engage with each other as necessary during the Examination processes with a view to narrowing and resolving any issues that may subsequently be raised.

SIGNATURES:

On behalf of the Applicant:

.....
Signature

.....
Name

.....
Position

On behalf of Leicestershire County Council:

.....
Signature

.....
Name

.....
Position

APPENDIX

RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

Date	Form of engagement	Summary of matters dealt with
April 2022	Email	<p>Archaeological Officer is provided with a copy of the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a geophysical survey at the EMG2 main site, and also informed that an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) is in production.</p> <p>Archaeological Officer approves geophysical survey WSI, and requests that subsequent evaluation trial trenching be supported by fieldwalking and deposit modelling.</p>
June 2022	Email and telephone	<p>Copy of the Archaeological DBA and geophysical survey report provided to the Archaeological Officer, in addition to a plan depicting a proposed scope of trial trenching.</p> <p>Archaeological Officer emphasises that fieldwalking and deposit modelling will be required to support any proposed trial trenching, and that the proposed scope of trial trenching will need to be revised. Magnetic Gradient <u>overview</u> plan within the geophysical survey report requested. Archaeological Officer requests the scope of trial trenching to consist of a 2% sample size, plus contingency, to the north of Hyam's Lane, and a 5% sample size to the south of Hyam's Lane.</p>
July 2022	Email and telephone	<p>Agreed with the Archaeological Officer that a programme of archaeological evaluation at the EMG2 main site would include fieldwalking and deposit as well as trial trenching. It is requested that the scope of trial trenching should consist of a 1%-2% sample size (plus contingency) to the</p>

		<p>north of Hyam's Lane, and a 3% sample size (plus 1% contingency) to the south of Hyam's Lane. Also requested that fieldwalking be focused solely to the north of Hyam's Lane.</p> <p>A response from the Archaeological Officer regarding the scope of trial trenching is sort at regular intervals via email and telephone during the month.</p>
August 2022	Email and telephone	<p>Archaeological Officer agrees that 1%-2% sample size (plus contingency) to the north of Hyam's Lane is acceptable, although recommends that a 4% sample size (plus 1% contingency) to the south of Hyam's Lane.</p> <p>The trial trenching scope proposed by the Archaeological officer is accepted.</p> <p>A WSI and programme for trial trenching, fieldwalking, and geoarchaeological monitoring to inform deposit modelling at the EMG2 main site is issued to the Archaeological Officer. The WSI contains the methodology to fieldwalk all areas to the north of Hyam's Lane and sample of the areas to the south of Hyam's Lane.</p> <p>Archaeological Officer confirms they are happy for the trial trenching and fieldwalking to commence prior to full approval of the WSI.</p>
September 2022	Email, telephone, and meetings on site	<p>Archaeological Officer updated via telephone and email as to initial fieldwork results.</p> <p>Archaeological Officer approves the WSI with supporting technical comments.</p>

		At site meeting Archaeological Officer approves trial trenches currently open to be backfilled, and that an ongoing programme of remotely monitoring progress of the trial trenching can be implemented. Ongoing update emails are provided to the Archaeological Officer and responses received.
October 2022	Email, telephone, and meetings on site	Remote liaison with the Archaeological Officer ongoing throughout October including provision of provisional fieldwalking results and an additional site visit by the Archaeological Officer. Archaeological Officer happy for the programme of evaluation works as set out within the approved WSI to be concluded.
June 2023	Email	Trial trenching, fieldwalking, and geoarchaeological deposit modelling report issued to the Archaeological Officer. No response received.
September 2023	Email	Archaeological Officer requests that copies of the original trial trenching, fieldwalking, and geoarchaeological deposit modelling reports are re-issued. This is actioned. No further response received.
July 2024	Email and telephone	Archaeological Officer informed that a DCO application for the site would be progressed.
September 2024	DCO Scoping Response	The Archaeological Officer recommended that baseline assessments be submitted which assess potential impacts upon both built heritage assets, archaeological assets, and historic landscape. This assessment should use the results from the previous programme of archaeological evaluation at EMG1 and the EMG2 main site. The need for any further archaeological evaluation required should be identified.

November 2024	Email	Archaeological Officer informed that their DCO scoping response has been reviewed and asked if any recent archaeological work had been undertaken within the immediate area which should be considered within the baseline assessment.
December 2024	Email	Updated Archaeological DBA issued to the Archaeological Officer. Archaeological Officer requests that full Ordnance Survey map coverage should be provided within the Archaeological DBA.
January 2025	Email	Archaeological Officer informed regarding the upcoming round of DCO consultations. No response.
February 2025	Email	An updated version of the Archaeological DBA is issued to the Archaeological Officer which contains the requested Ordnance Survey mapping. No response.
March 2025	Email	Further comments requested from the Archaeological Officer. No response.
April 2025	Email and telephone	Plan and summary scope relating to a proposed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) for the proposed DCO/MCO scheme is issued to the Archaeological Officer for comment. This is followed up with additional emails and telephone calls. No response received.
June 2025	Email	Further comments requested from the Archaeological Officer. No response.

September 2025	Email and telephone	Further comments requested from the Archaeological Officer. No response.
November 2025	Email	Archaeological Officer informed that the DCO/MCO applications were re-submitted and that all documents will be available for consultation shortly.
		[To be updated]

DRAFT