



Applications by:

1. **SEGRO Properties Limited, for an order granting development consent order for a Scheme comprising the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2) Works**
2. **SEGRO (EMG) Limited, for an order making material changes to the previously approved East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange and Highways Order 2016**

The Examining Panel's third written questions and requests for information (ExQ3): Issued on 14 July 2026

Responses are due by deadline 6: 28 July 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Panel's (ExP) third written questions and requests for information – ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex C** to the Rule 6 Letter dated 10 February 2026. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExP would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 3 (indicating that it is from ExQ3) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

You should respond to the questions by using the **Have your say** function on the project pages of the National Infrastructure website

- for the DCO at [East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 - Project information](#)
- for the MCO at [East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Material Change - Project information](#)

and selecting 'Responses to Examining Panel's Third Written Questions (ExQ3)' when asked.



If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should download a copy of the Microsoft Word version of the document, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by selecting 'Upload files'.

Microsoft Word version: <https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR0510002-000958>



Abbreviations used:

Applicant/ Applicants	SEGRO Properties Limited and/ or SEGRO (EMG) Limited
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
BREEM	Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method
CEMP	Construction Environment Management Plan
D	Deadline
DCO	Development Consent Order
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
dMCO	Draft Material Change Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMA	East Midlands Airport
EMCCA	East Midlands Combined County Authority
EMF	East Midlands Freeport
EMG2	The application for the DCO
EMIA	East Midlands International Airport Limited and/ or East Midlands Airport Property Investments (Industrial) Limited as appropriate
ES	Environmental Statement
EV	Electric Vehicle
ExP	Examining Panel

HE	Historic England
IP	Interested Party
JRC	Joint Radio Company
LCC	Leicestershire County Council
LONI	Letter of No Impediment
MCO	Material Change Order
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
NE	Natural England
NH	National Highways
NNNPS	National Networks National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
NWLDC	North West Leicestershire District Council
P-CEMP	Phase Construction Environment Management Plan
Prologis	Prologis UK Limited and/ or Prologis UK 121 Limited as appropriate
PRTM	Pan Regional Traffic Model
RR	Relevant Representation
SEGRO	SEGRO Properties Limited and/ or SEGRO (EMG) Limited as appropriate



SoS	Secretary of State
-----	--------------------

SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems
------	------------------------------

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-001]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: [East Midlands Gateway 2 and Material Change examination library](#).

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ3 Q1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index	
1. General and cross-topic questions.....6	
1.0 Consideration of application – general matters.....6	
2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development6	
3. Agriculture and soils.....6	
4. Air quality and emissions6	
5. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment).....6	
5.0 Non-Habitats Regulations matters6	
6. Climate change and energy7	
7. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land rights considerations.....8	
8. The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP5-008D]9	
8.1 Articles.....9	
8.2 Schedule 1 – Authorised development9	
8.3 Schedule 2 – Requirements9	
8.4 Schedule 13 – Protective provisions9	
9. The draft Material Change Order (dMCO) [REP5-007M]9	
10. Ground Conditions10	
11. Historic environment.....10	
12. Landscape and visual10	
13. Major accidents and disasters and other safety risks10	
14. Materials and waste..... 10	
15. Need and alternatives..... 10	
16. Noise and vibration 11	
17. Population and Human Health..... 11	
18. Socio-economic effects 12	
19. Traffic and Transport..... 12	
20. Utilities..... 12	
21. Water Environment..... 12	
22. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP4-018D] 13	

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic questions		
1.0 Consideration of application – general matters		
Q1.0.1	All IPs	National Planning Policy Framework All parties are requested to consider the draft National Planning Policy Framework published in December 2025 and set out if and how any changes in government policy from the December 2024 version of the National Planning Policy Framework, if the December 2025 version were published, would affect the consideration of the proposed developments. If an updated National Planning Policy Framework is published after the issue of ExQ3 but before deadline 6, then please consider the updated framework and make submissions accordingly.
Q1.0.2	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council	Neighbourhood Plan The ExP notes from the revised Planning Statement that the Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan has now progressed further through examination with modifications proposed by the Examiner before the plan goes forward to a referendum. Could the Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council please provide a copy of the Examiner's report, and advise as to the latest situation.
2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development		
Q2.0.1	The applicants NH LCC	Mezzanines/ internal floorspace <u>Note:</u> Please also see the relevant ExP's proposed change to these requirements. The ExP notes the response to AP 66 in the applicants' 'Applicants' Response to Deadline 4 Submissions' [REP5-033] in relation to NWLDC that "following further engagement with [NH], is it anticipated that the requirement may not be required." (a) Should this be the situation, then the applicants', NH and LCC should set out clearly and fully why this would be the case. (b) In any event, should the ExP's proposed change to this requirement be imposed to ensure that no additional internal floorspace is provided, as the provision of internal floorspace would not represent 'development' and without this, it is possible that the effects which have not been assessed could occur?
3. Agriculture and soils		
Q3.0.1	The applicants Natural England	Soil Management Plan – cumulative effects Please can the applicants and NE confirm whether agreement has been reached relating to the contents of the updated Soil Management Plan to reflect the assessment of cumulative effects on the soil resource.
Q3.0.2	The applicants	Soil Management Plan Please can the applicants confirm whether the NE advice on the soil management measures has been included in an updated Soil Management Plan.
4. Air quality and emissions		
Q4.0.1	The applicants LCC	PRTM 2023 The Statement of Commonality [REP5-036] sets out that there are a number of areas where NWLDC have SoCGs agreed subject to confirmation from LCC about PRTM 2023 modelling. Can LCC and the applicants provide detailed up to date positions on the PRTM 2023 modelling insofar as it is preventing the air quality SoCG (and any other SoCGs) with NWLDC from being agreed. Particularly, the ExP would like LCC to set out why the technical notes submitted with the SoCGs do not resolve the issues, and what steps the applicants could take to bring about a resolution.
5. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment)		
5.0 Non-Habitats Regulations matters		
Q5.0.1	The applicants	Biodiversity net gain guidance The applicants are asked to comment on the following documents published on 2 June 2026 and to set out how they relate to its biodiversity net gain (BNG) proposals. Biodiversity net gain: nationally significant infrastructure projects Biodiversity net gain statements for nationally significant infrastructure projects

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
		The ExP asks the applicants to set out how their proposals compare and whether, if the applications had been submitted after 2 November 2026, they would comply with the guidance and whether anything in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report [REP3-041] would need amending or adding to in order to be in compliance with the recently published guidance on BNG.
Q5.0.2	The applicants	Air quality standing advice In relation to the applicants' response to Q5.0.3 of ExQ2 [REP4-036] please can they provide further details that demonstrate compliance with the air quality standing advice. In doing so please set out how the requirements within each step of the standing advice has been followed. Furthermore, please can the applicants explain how the ES demonstrates compliance with paragraphs 5.61, 5.62 and 5.63 of the NNNPS and associated statutory duties? For example, would the proposed development's air quality impacts have an adverse effect on SSSIs or irreplaceable habitats and would the relevant exceptions apply, and statutory duties be complied with?
Q5.0.3	The applicants	Effect on badgers The applicants responded to Q5.0.4 of ExQ2 [REP4-036] explaining that the details being requested by Natural England primarily relate to post-consent license applications rather than matters that affect the conclusions of the [ES] or the decision making process. Natural England also responded to Q5.0.4 of ExQ2 [REP4-091] stating that the [ES] should take account of the impacts on species. Based on the latest Risk and Issues Log [REP4-090] and SoCG [REP4-054] and the aforementioned responses to Q5.0.4 of ExQ2 [PD-022] , whilst the ExP agrees some matters can be deferred to the licensing stage, the ExP is not clear that all of the matters are for the licensing stage alone. For example, referring to NE25 of the Risk and Issues Log [REP4-090] , it is not clear why the location of the sustainable drainage system and footpaths relative to the badger setts and the risk of flooding and disturbance should not be addressed in the ES. These appear to be matters of principle and parameter design rather than matters of detail design that might be secured by requirements in the dDCO and addressed under the future management documents (P-CEMP etc.) that in turn would inform future license applications. In order to ensure that the ExP and SoS have sufficient information to take a view either way, and using the Risk and Issues Log [REP4-090] as a reference, please can the applicants submit the following additional details and justification: NE25 and NE26– updated Community Park Plan [REP4-015D] showing buffer distances between existing natural badger setts and proposed artificial badger setts and sustainable drainage systems and public footpaths. The impact on badgers from flood risk and recreational disturbance and how this would be mitigated during construction and operation. The applicants should submit the relevant information in a confidential manner, consistent with previous submissions relating to sensitive protected species.
Q5.0.4	The applicants	Local nature recovery strategies Paragraph 4.30 of the NNNPS sets out that applicants should have regard to appropriate guidance and plans such as local nature recovery strategies. Please can the applicants explain where they have had regard to the relevant local nature recovery strategy in this case, including Leicester City Tech Guidance (2021) and associated SuDS standards. If regard has not been had to the relevant local nature recovery strategy, and associated guidance, please justify accordingly.
Q5.0.5	The applicants Natural England	SoCG with Natural England Notwithstanding any overlapping questions elsewhere within ExQ3, please can Natural England and the applicants provide a detailed up to date position clarifying what is preventing 4.9, 4.26, 4.27 and 5.8 within the SoCG [REP4-054] from being agreed?
6. Climate change and energy		
Q6.0.1	The applicants	Seventh Carbon Budget 2038-2042 The Carbon Budget Order 2026 (SI 2026 No. 695) came into force on 26 June 2026. The applicants are asked to consider this and undertake an appropriate analysis updating the ES as necessary.
Q6.0.2	The applicants NWLDC	Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) The dDCO [REP5-008D] secures BREEAM. To what extent is this comparable to the Net Zero Carbon Building Standard? Further, what does the NNNPS or other important and relevant policy or guidance require in terms of minimum sustainable building standards, and is the level of BREEAM secured in the dDCO consistent with such requirements?

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
7.	Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land rights considerations	
Q7.0.1	The applicants	Private rights on land controlled by applicants The ExP notes (item 2.3 in ‘Applicants’ Post Hearing Submissions (OFH1, CAH2 and ISH3’ in respect of CAH2)) that the applicants have reverted to the original drafting of the dDCO in respect of private rights in relation to article 24. The ExP also notes that the third party interests are set out in Part 2 of the Book of Reference [APP-021D]. The applicants are asked to set out in a table, by individual plot, party and interest, what effect the retention of the interest would have on the deliverability of the proposed development. The applicants should ensure that as much information as possible is provided so that the ExP and SoS can be satisfied whether complying with the interest could or would affect the deliverability of the proposed development. If specific negotiations have taken place with the beneficiary of the right to acquire the right or to allow the development to proceed, these should also be set out. Where the third party is “unknown”, the applicants should explicitly explain how they would ensure that the third party right would not affect the deliverability of the proposed development. The applicants are also asked to set out what sum (financial) has been included to acquire any necessary rights in the viability model, explaining how that figure has been derived.
Q7.0.2	The applicant All affected parties	Revised guidance on the compulsory purchase process On 17 June 2026 MHCLG published updated Guidance on the compulsory purchase process. The applicant and all affected persons are invited to make comment on the changes between that and the previous January 2025 version insofar as they relate to the proposed development and the associated request for compulsory acquisition.
Q7.0.3	The applicant Prologis EMIA NWLDC	Possible take over of SEGRO PLC by Prologis Inc The ExP is aware that Prologis Inc has made a bid to take over SEGRO PLC, and thus the two applicant companies, which has been, at least initially, rejected by the SEGRO PLC board. The ExP also understands that under UK Stock Market Takeover Rules, a formal bid has to be made by 22 July 2026 at the latest. (a) Prologis and the applicants are asked to confirm the situation on 28 July 2026, setting out the position of the parties, along with the timeframe for any bid. (b) Prologis and the applicants are asked to set out, as far as they are able, their positions in respect of the application for development consent, including compulsory acquisition and funding, and whether this bid amends their positions in any way. If so, they are also asked to set this out as fully and clearly as possible. (c) EMIA are asked to confirm its position in respect of the compulsory acquisition of its interests as of 28 July 2026 in light of the above and whether the bid makes a difference to its non-statutory undertaker position. (d) Prologis and the applicants are asked, as part of their submissions at deadlines 7 (1 September 2026) and 8 (9 September 2026) to set out the legal situation of the two applicant companies at those dates (should this change on 10 September 2026 this should also be supplied to the ExP) and to update the ExP as to any implications for the consideration of the applications, including compulsory acquisition and funding. (e) EMIA is also asked to confirm its statutory undertaker position. (f) NWLDC, EMIA and Prologis are also asked to confirm the situation as regards the Joint Application as of both 28 July and 9/ 10 September.
Q7.0.4	EMIA	Prologis Land In paragraph 27 of Annex L to the ‘Applicants’ Response to Deadline 2 and 3 Submissions’ [REP4-033] it is stated that the applicant was an “underbidder” for the Prologis Land. Could EMIA confirm whether the applicants were ‘underbidders’ in the full sense of the term, that is at a lower price than that paid by Prologis. The ExP is not interested in the amount, rather whether it was less than the applicants’ bid, or whether it was in different terms, and if so, the nature of those terms.
Q7.0.5	The applicants Prologis EMIA	Viability In Annex 7A to the ‘Applicants’ Response to Examining Panel’s Second Written Questions’ [REP4-036] in the entry for 9 March 2026 it is noted that the applicants’ suggested a meeting to update Prologis “on progress in getting landowner consent to release terms of its Option Agreement”. Given how the sentence is drafted, the ExP assumes that this relates to land in which the applicants have an interest. Could the applicants confirm whether this interpretation is correct.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
		The entry also “suggests a meeting”, but it is not clear whether this took place. Could all three parties confirm. Finally, assuming the ExP’s interpretation of the sentence is correct, it is reasonable that this will affect the £225,000 (with inflation) per acre utilised in the applicants’ valuation exercise. Could the applicants set out the implications of this in his regard.
Q7.0.6	The applicants NWLDC LCC Castle Donington Parish Council EMA National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc	Plots 2/18, 2/20, 2/23 and 2/25 Could the applicants please explain why it needs to compulsorily acquire all interests in these plots and why Work 19 could not be delivered by the temporary possession of land and permanent acquisition of rights? As NWLDC, LCC, Castle Donington Parish Council, EMA and National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc all have interests in these plots they are also invited to comment.
8. The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP5-008D]		
8.1 Articles		
The ExP has no further questions on this topic at this time.		
8.2 Schedule 1 – Authorised development		
The ExP has no further questions on this topic at this time.		
8.3 Schedule 2 – Requirements		
Q8.3.1	The applicants	Requirement 7 - EV Charging points Should the electrical charging points have a rating, for example, 7kW or 22kW?
Q8.3.2	The applicants NWLDC	NWLDC SoCG Noting 3.4 of the Overarching SoCG [REP4-039] between the applicants and NWLDC, please can the parties set out or direct the ExP to their latest respective positions on the requirements listed and explain why these cannot yet be agreed.
8.4 Schedule 13 – Protective provisions		
Q8.4.1	EMA	Protective Provisions in favour of EMA In its document ‘Applicants’ Response to Deadline 4 Submissions’ [REP5-033] the applicants state “the protective provisions included in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 5 represent the wording proposed by the Applicants which aligns with the proposed conditions approved by EMIA for the Joint Application, suitably adapted to apply to the DCO Scheme. The Applicants await reasoned justification why the DCO Scheme should be subject to more stringent and onerous requirements.” EMA are requested to provide a copy of the proposed conditions recommended by EMIA for the Joint Application. The ExP notes in the draft SoCG between the applicants and EMA [REP5-048] that “EMA would typically expect the level of detail agreed in terms of operational safety matters to be resolved at reserved matters stage for those proposals. EMG2 is a development consent order, meaning the level of detail to be secured in the terms of the consent must be negotiated and secured now, prior to determination of the application”. However, the decision of the Supreme Court in <i>C G Fry & Son Limited v SoSHCLG</i> [2025] UKSC 35 makes clear that conditions of this type should be finalised at the grant of permission stage; in the case of the Joint Application or Isley Woodhouse developments meaning the outline stage. Therefore, the conditions/ requirements for all the projects should effectively be the same, subject to any variations due to specific site location or other project specific matter. Other than amendment for a development consent order, should EMA seek different protective provisions for this proposal, EMA should set out in a ‘provision by provision’ basis why alternative provisions different are required from those sort on the Joint Application and Isley Woodhouse application.
9. The draft Material Change Order (dMCO) [REP5-007M]		
Q9.0.1	The applicants	Article 2(21) - EV Charging points Should the electrical charging points have a rating, for example, 7kW or 22kW?

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
Q9.0.2	EMA	Protective Provisions in favour of EMA In its document 'Applicants' Response to Deadline 4 Submissions' [REP5-033] the applicants state “the protective provisions included in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 5 represent the wording proposed by the Applicants which aligns with the proposed conditions approved by EMIA for the Joint Application, suitably adapted to apply to the MCO Scheme. The Applicants await reasoned justification why the MCO Scheme should be subject to more stringent and onerous requirements.” EMA are requested to provide a copy of the proposed conditions recommended by EMIA for the Joint Application. The ExP notes in the draft SoCG between the applicants and EMA [REP5-048] that “EMA would typically expect the level of detail agreed in terms of operational safety matters to be resolved at reserved matters stage for those proposals. EMG2 is a development consent order, meaning the level of detail to be secured in the terms of the consent must be negotiated and secured now, prior to determination of the application”. However, the decision of the Supreme Court in <i>C G Fry & Son Limited v SoSHCLG</i> [2025] UKSC 35 makes clear that conditions of this type should be finalised at the grant of permission stage, in the case of the Joint Application or Isley Woodhouse developments meaning the outline stage. Therefore, the conditions/ requirements for all the projects should effectively be the same, subject to any variations due to specific site location or other project specific matter. Other than amendment for a material change order, should EMA seek different protective provisions for this proposal, EMA should set out in a ‘provision by provision’ basis why alternative provisions are required different from those sort on the Joint Application and Isley Woodhouse application.
10. Ground conditions		
The ExP has no further questions on this topic at this time.		
11. Historic environment		
The ExP has no further questions on this topic at this time.		
12. Landscape and visual		
Q12.0.1	The applicants	Viewpoints In the 'Applicants' Response to Deadline 4 Submissions' [REP5-033] in commenting on Protect Diseworth’s representations on viewpoints, in point 29 the respond “the applicants note the response”. However, in points 30 to 35 is stated “see response to point 29 above” which would imply a longer and more comprehensive response to point 29. Could the applicants please confirm the situation.
13. Major accidents and disasters and other safety risks		
Q13.0.1	The applicants EMIA	Aerodrome safeguarding The ExP’s understanding is that requirement 33 in the dDCO [REP5-008D] is now fully drafted. The ExP also notes EMIA reserves its position on the Operational Environmental Management Plan in relation to aerodrome safeguarding. In this context, should requirement 33 require the local planning authority to consult EMIA as part of approval process?
14. Materials and waste		
Q14.0.1	The applicants LCC	Waste monitoring The SoCG between LCC and the applicants submitted at D5 records that the only remaining matter under discussion relates to monitoring of waste types and quantities during construction (matter 4.8 and 5.7). Please clarify whether agreement has now been reached on the proposed monitoring arrangements. If not, please identify precisely what remains outstanding, including when and how monitoring will be undertaken, to whom the information will be reported, and whether any amendment to the CEMP, Site Waste Management and Materials Plan or draft DCO is required to secure those arrangements.
15. Need and alternatives		
Q15.0.1	The applicants	Alternatives Why was the alternatives site search not conducted on a more regional scale in the context of East Midlands Combined County Authority's (EMCCA) and is the scope of the alternatives site search ultimately too localised given the cross boundary nature of the freeport? Please can the applicants explain their approach in this regard and whether EMCCA were consulted or otherwise engaged as part of the DCO application process.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
Q15.0.2	The applicants	Regional need In relation to the Iceni Projects Limited report [REP1-126] , please can the applicants clarify whether it is sufficiently granular to demonstrate the scale and immediacy of need for EMG2 in this particular location. Or whether it merely demonstrates a broader level of need that could be delivered regionally across multiple sites, rather on one site alone? Please can the applicants clarify the extent to which the report is based on projections, and whether the use of projections could overstate future demand?
Q15.0.3	NWLDC	Local need The applicants set out in their post hearing submissions [REP1-052] that the Iceni Projects Limited report [REP1-126] demonstrates a need for 3,969,400m ² of additional floorspace for strategic B8 development over the 23 year forecast period, weighted towards NWLDC where there is a 1,000,000m ² unmet need. Consequently, the ExP notes around 30% would be met by EMG2 over the coming years. This would leave around 70% of the unmet need to be addressed as part of the emerging local plan. In this context, please can NWLDC explain how EMG2 would result in over delivery?
Q15.0.4	The applicants NWLDC	Policy Ec2(2) NWLDC in their LIR [REP1-103] and responses to ExQ1 [REP1-106] state that the proposed development does not comply with policy Ec2(2). The applicants subsequently responded [REP2-031] and [REP2-032] . However, this disagreement does not seem to be reflected in any of the SoCGs between the parties. Please can NWLDC and the applicants update the SoCGs with their latest positions on this issue. Furthermore, can the parties also consider Policy Ec2(2)(c) and the extent to which the proposed development would affect the amenities of any nearby residential properties (such as those within Diseworth) or the wider environment and the implications in terms of policy compliance.
16. Noise and vibration		
Q16.0.1	The applicant	Construction noise management The applicant's response to ExQ2 Q16.0.2 explains that each P-CEMP would include construction noise trigger thresholds, monitoring arrangements, complaint investigation procedures, escalation processes, identification of affected properties and response measures. Please identify the specific provisions within the current CEMP and/or the draft DCO which secure these matters. If these matters are intended to be developed only at P-CEMP stage, please explain how the draft DCO ensures that those minimum requirements will be included within each P-CEMP.
17. Population and Human Health		
Q17.0.1	The applicant LCC	Updated modelling and SoCG matters The Population and Human Health SoCG between the applicant and LCC states that several matters remain under discussion following the applicant's Population and Human Health Technical Note. • Please can the applicants confirm whether they intend to provide any further update to ES chapter 17 and/ or appendix 17C before the close of the examination to address LCC's outstanding concerns; • if not, identify precisely where in the examination documents the applicant says the integrated re-evaluation requested by LCC is already provided, including signposting to the relevant parts of ES chapter 17, appendix 17C, the technical note and related noise / air quality / transport material; and • provide a short schedule showing, for each transport modelling dependent determinant (transport/access, air quality, noise/vibration and diet/nutrition), how the updated modelling has been considered, whether any mitigation conclusions change, and how vulnerable groups including Gypsy and Traveller receptors have been considered. LCC is invited to confirm whether the information provided would be sufficient to resolve the matters currently identified as under discussion in the SoCG, or to identify the minimum further information still required. Please also clarify whether section 6.1 of the SoCG [REP5-042] should be corrected, given the matters marked as “under discussion” in sections 4 and 5.
Q17.0.2	The applicants LCC	PRTM2023 modelling The ExP notes that the some of the SoCGs state that several matters remain under discussion pending LCC's consideration of the PRTM2023 modelling updates and associated technical note. Please can LCC confirm its current position on the updated modelling insofar as it relates to Population and Human Health and other areas if relevant, including whether the applicant's technical note satisfactorily demonstrates the implications of the updated modelling for the ES chapter assessment. If not, please identify the specific remaining concerns and the minimum further information required to resolve them. The applicant may comment.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
18.	Socio-economic effects	
Q18.0.1	EMF NWLDC	Retained business rates In relation to the East Midlands Freeport (EMF) response to Q18.0.2 and Q18.0.8 [REP4-070D], the ExP notes that it expects around £288M from the EMG2 sites south of Hyams Lane up to 2048. Firstly, please can EMF clarify if this relates to the entirety of the EMG2 main site to the north and south of Hyam's Lane, or just land to the south. Furthermore, please clarify the distinction between government reimbursement of business rates relief and retained rates. For example, does the £288M retained business rates to 2048 include both the rates that are reimbursed by government and the rates that would be payable up to 2048 once rate relief ends? Comments from NWLDC are also invited.
19.	Traffic and Transport	
Q19.0.1	The applicants NH LCC	Co-located office functions The applicants are asked to explain demonstrate how a “co-located office function”, which could be, within an eventual individual planning unit (please refer back to earlier discussion on “substantial completion”) part of a mixed use also incorporating storage and distribution uses or advanced manufacturing uses or a combination of all three, has been considered in relation to the traffic generation assessment of the proposed development. NH and LCC are also requested to comment on this.
Q19.0.2	The applicants NH LCC NWLDC	Advanced manufacturing It its proposed changes to the DCO the ExP as set out that 20% of the total gross floorspace provided as part of the authorised development shall be for advanced manufacturing use. Should, for example, it be possible to let more than 20% of the gross floorspace as advanced manufacturing the ExP is also concerned to ensure that the total of advanced manufacturing does not result in additional effects that have not been assessed. The applicants, NH, LCC and NWLDC are asked to consider mechanism(s) to ensure that no additional effects not assessed occur.
20.	Utilities	
Q20.0.1	The applicants	Microwave/ radio link infrastructure In response to ExQ2 20.0.2 [REP4-036] the applicants indicate a proposal for a direct, ethernet connection between the Pegasus Business Park and Bondwood Radio facility to overcome the objection from the Joint Radio Company and National Grid Electricity Distribution. Could the applicants signpost where this would be secured in the dDCO, or if necessary, make adequate provision.
Q20.0.2	The applicants	Proposed public footpath and cycle track In the changes to the proposed development consent order introduced at deadline 5, the applicants, in response to queries from LCC, have ensured that the cycle tracks proposed would also incorporate a public footpath. Could the applicants please provide a typical drawing, both plan and section, showing how this would be laid out to ensure that there is no conflict between these uses.
21.	Water Environment	
Q21.0.1	The applicants	Sustainable drainage system design and silt management The original construction management framework for the EMG1 DCO is not before the ExP as part of the examination. Consequently, it is not clear whether silt management during construction has been secured by the dMCO in the same way as the dDCO secures silt management as part of the CEMP [REP4-018D]. As such, please can the applicants update the dMCO accordingly.
Q21.0.2	The applicants	Abnormal flood events Whilst not originally directed to them, please can the applicants provide a response to Q21.0.1 of ExQ2 [PD-022]. For clarity, the ExP wishes to understand whether any uncertainty about the causes of flooding in Kegworth means EMG2 should take a particularly precautionary approach to flood risk within the EMG2 drainage catchment, and strengthen EMG2 drainage monitoring and remediation measures in the dDCO [REP5-008D]? It would assist the ExP if the applicants could provide ‘without prejudice’ wording for a requirement securing monitoring and investigation of the EMG2 surface water drainage systems in the event of abnormal flood events within the EMG2 drainage catchments. The requirement should also secure updated drainage modelling and remediation measures if the surface water drainage systems are found to be underperforming. The applicants should also explain how third parties would be required to comply with such provisions in the event they adopted part of the EMG2 drainage systems.
Q21.0.3	The applicants	Water quality Within the applicants’ response to deadline 4 submissions [REP5-033], under appendix 4 and water quality 26, the Environment Agency identifies unresolved issues. However, the applicants do not provide a response. Please can the applicants provide a detailed response explaining whether they will

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:
		be updating the application documents as requested. If the applicants do not intend to update the application documents, please justify why the existing approach is acceptable.
22. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP4-018D]		
The ExP has no further questions on this topic at this time.		