



The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Your Ref
URN: 20049389
Our Ref
MTP/TGH/207930.0002
Date
17 February 2025

Dear Sir or Madam

EN070009: H2TEESSIDE DCO EXAMINATION DEADLINE 7A SUBMISSIONS

On behalf of our client the South Tees Group (“**STG**”), we enclose three documents for submission at Deadline 7A:

- STG’s response to the Applicant’s Second Change Request and the matters raised in Annex B to the Examining Authority’s procedural decision letter dated 10 February 2025 [[PD-020](#)];
- STG’s preferred form of protective provisions (“**PPs**”) (clean copy); and
- STG’s preferred form of PPs (highlighted to show where these differ from the Applicant’s preferred form to be submitted at Deadline 7A).

STG’s preferred form of PPs as submitted is currently subject to engineering approval. STG will confirm its final version at Deadline 8.

As set out more fully in STG’s primary Deadline 7A submission, as has been the theme throughout the Examination (most recently restated at CAH2 [[REP6A-037](#)]), STG’s objections largely relate to the Proposed Development’s acquisition of land, the Applicant’s exercise of powers across the Teesworks site, and the sterilisation of critical national infrastructure on STG’s retained land.

Although the Applicant’s second change request removed some Phase 2 land from the Order Limits [[REP7-011](#)], STG strongly objects to the inclusion of *any* land at the Foundry site outside of Phase 1 – namely the retained Phase 2 land, the Red Main land, and the proposed pipeline corridor linking the main site to RBT land. Such land conflicts with critical national infrastructure planned by STG for that site.

STG also objects to the extent of the Applicant’s powers under the Order. STG has sought to limit the Proposed Development’s impact on its development of the main site by negotiating protective provisions

Registered Office

One Bartholomew Close
London
EC1A 7BL
DX 339401 London Wall

20 Station Road
Cambridge
CB1 2JD
DX 339601 Cambridge 24

The Anchorage
34 Bridge Street
Reading, RG1 2LU
DX 146420 Reading 21

4 Grosvenor Square
Southampton,
SO15 2BE
DX 38516 Southampton 3

T +44 (0)345 222 9222 W www.broadfield-law.com



Broadfield

with the Applicant, but the Applicant has not agreed to important provisions constraining the exercise of its powers at the main site and giving STG more of a say in how the Proposed Development proceeds.

Additionally, as noted in STG's Deadline 7 submission [[REP7-062](#)], STG has serious concerns about the sterilisation of its retained land as a result of the Health and Safety Executive's ("HSE's") consultation zones for hazardous development,. Since Deadline 7, the Applicant has not provided additional information regarding this issue. It appears from the current works plans [[REP7-005](#)] that the Applicant has also not designed the Proposed Development in a way that attempts to keep the anticipated inner consultation zone away from STG's retained land on the main site.

STG must therefore object to the Order being consented without the inclusion of a satisfactory requirement for the Applicant to design and operate the Proposed Development in a way that keeps any HSE "inner zone" within its Order Limits and away from STG's retained land earmarked for other development. Without this, the Proposed Development will be seriously detrimental to STG's development of the Teesworks estate outside the Order Limits. Because this issue is critical for STG, STG has drafted protective provision wording that would address this issue.

To summarise, STG's final position in this Examination is as follows:

- Because insufficient land was removed by the Applicant's second change request, STG objects entirely to the retained Phase 2 land, the Red Main land, and the proposed pipeline corridor linking the main site to RBT land and requests that these be omitted should the Proposed Development proceed.
- Because the Applicant has not allayed STG's serious and legitimate concerns about the sterilisation of its retained land as a result of the possibility of an HSE inner zone encroaching on its land adjacent to the Proposed Development, STG objects to the Proposed Development proceeding at all, insofar as it has any sterilising or limiting effects on STG's retained land at the main Teesworks site.



Broadfield

Yours faithfully



Partner

For and on behalf of Broadfield Law UK LLP

T

M

E

██████████@broadfield-law.com

enc STG's response to the Applicant's Second Change Request and the matters raised in Annex B to the Examining Authority's procedural decision letter dated 10 February 2025 [PD-020]; and
STG's preferred form of PPs (clean and highlighted copies), subject to engineering approval.