



3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000
e-mail: Morpeth@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk

To all interested parties

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR010010

Date: 5 June 2014

Dear Sir/Madam

**Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and the Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended)**

**Application by Northumberland County Council for an Order Granting
Development Consent for the proposed Morpeth Northern Bypass**

Notice of a hearing, requests for information and deadlines

I write to notify you of a hearing, of new deadlines, and to request further information.

Notice of a hearing

I have decided that the following hearing will be held, at the below date, time and place:

Date	Type of Hearing	Subject	Place	Time
Tuesday 8 July 2014	Issue specific hearing	Draft Development Consent Order, Requirements and associated matters.	The Ballroom, Morpeth Town Hall, Market Place, Morpeth, NE61 1LZ	10.00am

Registration of speakers will begin **30 minutes** before the notified start time of the hearing. Those wishing to speak should arrive in good time to register.

The agenda for the hearing will be published 5 working days before the hearing, on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/morpeth>

Requests for further information or written comments

I am now making requests for further information, which are in Annex A to this letter.

Deadlines

Any interested party who wishes to respond to the requests in Annex A should supply the information requested by email or by post to the address at the top of this letter, by **19 June 2014**.

Anyone who wishes to comment on the responses to these requests; or any other response to requests for information that I may send to specific parties; or has any outstanding comments on submissions made to the examination before that date; should send their comments to me by **12 July 2014**.

I have amended the timetable to give effect to these deadlines.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully

John Watson

John Watson
Examining Authority

Advice may be given about applying for an order granting development consent or making representations about an application (or a proposed application). This communication does not however constitute legal advice upon which you can rely and you should obtain your own legal advice and professional advice as required.

A record of the advice which is provided will be recorded on the Planning Inspectorate website together with the name of the person or organisation who asked for the advice. The privacy of any other personal information will be protected in accordance with our Information Charter which you should view before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

Requests for further information

- A1.2
- (i) In MNB-1Q TAB1 (revised) there are now numerous crossings out and new text insertions. In each case, why?
 - (ii) In MNB-1Q TAB1 (revised), please provide (perhaps in an endnote) document reference "numbers" for each document identified in the "Relevant Document" column.
 - (iii) It is unclear whether the mitigation identified in the ES, or the amended mitigation identified in MNB-1Q TAB1 (revised), would be provided. In each case, what is intended?
- A6.1
- (a) What are the purposes of the proposed equestrian route, what connections would it provide between equestrian facilities, and how much use does the applicant expect it to attract? Please provide the evidence on which the applicant relies in respect of equestrian activity, and explain why the applicant believes its view to be correct.
 - (b) TA91/05 says that "For all equestrian crossings, the grass verge should therefore be extended back on each side of the road at the point of crossing to provide a holding area for horses within the verge (10m wide x 5m long)." Please (i) show how this would be done at each equestrian crossing identified in the appellant's response 6.1(i) in document MNB-2Q REP1; (ii) show how the visibility splay requirements of TA90/05 paragraphs 3.15 to 3.18 would be met in each case; and (iii) show how the advice of TD42/95 regarding equestrians' facilities would be met.
- A6.2 With reference to the technical note MNB-2Q REP5, what would be the NMU visibility at PF9 crossing, south side looking right, from an eye height of 0.9m at the crossing (2.0m "x" distance) to an approaching object 1.05m high?
- A6.3 With reference to the technical note MNB-2Q REP5:
- (a) What is a VRS?
 - (b) Please provide the NMU Audit report (which was due on 23 April 2014 to be completed in the near future) and any associated documents.
- A16.7(i) **Natural England** and the Applicant are each invited to comment on progress made (since 9 May 2014, the date of NE's representation) in the agreement of an Ecological Management Plan and in particular the specific means by which bat commuting/foraging routes would be maintained during the construction and operation of the scheme.
- A13.3 To the **Applicant** and the **Environment Agency**: The Environment Agency refers, in its letter dated 9 May 2014, to opportunities for ecological enhancement that it has discussed with the Applicant.
- (i) What are those ecological enhancements?
 - (ii) Have they been taken into account in the ES and, if so, where in the ES?
 - (iii) If they have been taken into account in the ES, how would they be secured through the DCO?

(iv) If they have not been taken into account in the ES, why not?

A16.1 Will the **Applicant** provide the memorandum of understanding with the Highways Agency, due to be provided by 30 May 2014.

A16.11 Drawing HE092631/0/A197/100/28 was among those accepted for examination in August 2013. It shows the eastern boundary of plot 12 to be set back, in part, from the highway boundary. Drawing HE092631/0/A197/100/28revC was submitted in May 2014 and has yet to be accepted for examination. It bears a revision note C which includes "Plot 12 split into 12 and 12A at the request of the landowner and adjusted to meet highway boundary." Comparison of the two drawings shows drawing HE092631/0/A197/100/28revC to represent an extension of Plot 12 on its eastern side so as to take it up to the highway boundary.

- (i) Does this amount to "additional land" in the terms set out in The Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010?
- (ii) If so, does the applicant consider the requirements of those regulations are engaged?
- (iii) If so, does the applicant intend to proceed on the basis that it will secure all necessary consents to the inclusion of the new provision in the Order (and if so does the applicant rely on submitted document MNB-2Q LAND1 to provide evidence of this?); or does the applicant intend to follow the procedure in Regulations 5 to 19 (and, if so, how?)?

If the applicant relies on document MNB-2Q LAND1, how does that document confirm all necessary consents of those indicated by the Book of Reference as having an interest in the land?

- A16.15(iii)
- (a) To and from what location on the A697, and to and from what location on the A1 North, were journey times modelled that are reported on page 43 of document MNB-2Q REP1?
 - (b) Why are no locations modelled to the south of the proposed St Leonard's junction?

Matters newly raised

A20.1 ES paragraph 9.85 indicates that the scheme would permanently take 26.5 hectares of land. Within that total, how much land is designated as the best and most versatile agricultural land?

A20.2 New and revised section plans have been provided (HE092631/0/A197/09/08revB to HE092631/0/A197/09/19revB, and HE092631/0/A197/09/32revB to HE092631/0/A197/09/37revB, and HE092631/0/A197/09/38 to HE092631/0/A197/09/42).

- (i) Are the earthworks details, which are newly shown on the new and revised section plans, within the parameters established by the ES? Please provide full references within the ES (paragraph, table, figure etc.). If the earthworks details are not within those parameters, on what basis would it be appropriate for the Secretary of State to accept for examination the drawings that show those details? If the earthworks details would be changed as shown on the new and revised section plans, please describe their effects on the environmental effects of the scheme, and whether those

have been the subject of consultation (and if so, how and with what results).

Item 2 in document reference MNB-1Q REP3 explains that drawings HE092631/0/A197/09/08revA to /19revA were in error in that the note "Design Model Updated" should instead be as set out in the explanation given. Newly issued drawings HE092631/0/A197/09/08revB to /19revB retain the note "Design Model Updated" without correction. If that note is in error too, please provide revised versions of the drawings in question with an appropriate correction. If the note is now correct, please apply question 2 of my letter dated 20 March 2014 to the new drawings and provide your replies.

A20.3 Will the **Applicant** please provide, by way of a final document revision list, a single and clear written statement of all the changes that the applicant seeks be made to the documents that were accepted for examination on 7 August 2014.

This revision list should set out the date and reference of each submitted revision of each document, indicating clearly the most recent revision. If the applicant anticipates making further revisions to any document, this should also be indicated.