

The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/19A
Temple Quay House (2 The Square)
Temple Quay
Bristol
Avon
BS1 6PN

Our ref: NA/2020/115279/07-L01
Your ref: A1 in Morpeth
Date: 04 June 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

**A1 IN NORTHUMBERLAND: MORPETH TO ELLINGHAM: EXAMINER
WRITTEN QUESTIONS (EXQ4)**

Please find enclosed our written representations to the Examining Authority's written questions (EXQ4) for this Development Consent Order (DCO) on behalf of the Environment Agency (EA).

If you have any questions or require any clarification on the points below, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

Lucy Mo
Planning Technical Specialist - Sustainable Places

Direct dial [REDACTED]
Direct e-mail [REDACTED]@environment-agency.gov.uk

**A1 IN Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham Development Consent Order
Application Planning Inspectorate Reference: TR010059**

**The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information
(ExQ4) Issued on 24 May 2021**

WE.4. 1	EA	<p>The EA [REP5-044] requested that the Flood Risk Assessment should be updated to include the risk implications of the proposed temporary bridge across the River Coquet. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment Addendum - River Coquet - Rev 1 [REP7-015] which seeks to address this point in light of the proposed changes and recent geotechnical investigations.</p> <p>Could the EA confirm if it is satisfied with the information submitted and if there are any remaining concerns regarding the effects of the proposed changes on flooding?</p>
		<p>EA response: The EA have reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment [REP7-015] and are satisfied with the conclusions discussed. There are short term risks with the proposed temporary bridge crossing during the construction phase. Receptors are not affected however depths are increased upstream and there are some areas of land which were dry in the baseline scenario but which become wet as a result of the construction scenario (particularly the 100 year). The increased risk is largely contained within areas which are already at flood risk within the baseline model with potential depths increasing from 4 to 10cm during the 1in100 year scenario.</p> <p>Our model review has now completed and the reviewer has stated that the baseline, construction, and operational models are considered reasonable. Therefore the model used within the Flood Risk Assessment [REP7-015] is acceptable. We are satisfied with the information submitted and we have no concerns regarding flood risk.</p>
WE.4. 2	EA NE	<p>The EA [REP5-044] and NE [REP5a-004] have expressed concerns regarding the effect of the change request for stabilisation work and southern access works on to the River Coquet,</p>

		<p>particularly in relation to its geomorphology. Consequently, the EA has requested that the River Coquet Geomorphology Modelling Assessment be updated. The Applicant has submitted the River Coquet Fluvial Geomorphology Assessment [REP07-003] in order to address these concerns.</p> <p>Can the EA and NE please confirm if they are satisfied with the information submitted and if there are any remaining concerns in relation to the effects of the change request for stabilisation work and southern access works on the River Coquet?</p>
		<p>EA response: We are satisfied with updated geomorphology assessment. We have no outstanding concerns in relation to the effects of the stabilisation and southern access works. However, we disagree with the Applicant's determination of the nature and scale of the impact. The Applicant has stated that the scheme will have a 'minor adverse' impact. We consider the impacts to be 'moderate adverse' as the Applicant is permanently fixing the channel in this location, thus preventing the river from changing and adapting. Overall, we consider the impacts to be 'moderate adverse' and that the Applicant must provide compensation for the impacts of the stabilisation and southern access works. The Applicant is prepared to make a contribution towards offsite works in order to compensate for the stabilisation and southern access works and for the localised loss of watercourses. This would be subject to a legal agreement. The details of the contribution and associated offsite works are currently under discussion with the Applicant.</p>
WE.4.3	EA	<p>The EA [REP5-044] has stated that a plan identifying the borrow pits which require dewatering and daily quantity and duration/ restoration proposals has been asked to be submitted as part of the DCO submission. In addition, it has also stated that a dewatering assessment should consider impacts to unknown licensed and private water supplies and groundwater dependent designation such as peat bogs. Subsequently, the Applicant has submitted</p>

		<p>a Borrow Pit Dewatering Assessment [REP7-004] in order to address the EA's concerns.</p> <p>Can the EA confirm if it is satisfied with the information submitted and if there are any remaining concerns regarding the borrow pit dewatering assessment and its impacts?</p>
		<p>EA response: We are satisfied with the borrow pit dewatering assessment and its impacts. Sufficient mitigation measures have been provided in 7.3 Updated Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Clean) - Rev 6 [REP7-008]</p>
WE.4.4	EA	<p>The EA [REP5-044] asked for confirmation of the type of lining to be utilised in Borrow Pit 4, as it is proposed to be used as a detention basin. The EA also raised concerns regarding the methodology used in order to backfill Borrow Pits 1 and 2 and also requested further information regarding the proposed long-term use of Borrow Pits 3 and 4. the Applicant, in [REP6-040], has addressed this matter.</p> <p>Can the EA confirm it is satisfied that its concerns have been addressed?</p>
		<p>EA response: we are satisfied with the type of lining to be utilised in the borrow pit 4 and the methodology for backfilling the borrow pits.</p>