

**MARO DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

**ON BEHALF OF THE HILLARY FAMILY, IP AND SIGNIFICANT LANDOWNER**

**TR010064: Application by National Highways for the M60/M62/M66 Simister Island Interchange Project The Examining Authority's Written Questions and requests for further information**

**Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession of Land and Rights**

ExQ1 – CA 2.4

*PfE allocation JPA1.1 – Northern Gateway and Hillary Family Ownership*

The whole of the Northern loop proposal in the NE quadrant of the proposed Simister Island redevelopment falls within the red line Allocation Boundary of JPA1.1 (see plans referenced below). Land in the ownership of the Hillary family (plots 2/16a, 2/16b, 2/16c, 2/16d, 2/16e, and 2/16f) comprises by far the largest proportion of the NE quadrant. The Hillary land is identified on the attached Title plan ref. GM706922.

The majority of the 'Operational Land' area required for permanent acquisition under the DCO similarly falls within the ownership of the Hillary family.

The whole of the two Environmental Mitigation Areas (EMA) outside and to the east and south-east of the northern loop, as identified in blue hatching on the Works Plans, falls within the ownership of the Hillary family.

*Northern Gateway Development Framework (JPA1.1) Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft – November 2024*

At P17, Fig 3 Indicative Development Framework Plan shows areas allocated for Employment Uses and this includes, in the far SW corner. The plan is duplicated at p85 and at p87 Fig 16 Built Form Plan similarly shows the extent of the area allocated for Employment Development. Various other plans replicate the extent of development in identically.

All of the plans show the two EMA areas, referenced above, as Employment Development Areas.

The Hillary Family have no objection to the Compulsory Purchase of the 'Operational Land' comprising the area required for the permanent works construction of the Northern Loop itself, subject to appropriate compensation recognising its status and value as land allocated for Employment Development. Similarly, they have no objection to the occupation of the two EMAs on a temporary basis for as short a time as is practically necessary, including a period for its reinstatement, as was originally proposed, again subject to appropriate compensation for its temporary use. They do object to the two EMAs being acquired permanently (see REP4-031).

