

A1 Birtley to Coal House

Scheme Number: TR010031

Statement of Common Ground with Gateshead Council

Rule 8(1)(e)
Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure Rules) 2010
April 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure Rules) 2010**

A1 Birtley to Coal House
Development Consent Order 20[xx]

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH GATESHEAD COUNCIL

Regulation Number	Rule 8(1)(e)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010031
Application Document Reference	TR010031/7.5A
Author:	A1 Birtley to Coal House Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	20 April 2020	Draft

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Gateshead Council.

Signed.....

[NAME]

Project Manager
on behalf of Highways England

Date: [DATE]

Signed.....

[NAME]

[POSITION]

on behalf of [Gateshead Council]

Date: [DATE]

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Purpose of this Document	1
1.2	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground.....	1
1.3	Terminology	1
2	RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT	2
	Table 2.1 - Record of Engagement	2
3	ISSUES	12
	Table 3.1 Issues related to the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	12
	Table 3.2 Issues related to Angel of the North.....	13
	Table 3.3: Issues related to Bowes Railway	17
	Table 3.4: Issues related to Landscape Mitigation.....	19
	Table 3.5: Issues related to Local Wildlife Site Boundary	22
	Table 3.6 : Issues related to Noise Barriers.....	24
	Table 3.7: Issues related to Sustainable Transport Contributions.....	24
	Table 3.8: Issues related to LLFA / Flood Risk / Drainage / Water Quality	27
	Table 3.9: Issues related to Property and Asset Management	37
	Table 3.10: Issues related to Structures	37
	Table 3.11: Issues related to Scheme Design.....	38
	Table 3.12: Issues related to Green Belt Considerations.....	43

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") relates to an application made by Highways England (the "Applicant") to the Secretary of State via the Planning Inspectorate (the "Inspectorate") under the Planning Act 2008 (the "2008 Act") for a Development Consent Order (DCO). If made, the DCO would grant consent for the A1 Birtley to Coal House (the "Scheme"). A detailed description of the Scheme can be found in **Chapter 2** of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-023].

1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available on the Inspectorate website:
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/North%20East/A1-Birtley-to-Coal-House-Improvement-Scheme/>.

1.1.3 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Highways England as the Applicant and (2) Gateshead Council.

1.2.2 Highways England became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England.

1.2.3 Gateshead Council is the Local Authority for the Scheme falling within Category A of section 43(1) of the Planning Act 2008. The Scheme falls entirely within the Council's administrative area.

1.3 Terminology

1.3.1 In the tables in the Issues chapter of this SoCG, "Not Agreed" indicates a final position, and "Under Discussion" where these points will be the subject of on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties. "Agreed" indicates where the issue has been resolved.

1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to Gateshead Council, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to Gateshead Council.

2 RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and Gateshead Council in relation to the Application is outlined in **Table 2.1** below.

Table 2.1 - Record of Engagement

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
05/09/2017	Meeting with Andrew Haysey (Transport Planning Manager) and Neil Frier (Gateshead Council -Team Leader Traffic and Rights of Way)	Discussion on the provision (existing and future requirements) for walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH) including Longbank Bridleway, North Dene Footbridge, national cycle route 725 and crossings at junction 66 (Eighton Lodge) and junction 67 (Coal House).
31/10/2017	Gateshead Council (Planning Officer) and Environment Agency	<p>Discussion on opportunities for environmental betterments, particularly opportunities to reduce surface water flood risk (Environment Agency were also present at this meeting).</p> <p>Discussion around the Bowes Railway Culvert and that Gateshead Council frequently experience flooding at this location from the upstream catchment. Highways England to assess whether there is potential to undertake improvements to the crossing as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>The approach to surface water design was discussed and agreed, need to be aware of the potential updates in climate change allowances.</p> <p>Gateshead Council and the Environment Agency outlined their potential Flood Alleviation and Water Framework Directive Schemes in the area and how the construction phases may overlap. With Gateshead Council outlining their desire for runoff rate and water quality improvements.</p>
17/11/2017	Email and telephone call with Gateshead Council (various officers)	<p>Email: Discussions regarding the effect of the ground investigation which includes a woodland strip with some vegetation clearance undertaken to allow access.</p> <p>A call was set up with various representatives at Gateshead Council and Highways England to discuss the impacts of the compensation/mitigation requirements, which may</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		be in the in the form of compensatory payment to fund a project or habitat management. No resolution was found on the call. Highways England took the discussions further, which enabled the Ground Investigation works to be carried out.
24/11/2017	Email from Peter Shield (Ecologist) and Telephone conversation with Neil Wilkinson (Spatial Planning and Environmental Manager)	Request from Gateshead Council for confirmation of residual impacts of vegetation clearance and site works. Request for contributed sum to facilitate off-site compensation measures.
08/12/2017	Email to Peter Shield	Following on from a call earlier that day an email was sent with an enclosed plan showing updated de-vegetation plan.
12/01/2018 – 17/01/2018	Email to Andrew Haysey	Uncertainty log seeking confirmation that the Transport Schemes (Kibblesworth housing site) aspect of the Updated Log is accurate. Confirmation was received from Andrew Haysey on 17/01/2018 that works to Coal House Junction are 'reasonably foreseeable' by 2023.
21/02/2018, 09/03/2018, 15/03/2018, 17/03/2018	Email to Chris Street (Contaminated Land Officer)	Discussion of scope of Ground Investigation in order that this was agreed prior to undertaking the assessment. Confirmation of no Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGS) being located within the Gateshead Borough and no contaminated land sites determined under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, within, or near to the area of proposed A1 improvement works. Considered scope of Ground Investigation acceptable.
26/02/2018 16/03/2018	Email to Janet Charlton (Landscape Officer) Email from Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	Enclosed a map of proposed viewpoints and requested confirmation that these are acceptable, to agree the location of the viewpoints for the purpose of the assessment of visual effects, in order that these were agreed prior to undertaking the assessment. Landscape officer commented proposing five new viewpoints and removal of three viewpoints. Detailed comments on viewpoints and general comments on the Scheme. Outcome was that the

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		number and location of the viewpoints was agreed prior to undertaking the assessment.
08/03/2018	Meeting with Claire Richardson (Landscape Officer) and Rob Hindhaugh (Public Rights of Way Officer)	<p>Measures to enhance appreciation of Bowes Railway Scheduled Monument (SM). Drainage and public access to bridleway.</p> <p>Tree removal to improve views towards the Angel of the North and concerns about drainage and public access to Longbank Bridleway. Following Gateshead Council's request at the meeting, a meeting was set up with Historic England on 11 April 2018 to discuss their views on the physical impact of the works on the SM. Historic England made recommendations on investigation and mitigation in response to the impacts to the SM. These included a walkover survey and an elevation and plan of that section of retaining wall that is proposed for demolition. Mitigation proposals included dismantling undertaken by an archaeologist, evaluation trenching pre-construction and repair an equal section of the remaining wall to that being demolished.</p>
08/03/2018	Gateshead Council, Stakeholder Reference Group	Highways England provided an overview of the Scheme and the DCO process including the role of statutory consultees to support understanding.
15/03/2018 18/06/2019	Meeting with Gateshead Council Email from Peter Burrows (water)	<p>Flood Risk/Drainage - Discussion on the Scheme works that may affect the water environment including Kingsway Viaduct and River Team crossing, Allerdene Culvert and outfalls.</p> <p>Gateshead Council provided drainage records for Smithy Lane Culvert. Highways England investigations on the Bowes Railway Culvert suggest that this could be a result of agricultural practices.</p> <p>The need for ordinary watercourse consent will be required from Gateshead Council.</p> <p>The approach to the attenuation design was discussed and the installation of oil interceptors at all outfalls was agreed.</p> <p>Confirmation from Peter Burrows that he has no further comments on the water environment documents submitted to Gateshead Council.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
11/04/2018	Meeting with Lee Mcfarlane (Historic England – Inspector of Ancient Monuments)	Discussed the Longbank Underpass extension. WSP stated that a contractor review determined that the existing Longbank Underpass will remain closed during the construction works. Historic England had no objections to the current design proposals for the underpass but recommended investigations to be undertaken by the Cultural Heritage team as part of ES. WSP to provide scope for the investigations and to provide information showing proposed location of boreholes to be carried out in the vicinity of Longbank Underpass.
18/04/2018 16/05/2018	Email to Andrew Softley (Senior Planner) Email from Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	Enclosure of revised viewpoint locations and list of proposed photomontage locations sent to Gateshead Council for approval to progress the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Confirmation that photomontage locations are accepted and approval to progress the LVIA.
26/04/2018	Email from Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	Formal response from Gateshead Council on the Scheme proposals.
27/04/2018 17/05/2018 11/06/2018 20/06/2018 21/06/2019 25/06/2019	Email to Environmental Health team at Gateshead Council via Andrew Softly (Senior Planner)	Proposal for an approach and methodology to undertake the Noise and Vibration assessment. The Council responded on the 01 July 2019 confirming that their Environmental Health Section are happy with the content of the noise and vibration consultation details provided and had no further comments at that time.
03/07/2018	Email to Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	To discuss lighting options in the Longbank Bridleway Underpass in relation to established bats presence. The proposed solution put forward involved using security lighting therefore the underpass will be lit for anyone using it, but when not in use would remain a dark corridor for bats. The Council were reasonably satisfied a workable solution had been found.
24/10/2018	Email to Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	Methodology for cumulative effects and “long list” of developments provided to Gateshead Council for comment. Request for details of additional relevant consented developments.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
01/04/2019	Email from Andrew Haysey (Transport Planning Manager)	Approach and justification to the ramp provision for the North Dene Footbridge. On the 01/04/2019 the Council responded that the 1:12 ramp does not comply with guidance, however Highways England prepared an 'Application for Departures from Standards' which was presented to Gateshead Council for agreement. It explained the reasons why this design has been proposed including a better gradient and more width to provide an elongated route and higher bridge. In light of this and with the design being supported by an accessibility statement, the approach seems reasonable.
12/03/2019	Meeting with Gateshead Council (various officers)	<p>Scheme update, programme update, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) findings and consultation (landscape, biodiversity, cultural heritage, water).</p> <p>The discussion on the water environment was limited to the Allerdene realignment and design preferences, however, given the design stage of the Scheme, these are to be considered during detailed design.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Angel of the North be included as a heritage asset.</p>
28/03/2019 01/07/2019	<p>Email to Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)</p> <p>Email from Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)</p>	Confirmation that Gateshead Council Environmental Health agrees with the content of the noise and vibration consultation details provided and offer no comments at this time.
12/03/2019	Meeting with Gateshead Council (various officers)	<p>Meeting to discuss Scheme overview, DCO Headline Programme, EIA Progress Update (Landscape and Visual, Biodiversity, Cultural Heritage and Water). Gateshead Council preferred the viaduct option over the embankment option for Allerdene Bridge. Landscape Mitigation and Scheme Extents, and Environmental Constraints were submitted to Gateshead Council to inform the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p> <p>Actions for WSP are to: issue water chapter figures to Gateshead Council and the Environment Agency; issue relevant draft Environmental</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		Statement (ES) chapters to Gateshead Council; to consider gantries and their placement on the Scheme to minimise visual impact on the Angel of the North; to include sentence in the ES on Historic England's aim to list the Angel of the North as a SM; to send the landscape plan to inform Gateshead Council what planting has been proposed on their land and to gain agreement that they will manage these areas going forwards; to reissue the long list of developments used in the assessment of cumulative effects; and, to share Draft DCO Work Packages, Requirements, approach to discharge of conditions and SoCG with Gateshead Council.
07/06/2019 17/07/2019	Email to Andrew Softley (Senior Planner) Email from Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	Agreement on the approach to air quality monitoring during Scheme construction and on the location of the receptors selected for use in the air quality assessment. Confirmed need for dust monitoring during construction phase and agreed that the duration and location of dust monitors is to be determined in the CEMP following consultation with Scheme contractor and Andrew Softley. Gateshead Council agreed on methodology for receptor selections and air quality assessment area will follow Design Manual for Roads and Bridges HA 207/07 and on the finalised modelled area and receptors.
01/07/2019	Email from Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	Confirmation from Environmental Health section of agreement with noise and vibration consultation details provided and no comments offered at this time.
10/07/2019 23/07/2019	Email to Andrew Softley (Senior Planner) Email from Janet Charlton (Landscape Architect) and Andrew Softley (Senior Planner)	Seeking feedback on Landscape Mitigation and draft Landscape Strategy. Comments received on the draft Landscape Strategy. Confirms Gateshead Council agreed that the Scheme is generally acceptable but seeks additional information on overhead signage mitigation and expresses opinion that greater detail would be better.
24/07/2019 25/07/2019	Email to Peter Shield (Ecologist)	WSP requested data from Peter Shield on the presence of Otter within Coal House roundabout for use in EIA.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Email from Peter Shield (Ecologist)	Peter Shield provided Otter survey data for 2018 and 2019 and survey reports provided to inform the EIA biodiversity assessment.
01/11/2019	Meeting with Claire Richardson (Senior Conservation Officer), Neil Wilkinson, Andrew Softley, Janet Charlton, Nicola Wilkes, Andrew Williams, Sarah Proctor, and Jodie Rothwell	<p>Request single landscape scheme across all A1 schemes. Main objective is one landscape response across the A1 works and the immediate setting and use of the Angel itself, so both dovetail together in 2023.</p> <p>The Scheme needs to achieve no net loss of trees, onsite replanting is preferred, Sarah Proctor to look into this.</p> <p>Highways England agreed to check that Order limits along paths at the Angel and that DCO refers to path closures during construction works and alternative routes and arrange a larger plan to show what is proposed.</p> <p>Historic England, Highways England, Durham Wildlife Trust and Anthony Gormley are currently being consulted on the three options, feedback is expected by 15/11/2019.</p> <p>Next steps are internal reporting upwards to decide about way forward and public consultation. Recognised that there will be tensions between the artist and the climate change/ecology views.</p> <p>Visuals of the Scheme showing the completed landscape design would assist in developing the detailed landscape design and enable views to be managed alongside gantries and other infrastructure.</p> <p>Detailed landscape mitigation design likely to start in 12 months' time, after the DCO. This would be a condition, discharged by the LPA. WSP may not be delivering the detailed design. Highways England to speak to the potential delivery partner to bring them to the discussion about the options and working together.</p>
01/11/2019	Email from Clare Richardson (Senior Conservation Officer)	Email (following meeting on the same day) summarising Angel of the North meeting notes and intention to forward AutoCAD drawings once received. Ecology reports have already been forwarded and awaiting feedback on the options.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
07/11/19 and 11/11/19	Email from Jack Fenwick (WSP Principal Ecologist) to Peter Shield (Ecologist)	Email summarising conversation regarding a local wildlife site. Gateshead Council responded on 11/11/2019 by confirming that the data received from the Environmental Records Information Centre (ERIC North East) on Local Wildlife Site (LWS) boundaries, including Ravensworth Ponds and Woods, Dunkirk Pond and Dunkirk Farm West matches that of the Council data and therefore is suitable to inform the ecological impact assessment.
08/01/2020	Meeting with Andrew Softley (Senior Planner) and Andrew Haysey (Transport Planning Manager)	Meeting to explain DCO process to Gateshead Council to prepare them for the preliminary hearing in Jan 2020 and rest of the examination period. Gateshead Council shared Clean Air Plan following meeting. Meeting was for information purposes with no key outcome.
07/02/2020	Meeting with Rachel Grahame (Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer)	Discussions covered the geophysical survey to the west of Bowes Incline Railway results and any further requirements. The meeting was arranged to agree the contents of the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be used as a work brief/scope for the archaeological contractor and to confirm the requirements for further work. The contents were broadly agreed but will formally approved on receipt of the WSI.
		General liaison meetings with Highways England, both individually as Gateshead Council and as part of the LA7/Joint Transport Committee arrangements at which overall progress on the scheme can be monitored.
19/02/2020	SOCG Meeting	Discussed design and environmental issues in light of previous conversations and written reps responses from the LPAs to agree a way forward. Including evolving design details such as landscape mitigation and updates of evolving SOCG and construction of the Scheme.
24/03/2020	Landscape skype meeting with Claire Richardson (Landscape Officer) and Andy	Meeting to discuss landscape design around the Angel of the North (sketch proposal subsequently issued to Gateshead Council on 25 March 2020 –

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Williams (Applicant's Landscape specialist)	see Appendix 2.5 A of the Applicant's response to the ExA's second written questions).
26/03/2020 And subsequent ongoing discussions	Andrew Haysey (Transport Planning Manager), Andrew Softley (Senior Planner), and Paul Muir (Group Engineer, Transportation Development, Sunderland City Council)	Joint meeting with Highways England, Sunderland City Council and Gateshead Council to discuss and agreed the Deadline 2 written questions responses; and the content of the transport management section of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). Feedback from this meeting was used by Highways England to update the Deadline 4 revisions of the CEMP and CTMP.
30/03/2020	Email from Andrew Haysey (Transport Planning Manager) regarding PRowS	Further comments on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document 000769 question 1.9.8 regarding requirement to follow "safety ay roadworks" DFT document and rules regarding partial PRow closures; and • Programme for construction works at Bowes Cycleway (long Bank) and North Dene footbridge.
03/04/2020	Email from Clare Richardson (Landscape Officer)	Email sent following discussions between Gateshead Landscape and Ecology Officers requesting a skype meeting (subsequently took place on 9 April 2020).
07/04/2020	Email to Andrew Haysey (Transport Planner Manager) and Andrew Softley (Senior Planner).	Follow up email to meeting of 26/03/2020 requesting information from GC on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Duty Vehicle (HDV) Routing - Local Roads restrictions and Impact on NMU's (WQ1.9.3) – Review Applicant's response and provide comment. • Allerdene Working Compound – Construction Trips, Impact on NMU route, Duration of Works (WQ1.9.3) – Review Applicant's response and provide comment. Highways England – commit to respond on Kibblesworth and the Regional Hub at Hags Lane
09/04/2020	Skype Meeting with Council Officers: Clare Richardson (Landscape	Meeting (by Skype due to lockdown). Discussed proposed updates to The Landscape Mitigation Design, Figure 7.6 of the ES [APP-061] ;

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Officer), Janet Charlton (Landscape Officer) Peter Shield (Ecologist) and Highway's England's Landscape specialist and Ecologist	requirement 5; ecology mitigation; replacement planting; alternative mitigation sites; maintenance and management practicalities; and land south of the Angel of the North.
14/04/2020	Email to Andrew Softley (Senior Planner) regarding cumulative effects	<p>Enclosed cumulative effects long list produced to update ES Cumulative Effects Chapter 15 in February 2020 to include an assessment of the design changes of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional land required for a new site compound at junction 67 (Coal House); and • A new design for Allerdene Bridge (three span viaduct option in addition to a six/seven span viaduct option and embankment option <p>The email seeks clarification that Gateshead Council is in agreement with the updated list.</p>
15/04/19	Email to Peter Burrows (Water Officer) and Clare Richardson (Landscape Officer) regarding Written Questions and SoCG	Email sent seeking agreement on the water related matters related to the scheme that remain under discussion.

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) Highways England and (2) Gateshead Council in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

3 ISSUES

3.1.1 This section sets out the ‘issues’ which are agreed, not agreed or are under discussion between Gateshead Council and Highways England.

Table 3.1 Issues related to the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
All	All	Under Discussion	The Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-013] has been drafted and updated at Deadline 4 to a satisfactory standard.	Under Discussion
Articles 1-46	-	Under Discussion	The provisions stated in Articles 1- 46 of the DCO [APP-013] are acceptable.	Under Discussion
Requirements 1- 19	-	Under Discussion	The provisions stated in Requirements 1-19 of Schedule 2 of the DCO [APP-013] are acceptable. The Council are satisfied that they shall be consulted prior to discharge.	Under Discussion

Table 3.2 Issues related to Angel of the North

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Environmental Statement - Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage	6.8 Potential impacts	In a meeting on 08/03/2018 Gateshead Council's Conservation Officer asked Highways England to consider removal of trees along the A1 that currently obstruct the view of the Angel of the North.	Highways England agrees that the removal of existing trees has the potential to bring beneficial impacts on the Setting of the Angel of the North. However, removal of some of the trees within this location is restricted for ecological reasons.	Under Discussion
		<p>Gateshead Council recognises tensions between artist, climate change and ecology views. Gateshead Council requested visuals of the proposed A1 works showing the landscape in its finished (post construction) massing would assist in developing the detailed landscape design and enable views to be managed alongside gantries and other infrastructure.</p> <p>Agreed in November 2019 that a single joint landscaping scheme should be developed by Highways England and Gateshead Council. Discussions are ongoing.</p>	<p>Following a meeting on 9 April 2020 between Gateshead Council Landscape and Ecology Officers and Highways England environmental specialists there is an agreement in principle to the design of the landscape and habitat mitigation proposals within the Order Limits and associated with the interface of the Scheme and the Angel of the North. An updated version of The Landscape Mitigation Design, Figure 7.6 of the ES [APP-061] showing landscape and habitat mitigation planting around the Angel of the North will be produced. It is understood that agreement to this plan will be subject to further discussions internally within Gateshead Council</p>	Under discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			and consideration of the effects on the impact assessment	
		The Council does not agree that there will permanent beneficial impacts on the setting of the Angel as a result of reduced planting, and the effect of the gantries will be significant.	Views from the road towards the Angel of the North would be slightly more restricted due to the installation of gantries but the effect would not be significant. Appendix 2.0 B Gantry Report [EX/D4/015] of the Applicant's Response to the ExA's Second Written Questions addresses the effect that these gantries will have on views of the Angel of the North and confirms that the effect of the installation of the gantries on the Angel of the North would not be significant.	Under discussion
		The appearance of the new underpass is agreed by Gateshead Council.	Noted and agreed	Agreed
Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	7.4 Method of Assessment	Gateshead Council considers that additional photomontages are required to show the appearance of the embankments and cutting around the Angel of the North.	Section 7.4 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [APP-028] summarises the assessment methodology for impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		An additional photomontage for the Bowes Incline area was requested.	<p>Visual effect schedules have been prepared for receptors with a view of the Scheme, the typical view being demonstrated within representative viewpoints. These representative viewpoints have been agreed with Gateshead Council. The findings of the detailed visual receptor assessments against the agreed representative locations have been presented in standalone Visual Effects Drawings (VED).</p> <p>Highways England has produced extra photomontage for Bowes Incline, a cross section of the Bowes Incline area.</p>	
Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	7.10 Significance of Effects	As set out above, Gateshead Council and Highways England each have the main objective that the landscaping appears as one scheme across the A1 works and within the immediate setting and use of the Angel itself. Discussions	<p>Section 7.10 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [APP-028] provides an assessment of the Scheme's likely significant effects.</p> <p>During construction there would be impacts on the views of 300 residential receptors as a result of</p>	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>are ongoing regarding the details of the landscaping scheme.</p> <p>Gateshead Council adopted a preferred landscape scheme on 19 February 2020 and provided Highways England with details of it.</p> <p>At the meeting on 9 April 2020 Gateshead Council requested further clarification on the works due to be completed within the Order Limits which fall within Longacre Wood Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The ecological representative was concerned regarding the habitat loss, as Gateshead Council consider this section of the LWS to be of ecological value.</p>	<p>the removal of vegetation as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Once the Scheme is operational, there would be some visual changes to the character of the surrounding areas, however, these changes would only be significant for Landscape Character Area 1, Public Right of Way (PROW) P3 and Longacre Wood.</p> <p>In response to these requests for clarification from Gateshead Council's Highways England took an action to include control measures for works within the LWS to reduce impacts on Longacre Wood. These design changes are currently ongoing.</p>	

Table 3.3: Issues related to Bowes Railway

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Environmental Statement - Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage	6.9 Mitigation	<p>Measures to enhance the appreciation of the Bowes Railway such as installation of information boards along the public right of way would be welcomed (8 March 2018 meeting). Such works have the potential to outweigh physical harm.</p> <p>Gateshead Council confirmed that they will defer to the view of Historic England and Gateshead archeologist. They had no further comments on this matter.</p>	<p>Section 6.9 of Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-027] sets out the construction phase mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p>Prior to construction taking place within the field containing the ridge and furrow earthworks, adjacent to the Bowes Railway Hotel an archaeological topographic survey of the entire field would be undertaken in accordance with Historic England metric survey standards.</p> <p>Historic England agree that they can lead on this matter.</p> <p>'Further details of the discussions between Highways England and Historic England on this matter are set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Historic England [TR010031/APP/7.5D] revision 1 submitted at deadline 4.'</p> <p>A meeting was held on the 6 February 2020 with the Tyne and Wear Archaeological Officer to discuss and agree a geophysical</p>	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			survey to the west of Bowes Incline Railway survey and any further requirements.	

Table 3.4: Issues related to Landscape and Habitat Mitigation

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	7.8 Potential impacts	<p>Gateshead Council are seeking additional details on landscape design to mitigate for the overhead signage gantries.</p> <p>Further discussions took place at a Skype meeting on 9 April 2020 regarding impacts on views of Angel of North from the A1 during operation of the Scheme. Gateshead Council requested further discussions on minimising gantry impacts and these discussions are ongoing.</p> <p>The Council states that that there is a material and negative impact on the Angel of the North resulting from the scale of the new Allerdene footbridge and the number and position of the proposed gantries. The Council believes that this impact can be offset by the implementation of the 'Revealing the Angel' scheme in the 'Options Appraisal for Managing and Enhancing the Angel' report, on both Council and Highways England</p>	<p>Section 7.8 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the ES [APP-028] summarises the predicted construction and operation impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p>During construction, the Scheme the removal of roadside vegetation would, in places, expose views of the existing A1, associated construction activity and traffic management. The Landscape Mitigation Design, Figure 7.6 of the ES [APP-061] which identifies where existing vegetation would be removed and where new planting would be created is in the process of being updated to take into account feedback received from Gateshead Council and discussions continue to be ongoing. The impact of vegetation removal would be minimised due to either the current shape of the land, retained vegetation within the adjacent landscape or existing buildings.</p>	Under discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		land, with offsetting of tree planting numbers on another site in the Borough, to be agreed with the Council.		
Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	7.9 Mitigation	Gateshead Council requested that that landscape and habitat mitigation is secured by a requirement in the DCO to be discharged by the local authority. The wording of this requirement is currently under discussion.	<p>Section 7.9 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the ES [APP-028] sets out the construction phase mitigation measures for the Scheme.</p> <p>The measures are detailed running north to south. They are referenced against chainages shown on Figure 7.6 Landscape Mitigation Design of this ES [APP-061].</p> <p>The Scheme needs to achieve no net loss of trees. Off-site replanting is an option but more difficult to deliver and subsequently manage. Onsite replanting is preferred.</p> <p>Three locations have been identified as potentially offering opportunities to improve or enhance the landscape within the highway boundary, in line with the Highways England's licence to achieve environmental improvements,</p>	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>enhancements and long-term development of the network. These include Banesley Lane, east of the Allerdene embankment and south of the Angel of the North sculpture.</p> <p>Operational mitigation will be provided 12 months after the Scheme becomes operations, which might result in more significant short term effects.</p>	
Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	7.10 Significance of Effects	<p>Gateshead Council has its own Landscaping Proposals for the Scheme. Gateshead Council's main objective is that the landscaping appears as one scheme across the A1 works and within the immediate setting and use of the Angel itself, by 2023.</p>	<p>Section 7.10 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement [APP-028] provides an assessment of the Scheme's likely significant effects.</p> <p>During construction there would be impacts on 300 residential receptors as a result of the removal of vegetation as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Once the Scheme is operational, there would be some changes to the character of the surrounding areas, however these changes would only be significant for Landscape Character Area 1, PROW P3 and Longacre Wood.</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing to discuss how enhancements to the</p>	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			Scheme, specifically in association with the Angel of the North could be achieved to contribute towards the appearance of single scheme, whilst ensuring that appropriate and proportionate mitigation is provided to reduce potential impacts.	
Chapter 8: Biodiversity		Gateshead Council have requested that the Landscape Mitigation Plan includes habitat mitigation planting.	Highways England has agreed to update the mitigation planting scheme (The Landscape Mitigation Design, Figure 7.6 of the ES [APP-061]) and are currently in the process of finalising the design and reaching agreement with Gateshead Council.	Under Discussion

Table 3.5: Issues related to Local Wildlife Site Boundary

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Environmental Statement - Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	7.7 Baseline Conditions	A new Local Wildlife Site that will directly affected by the Scheme has been designated since the submission of the DCO application.	Section 7.7 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [APP-028] summarises the baseline conditions. The area surrounding the Scheme is characterised by a combination of uses including residential, urban, rural, industrial, recreational and open space. Much of the area falls within designated Green Belt land,	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>namely the Tyne and Wear Green Belt. The A1 and ECML sever the area and form strong visual and audible elements of the landscape. The assessment has considered impacts and their effects on the local character of the area (with the surrounding areas divided into five Landscape Character Areas) and visual impacts and their effects on existing residents, road users and those who use amenity areas such as footpaths.</p> <p>In November 2019, Gateshead Council highlighted a discrepancy of the boundaries of some of the other Local Wildlife Sites and the boundaries used in the Environmental Statement including, but not limited to the boundaries of Ravensworth Ponds and Woods; and Dunkirk Pond (Fox's Pond) and Dunkirk West. These were subsequently submitted to Gateshead Council and agreed.</p>	

Table 3.6 : Issues related to Noise Barriers

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration	11.9 Mitigation	<p>Noise barriers presented to Gateshead Council at meeting on 12 March 2019. No objections raised at the meeting on 19 February 2020.</p> <p>Queries about the appearance of the noise barriers and programme for installation. Can noise barriers be installed?</p>	<p>Section 11.9 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration of the ES [APP-032] sets out the operational and construction phase mitigation measures for the Scheme which includes the use of noise barriers at the operational phase.</p> <p>During construction the adoption of Best Practicable Means (BPM) would be ensured, as defined in Section 72 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (Ref. 11.5). Such measures have been included within the Outline CEMP [APP-174].</p>	Agreed

Table 3.7: Issues related to Sustainable Transport Contributions

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Appendix 7.3 Transport Assessment Report [APP- 173]	6. Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH)	In their formal representation to the Inspectorate and under the title "Smarter Choices", Gateshead Council has requested financial contribution for sustainable transport measures.	Within the vicinity of the Scheme is: one cycling route which provides a major link to Newcastle city centre; and three sections which can accommodate pedestrian and cyclist movements, namely the A1 Birtley to Coal House, Junction 66 and 67	Under discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>Further details will be required to inform further discussions and confirm Highways England's final position.</p>	<p>and Smithy Lane. However, public transport is very limited, there are no rail options available and bus routes only use the junctions of the A1.</p> <p>It is likely that WCHs would be directly impacted during the construction of the Scheme due to the requirement to temporarily close footpaths in the vicinity. Opportunities to provide potential improvements to the existing WCH infrastructure will be delivered as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Highways England will advise further on this element of the Scheme in ongoing discussions including construction traffic impacts associated with WCH routes.</p>	
	Bowes Cycleway	<p>The commitment to undertake the works to the Bowes Cycleway (Long Bank) and North Dene footbridge at different times to allow a choice of route for pedestrians and cyclists is welcomed. However, Gateshead Council requested confirmation that any additional connection to both the north and south side will be in</p>	<p>Two PRoWs: Bowes Cycleway (Long Bank); and North Dene footbridge (GA/6/1 and GA/7/1); fall within the Scheme boundary. These have been included in the assessment of impacts on walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH). Both routes are due to be temporarily stopped up during</p>	Under discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>place beforehand to allow the diversions to be effective. Document 000430 shows the route to the north, but implies an additional stretch of new footpath will be needed to the south to afford this connection.</p> <p>Bowes Mineral Line PROW (Regional Route 11) is an important public right of way which also acts as a regional cycle route and has suffered from flooding with water exiting the A1 on to the PROW. The Scheme should ensure that this cause of flooding is prevented with the drainage design of the new Scheme. The extension of the tunnel will also require a lighting system to be considered for the PROW. The proposed footpath diversions to the north of the A1 and linking to RR11 should conform to the equalities act.</p>	<p>construction at different times, with controlled crossing points to enable safe access across the proposed works access road. These routes are due to be returned to their existing condition once the Scheme is operational.</p>	

Table 3.8: Issues related to LLFA / Flood Risk / Drainage / Water Quality

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Environmental Statement – Road Drainage and the Water Environment	13.9 Mitigation	Gateshead Council stresses need for further discussions prior to Detailed Design.	Highways England submitted this response and is engaged in ongoing discussions with Gateshead Council in relation to resolve this matter.	
		The General Arrangement drawings show the detention basin as heavily engineered and uniform in plan form and profile, served by an excessive area of maintenance track. The basin should be amended to a more naturalistic design, incorporating more variation in form and profile to provide maximum potential for habitat development, and delivery of water quality and amenity benefits.	<p>The SuDS detention basin has been designed principally to manage the highway runoff from the Scheme. It is located in a landscaped area that is not publicly accessible. Therefore, there are and can be no amenity benefits associated with this pond. Health and safety has been at the forefront of all design considerations concerning the pond design; however, the principal design objective is to achieve volume attenuation and constructability.</p> <p>The surface water pond has been designed to minimise the impacts on the existing landscape and biodiversity, resulting in the design which minimises land take. The changes suggested by the council would lead to an increase in the land area that is required, a</p>	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			reduction in replacement planting that can be undertaken and greater impacts on the existing landscape, through land clearance and re-profiling etc and therefore cannot be accommodated without adverse impacts.	
		The extent of the basin maintenance track and turning head area should be reduced to allow more scope for the provision of appropriate habitat space around the basin. These improvements must be incorporated prior to the detail design stage, to provide confidence that they will be delivered at that stage.	The access track has been designed to accommodate the vehicles (which includes a vacuum tanker to empty the oil interceptor) that are likely to be required for the maintenance of the pond and associated apparatus. Due to the topography, layout and types of vehicles that require access the extent of the track and turning head is appropriate.	
		The re-aligned and opened-up sections of the Allerdene Burn shown on the General Arrangement drawings (all 3 options) are over-engineered, with not enough variation in form or profile. It goes against good flood risk management principles with an engineered design and disconnect from its floodplain. The drawings should be modified to	In terms of the design, the existing channel is highly engineered and not natural, whilst the Applicant has sought to improve upon the current conditions, there are many constraints that need to be considered. The main constraint to changes to the channel are landownership, as	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>show a more naturalised channel that would conform with paragraph 5.2.3 of the WFD Assessment (Appendix 13.2). There is space to incorporate some areas of widened channel with slackened bank profiles, pools, and possibly some connected floodplain areas. Although the Environmental Statement suggests that naturalised features could be considered at detail design stage, a firm commitment to them should be made now, to avoid them being overlooked or value-engineered out at detail design stage.</p> <p>Gateshead Council Stresses need for further discussions prior to Detailed Design.</p>	<p>the land in which the Allerdene Burn flows adjacent to is only being obtained on a temporary basis, therefore, the flood regime needs to be maintained. Only the land adjacent to the A1 is being sought for the Applicant ownership and therefore the flood regime cannot be changed in the long term without having an impact on third parties.</p> <p>In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) we are required to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk to third party land. The Applicant has undertaken a further iteration of the hydraulic modelling to address comments from the Environment Agency. This modelling has been submitted to the Environment Agency for their review, the comments are provided in WR10 B. This modelling demonstrates that it is not possible to balance changes in profile against an increase in flood risk, as the channel currently provides a significant volume of storage and any change in flow conveyance, storage or bank height</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>means that flood risk will likely increase or the spill location and volume would alter.</p> <p>The inclusion of pools at this stage is not feasible as further works would be required to quantify the sediment load and whether they would remain viable in the long term. As given the channel slope and potential load any pools may quickly become full of sediment. However, the design of the channel is documented in W10 of the Outline CEMP [APP-174].</p> <p>Highways England submitted this response and is engaged in ongoing discussions with Gateshead Council to resolve this matter.</p>	
		<p>Underground tank (Junction 65): It seems unnecessary to install an underground tank. A surface basin or pond that has the potential to provide habitat would be more in keeping with WFD, local and national policy requirements.</p>	<p>The option to creating alternative storage facilities by form of a pond was considered during design. Some of the constraints which limited suitability was due to the following: The levels did not permit much flexibility as storage was needed to be contained within shallow depths. Adverse</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>Gateshead Council Stresses need for further discussions prior to Detailed Design.</p>	<p>environmental impact due to the removal of established vegetation. Combined constraints of shallow depths and storage volume with a pond feature would have required further land acquisition. The maintenance accessibility against frequency would cause safety implications in comparison to a geocellular tank. For these reasons, an underground tank was deemed to be more appropriate.</p>	
		<p>Silt control vortex separators: There is only a firm commitment to provide a silt control mechanism at Long Acre Dene. A firm commitment to protect all affected watercourses should be made at this stage (prior to detail design) in order to avoid negative impact, and ideally provide betterment in water quality in line with WFD and local policy requirements.</p> <p>Gateshead Council Stresses need for further discussions prior to Detailed Design.</p>	<p>It is correct that a silt control vortex separator is proposed at Long Acre Dene.</p> <p>It is not clear that there is sufficient space to include the silt control vortex separators at all discharge locations. Checks are to be carried out to ensure that they can be physically installed and will not increase flood risk, as they reduce the peak flows that can be conveyed, as well as being able to be maintained over the longer term.</p> <p>Importantly, Appendix 13.3</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>Highways Agency (now Highways England) Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) of the ES [APP-165] does not demonstrate the need for inclusion of these in respect of the Scheme. Improvement in water quality is being provided through the inclusion of hydrocarbon separators.</p>	
		<p>Inlet/outlet features: New Inlets and outlets should utilise naturalistic design features wherever possible and minimise the use of pre-cast concrete features through the use of gabion mattresses, vegetated features, and a commitment to a more environmentally sensitive design. This approach would conform with the principles of the WFD, and with the objectives of the River Team Catchment Partnership and the emerging Gateshead Local Plan policies MSGP Policy 30:1a and b.</p>	<p>It is not always appropriate for naturalistic design features to be selected.</p> <p>The design approach is for the existing outfalls to be utilised, some of which are beyond the Order limits. The Order limits are set as close as possible to the existing highway landownership so as to avoid impacts on third party land as well as that on existing biodiversity.</p> <p>In relation to the culvert extension at Smithy Lane (Grid Reference 426045,557936) where a new inlet is required, naturalistic design features will be utilised, if constraints allow, which are to be developed during detailed design. We are aware of some reticence towards the use of gabion</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>mattresses from the Environment Agency (due to perceived design life) but will seek a robust and environmentally acceptable design. This approach is detailed in the updated b Outline CEMP [APP-174] in W10.</p> <p>Appendix 13.2: Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment of the ES [APP-164] outlines that where existing surface water outfalls fall within the Extent of Works, detailed design will consider modifications to the outlet structure to ensure that they are set back from the watercourse, to reduce the impacts to flow. This is detailed in the Outline CEMP [APP 174] within W10.</p>	
		<p>Ordinary Watercourses: The culverts at Bowes View, Leyburnhold Gill, Long Acre Dene, and the two at Smithy Lane should be clearly shown on the General Arrangement, and related drawings. This shall be to demonstrate that the works will not physically damage the culverts and their connecting</p>	<p>The locations of the culverts in question are shown on Figure 13.2: Water Feature Location Plan of the ES [APP-093].</p> <p>Table 4-1 of the Outline CEMP [APP-174], details that Ordinary Watercourse Consent is required, for the following works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal of an existing gateway 	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>watercourses, and that no extensions or alterations will be required to the culverts, or their connecting watercourses. Ordinary Watercourse Consent is required from the LLFA for any alterations to culverts, or watercourse channels.</p> <p>Gateshead Council Stresses need for further discussions prior to Detailed Design.</p>	<p>crossing by means of a culvert or bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a new gateway crossing by means of a culvert or bridge. • Piping a watercourse for a length of eight metres or less. • All structures or modifications in or within 9 metres of a watercourse (headwalls, sluices and fencing). • Any temporary works in or within nine metres of a watercourse, that will be in place for less than six months <p>The General Arrangement Plans [APP-010] show key features that are relevant to the DCO application – i.e. major works. Because the culverts in question are minor and are not being altered (with the exception of the southernmost Culvert at Smithy Lane – see below) as part of the Scheme, they do not need to be shown at this stage.</p> <p>The works comprised in the Scheme will not physically damage the culverts and their connecting watercourses, and that no extensions or alterations will be</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>required to the culverts, or their connecting watercourses. Provision for their protection is contained in the updated Outline CEMP (APP-174) in W19. The LLFA will be given the opportunity to review the detailed drawings as a requirement as set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-174] well in advance of the work progressing, for any ordinary watercourses/culverts that will be impacted.</p> <p>The culvert which is being altered is the southern most culvert at Smithy Lane (Grid Reference 426045,557936) where the earthworks require minor extension to the culvert headwall. The final design for the culvert extension / headwall will be hydraulically modelled during detailed design to ensure no impacts on flow conveyance and the findings submitted to the Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) as part of the submission for an Ordinary Watercourse Consent.</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>Highways England submitted this response and is engaged in ongoing discussions with Gateshead Council in relation to resolve this matter.</p>	
		<p>The Council considers that there is a need to fully consider the potential impacts from mine water/ groundwater constraints on the proposed surface water drainage system. Gateshead Council Stresses need for further discussions prior to Detailed Design.</p>	<p>Subsequent to the 2018 Coal Authority Guidelines, the Coal Authority and the Environment Agency released an online screening tool for Local Planning Authorities, developers and consultants to identify specific mining and groundwater related constraints.</p> <p>This tool kit has been utilised in the preparation of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and its output is documented in Appendix B of Appendix 13.1: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES [APP-163]. The Scheme is split into three zones all of which the toolkit identifies that no further consultation with the Coal Authority on groundwater flood risk in relation to proposed surface water drainage system is required.</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			Highways England submitted the above responses at Deadline 2, and is engaged in ongoing discussions with Gateshead Council in relation to resolve this matter.	

Table 3.9: Issues related to Property and Asset Management

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		Based on the negative impact the Scheme would have on Council land in respect of ecology/biodiversity, the Council is concerned about the extent of Council land/rights to be acquired by the Scheme. The Council will seek assurance that appropriate ecology/biodiversity mitigation is provided as part of any compensation settlement.	Discussions regarding access to enable maintenance of ecology/biodiversity mitigation areas of land outside Highways England's ownership and under the ownership of Gateshead Council are ongoing.	Under Discussion

Table 3.10: Issues related to Structures

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		Responsibility to repair and maintain Embankment: As the embankment	Discussions regarding access to enable maintenance, repairs and managing the impacts of the	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>supports the A1 at this point it is the Council's view that future maintenance responsibilities and liabilities should lie with Highways England, and confirmation of this is sought. Also, any design should incorporate features that offer scour protection at the headwall and within the underpass.</p> <p>The wider issue of the ponding effect of the embankment, and the damage this can cause to the Bowes Railway Path as a whole, will be considered in the Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>Scheme on structures are ongoing.</p> <p>The concept of for a design proposal (which is now to be included within dDCO) is to intercept the water runoff for the length of the wall construction (circa 17m) through a stone grip constructed of filter media wrapped in geo-synthetic material. The purpose is to intercept field runoff, reduce outflow and convey it on to the railway path, which is how water currently disperses. Whilst maintaining the natural passage of the runoff and disregarding the impact downstream, this would significantly reduce further occurrences of erosion failures as previously witnessed. This is secured through the Outline CEMP in [CH9] [REP2-050 and 051].</p>	

Table 3.11: Issues related to Scheme Design

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Structures Engineering Drawings and	Sheets 3, 4 & 5	Gateshead Council prefer the 6/7 viaduct option to the embankment option. Highways England proposed Rochdale envelope approach that accesses the	The 6/7 span viaduct option and embankment option for Allerdene Bridge are both assessed in the ES [APP-021 – APP-170] and the 3 Span Viaduct Option	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Sections [APP-011]		<p>maximum and minimum parameters. However, there are still some outstanding issues as from a Water Framework Directive/ flood risk perspective, as the 6 pier option would be preferable. These outstanding issues are subject to ongoing discussions with Highways England.</p> <p>Gateshead Council confirmed on 3 December 2019 that they are supportive of the preferred route Option 1a (which was announced as the preferred route in July 2017) it involves replacing Allerdene Bridge south of its current location.</p>	<p>is assessed in the nvironmental Statement Addendum [AS-016]. Each of these configurations is presented as options in the updated Draft DCO [APP-013]. Further details on the introduction of the 3 Span Viaduct Option are considered in the Change Request to the ExAu submitted on 20 April 2020 [EXA/D4/002]. This will be discussed with Gateshead Council in ongoing discussions.</p>	
Structures Engineering Drawings and Sections [APP-011]	Sheets 10 & 11	<p>The non-compliant 1 in 12 gradient access ramp to the North Dene footbridge was agreed by Gateshead Council following discussions at a meeting on 12 March 2019. (usual standard 1 in 20).</p>	<p>A 1:12 ramp at North Dene Footbridge is included in the Scheme design. The reasons for opting for a non-compliant 1:12 ramp includes improvement to the current situation (e.g. a better gradient, more width). A 1:20 ramp would provide an elongated route and higher bridge.</p> <p>North Dene Footbridge forms a link on Gateshead Council's cycle network and links the highway to the PROW network. Recently Gateshead Council worked with Highways England to improve the bridge with a cycle wheel ramp but the new design should allow the use of the bridge without cyclists having to dismount.</p>	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			Details are currently under discussion with Gateshead Council.	
Works Plans [APP-007]	Sheets 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7	Under discussion post DCO decision. Workshop to be arranged prior to Deadline 3	Gantries will be provided along the Scheme, although at this stage, their locations along the Scheme are not fixed to allow flexibility in later design stages. Further details of current proposals have been included in Appendix 2.0B Gantry Report [EXA/D4/015] of the Applicant's responses to the ExA's Second Written Questions submitted at Deadline 4. A telephone conversation was held with Clare Richardson from Gateshead Council on 24 March 2020. A further call between WSP and Gateshead Council was held on the 10 April 2020 to get feedback from Ecology, heritage and Landscape officers. This has informed further development of the design of the interface between the Angel of the North and the Scheme.	Under Discussion
ES Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-023]	2.5 Scheme Description	The minutes of the meeting on 12 March 2019 note that there is still some ongoing discussion over who will eventually own/maintain the lighting scheme of the underpass (Highways England and Gateshead Council).	Lighting of the Longbank Bridleway underpass will be provided and will be sensitive to the bats surveyed using the underpass. Lights will be provided on sensors, that will not trigger when the bats pass them. Refer to Table 2.1 above for	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		Details to be discussed with Highways England and Gateshead Council ecologist prior to Deadline 3 (10 March 2020)	record of engagement relating to lighting the underpass.	
ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-033]	12.8 Potential Impacts	The red lines along paths around the Angel of the North refers to path closures during construction works and alternative routes. Gateshead Council requested a larger plan to show exactly what is proposed.	<p>There would not be any permanent PROW diversions required during operation and it is intended that WCH facilities and connectivity would be improved as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Highways England will provide temporary diversions for the PROWs around the Angel of the North that will be closed during construction.</p> <p>ES [APP 12.1] Walking Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment Paragraph 2.6.3. states, <i>“Pedestrians originating from the Lady Park area of Gateshead, wishing to access local bus routes and supermarket provisions in Team Valley are concerned about walking routes/crossing opportunities around the Coal House Interchange”</i></p>	Under Discussion
		Eighton Lodge Roundabout is highlighted by pedestrians and cyclists as a major obstacle to trips on national cycle network route 725 (Great north cycleway) with no	The interactions between the Scheme and the Eighton Lodge roundabout are subject to separate ongoing discussions.	Under discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>facilities to help these sustainable modes to cross the junction. This is of particular concern to residents of Birtley who believe they are cut off from Gateshead and Newcastle. The Scheme needs to consider the impact these junctions have on the local community and that the Scheme includes facilities which stops the A1 from being an obstacle to sustainable modes.</p> <p>The footway from Eighton Lodge to Crathie is a now a multiuser path for pedestrians and cyclists and as such any alterations should be designed to include both modes with signage and minimum width. The Scheme needs to consider the impact of improving the entire length of the path to assist the local community to link to other parts of the local cycle network.</p>	<p>Discussions about the replacement of the Northdene Footbridge – timed to avoid works at the Eighton Lodge underpass, to allow for pedestrian access at all times. Horse riders may be required to use the Eighton Lodge interchange at certain time are ongoing.</p>	

Table 3.12: Issues related to Green Belt Considerations

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Planning Statement [APP-171]	5.4 Green Belt Policy	At meeting on 12 March 2019, Gateshead Council agreed that the Green Belt approach sensible, particularly where widening into the green belt was being proposed to negate impacts on residents at Crathie etc	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) defines development and its impact on openness is either 'appropriate' or 'inappropriate'. It is accepted that the Scheme is inappropriate but there are very special circumstances to justify the development in the Green Belt which outweigh the limited degree of harm identified.	Agreed

Table 3.13 Issues related to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP)

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Outline CEMP [APP-174]	All	Gateshead feedback on Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Visual, Biodiversity, and Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter submitted to Gateshead Council informed the production of the Outline CEMP. Discussions regarding the CEMP itself took place on 26 March 2020. Relevant details	The Outline CEMP provides details of environmental roles and responsibilities, details of consents and permissions, collection and submission of environmental data, environmental maintenance and monitoring requirements including procedures for monitoring and reviewing compliance with the CEMP. Ongoing discussions with GC will inform the content of the CEMP, the	Under discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		are set out in the environmental assessment section above.	CEMP has been updated in response to issues raised on 26 March 2020 and was resubmitted at Deadline 4.	
Chapter 1: Introduction and Background to the Scheme, Outline CEMP [APP-174]	Table 1-1	Under discussion.	Indicative Construction Programme Northern Gas Network – spring 2020-spring/summer 2021; Site Mobilisation – Winter 2020/21 Main construction works – winter 2020/21- Winter 2023/24 Site demolition and reinstatement – Winter 2023/24	Under discussion
Chapter 3: Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments – Included within Outline CEMP [APP-174]	G4	Under discussion. Agreed with the hours proposed by Highways England. Seeking further details likely exceptions and overnight working.	Hours of Work Weekdays 07.00-19.00; Saturdays 07.30-13.00; Sundays and bank holidays, no working unless agreed by exception. Typical exemptions might include online installation of the replacement pedestrian bridge that can only be carried out whilst the A1 is closed and full closures can only occur at night.	Under discussion

Table 3.13a Issues related to the Outline Construction Traffic I Management Plan (Outline CTMP)

Appendix B: Construction Traffic Management	General Issues	During a meeting on 26 March 2020, it was agreed that a Transport Working Group would be established to monitor arrival	The updated Outline CTMP (rev 1) has been submitted at Deadline 4. The following updates to the CTMP	Under idscussion
------------------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------

<p>Plan– Included within Outline CEMP [APP-174]</p>		<p>and departure of traffic.</p>	<p>have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction working hours have been updated to ensure consistency across all DCO documents. • CTMP workers catchment description has been updated, to confirm that Sunderland City Council was included within the study. <p>The scope of a new Traffic Management Working Group has been agreed along with permit procedures for road closures, travel plan measures for contractors and any other construction related activity issues that arise during the construction programme.</p> <p>At the meeting on 26 March 2020 the following items were agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction Worker Trips – Sustainable Travel Measures 2. Construction Vehicles – Arrival/Departure Profile 3. Heavy Duty Vehicle Routing – Local Roads Restrictions 4. Road Closures – Permit System (April 2020) 	
-----------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>Co-ordination with other Major Highway and Non-Highway Schemes such as the Regional Hub, falls out of the scope of this DCO and remains under discussion with Gateshead Council.</p> <p>The Allerdene Working Compound – Construction Trips, Impact on NMU routes, and the duration of Works remain under discussion.</p>	
Appendix B: Construction Traffic Management Plan– Included within Outline CEMP [APP-174]	2. Site Access	Under discussion.	<p>Two main construction compounds and 2 working construction compounds.</p> <p>Access routes, signage and PROW are set out in the document.</p>	Under discussion
Appendix B: Construction Traffic Management Plan– Included within Outline CEMP [APP-174]	4. Construction Traffic Impact	Under discussion	<p>Peak construction traffic generation will be Q3 2021. Trips assumed to originate from Junction 66. Average number of trips generated by construction traffic commuting assumed to be 200 per day.</p>	Under discussion

<p>Appendix B: Construction Traffic Management Plan– Included within Outline CEMP [APP- 174]</p>	<p>5.5 Mitigation</p>	<p>Under discussion.</p>	<p>Main contractor will produce an Access Route Survey Report to identify pinch points requiring mitigation such as temporary removal of street furniture and safety barriers.</p> <p>Further assessments will be undertaken to determine the exact temporary mitigation as well as agreement of traffic management and coordination and deliveries with Highways England and local authorities.</p> <p>Consideration will also be given to diversions, construction staff parking, lay down areas, temporary full overnight closures and diversions, construction staff parking, laydown areas.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------

	<p>Highway and Pedestrian Safety</p>	<p>After the skype meeting on 26 March 2020, Gateshead Council took away an action to consider the proposed measures to safeguard highway and pedestrian safety and subsequently confirmed that any works should follow the principles set out in the Department for Transport Document “Safety at Street Works and Road Works – A Code of Practice”.</p>	<p>In response to Gateshead Council’s feedback at the skype meeting on 26 March 2020, Highways England have added the following text to the CTMP (TR010031/APP/7.4) (Revision 2) submitted at Deadline 4:</p> <p>‘In discussion with the local highway authority it has been agreed to apply the principles contained in the DFT document ‘Safety at Street Works and Road Works – A Code of Practice’ and operate to the same guidelines as applied to footways as follows:</p> <p>The footpath will be closed for no longer than absolutely necessary, and in any case no longer than 15 minutes in every full hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient operatives will be available at all times to advise, assist and direct footway users safely past the works. • Pedestrians requiring assistance will not have to wait longer than 5 minutes for help. • All overhead operations will 	<p>Under discussion</p>
--	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------

			<p>be suspended when assisted pedestrians pass the works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Temporary footway closure signs will be placed a recommended minimum of 20 metres in advance of the closure.'	
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>Non-Motorised Users (NMU's)</p>	<p>Gateshead Council has confirmed that they have no objection to the principle of the the Scheme.</p> <p>Gateshead Council have expressed concerns that the Coal House Roundabout is highlighted by pedestrians and cyclists as a major obstacle to trips into Team Valley with no facilities to help these sustainable modes enter or exit the team valley trading estate. This is of particular concern to residents of Lady Park who believe they are cut off from bus services and local shopping opportunities.</p>	<p>With regard to the Coal House roundabout improvements for WCH, the representative from Gateshead Council has agreed that no improvements scheme is currently available. Gateshead Council will propose a separate scheme which would not coincide with the Scheme delivery programme and would not adversely impact the benefits of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
--	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------

