

## FOR DEADLINE 6

(19<sup>th</sup> May 2020)

#### ON BEHALF OF THE

# HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND MONUMENTS COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (HISTORIC ENGLAND)

#### **Application by**

Highways England

For an Order granting Development Consent for the

A1 Birtley to Coal House Improvement Scheme, Tyne & Wear

PINS Reference No: TR010031

**Historic England Reference No: PL00552195** 

Deadline 6 Submission 19<sup>th</sup> May 2020

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Historic England is more formally known as the "Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England". We are the government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment, including world heritage. It is our duty under the provisions of the National Heritage Act 1983 (as amended) to secure the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
- 1.2. We set out below our comments on matters that have arisen from documents submitted for Deadline 5 to this DCO examination. We have sought to focus our attention on those documents which we consider it would be of assistance to the Examining Authority to have our commentary.
- 1.3. Historic England are providing comments on the following documents:
  - Revised Draft DCO (Rev 4A / 4) (REP5 003 / 004)
  - Applicant's Comments on Submissions to Deadline 4 (REP5 010)

#### 2. REVISED DRAFT DCO (Rev 4A/4) (REP5 - 003 / 004)

#### Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 9

2.1 We confirm that the wording for Requirement 9 matches the agreed wording we appended at the end of our Deadline 4 submission (REP4 – 013). We are therefore in agreement with the Applicant with regards to Requirement 9 as set out in version 4/4a of the dDCO.

#### Schedule 10

- 2.2 The wording of Schedule 10 accurately reflects the works to the Scheduled Monument as we understand them to be at this point.
- 2.3 However, there are outstanding issues related to Schedule 10 which need to be addressed in the Outline CEMP (REP4 022 / 023). Specifically these are in relation to the need for a new action point in the REAC table regarding the

impact of the reinstated PROW and Bridleway access onto the Monument after construction. In addition, there is a lack of clarification in the Outline CEMP (REP4 – 022 / 023) of the drainage issue in so far as how the works might have an impact on the scheduled monument. We raised these points with the Applicant's Agents via email w/c 11<sup>th</sup> May 2020 and we discussed these with them during a video conference on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2020.

2.4 It is our understanding that an updated Outline CEMP will be submitted at Deadline 6 (19<sup>th</sup> May 2020) which will include a new action point CH10 regarding the access issues. We also understand that additional information may be coming forward for discussion about the drainage grip following the sharing of a sketch design. We await sight of the submission at Deadline 6 and we will update the Examining Authority accordingly.

### 3. APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS TO DEADLINE 4 (REP5 – 010)

3.1 We note that the Applicant has provided comments on our Deadline 4 submission (REP4 - 013) in Table 4 of this document and we provide the following comments.

#### **Table 4 ref: 2.0.13**

3.2 We welcome the revisions to Requirement 4(1) and 4(3) in the updated draft DCO (REP5 – 003) which ensures that Historic England will be consulted by the Secretary of State.

#### **Table 4 ref:** Q. 2.4.12 (b)

3.3 We confirm that Figure 1 of the Outline WSI as submitted as an appendix of the Outline CEMP at Deadline 4 (REP4 – 022/023) shows the location of the access from the site compound down onto the Monument. We have agreed that the method statement will form part of the FINAL WSI; however it is not clear from the Applicant's response to this question that the Method Statement for the compound access will be in the FINAL WSI. We would consider it appropriate for this to be included.

3.4 The Applicant's response to this question refers back to "Structures Engineering Drawings and Sections (Revision 2) TR010031/APP/2.7(J)" (REP4- 010) as clearly showing the proposed access. However, we do not find this to be the case nor is it fully indicative, for example the location of the access back onto the Monument is not shown on the drawing as the Applicant does not yet have detailed drawings. However, it is our understanding a new CH10 action in the Outline CEMP (see 3.4 above) to be submitted at Deadline 6 will provide some more certainty about the works and we would consider it appropriate that a clearer drawing is included here which also shows the boundary of the scheduled monument. We await the revised Outline CEMP submission at Deadline 6 to see whether this issue has been addressed and will update the Examining Authority accordingly.