

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
July 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 0	20 February 2020	Deadline 2 Submission
Rev 1	20 April 2020	Deadline 4 Submission
Rev 2	9 June 2020	Deadline 8 Submission
Rev 3	8 July 2020	Deadline 9 Submission

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	14
	Table 3.1 Issues related to the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	14
	Table 3.2 Issues related to Angel of the North	15
	Table 3.3: Issues related to Bowes Railway	26
	Table 3.4: Issues related to Scheme Wide (excluding Angel of the North) Landscape and Habitat Mitigation.....	28
	Table 3.5: Issues related to Local Wildlife Site Boundary	34
	Table 3.6 : Issues related to Noise Barriers.....	35
	Table 3.7: Issues related to Sustainable Transport Contributions.....	36
	Table 3.8: Issues related to Flood Risk / Drainage / Water Quality.....	39
	Table 3.9: Issues related to Property and Asset Management	48
	Table 3.10: Issues related to Structures	48
	Table 3.11: Issues related to Scheme Design	49
	Table 3.12: Issues related to Green Belt Considerations.....	55

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
07/11/2019 and 11/11/2019	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 Higgs 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.
21/04/20-20/05/20	Various and phone calls and emails between Highways England and Peter Burrows (Water Officer)	Discussions on water and drainage related issues that remained under discussion and Deadline 4. These include: naturalising the balancing ponds and access roads.
30/04/2020	Email to Peter Shield (Ecologist), Clare Richardson (Landscape Officer) and Janet Charlton (Conservation Officer)	<p>Email provides Gateshead Council with WSP actions associated with the Angel of the North meeting on 9 April 2020 in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woodland Planting in the parkland between Chowdene Bank and Woodford; • River Team planting in Coalhouse Roundabout; and • Scheme Footprint within Longacre Wood Local Wildlife Site. Some of these discussions, particularly in relation to

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		alternate planting schemes, remain on a without prejudice basis.”
01/05/2020	Email from Janet Charlton (landscape)	<p>Email provides Gateshead Council’s response to WSP’s email of 30/04/2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woodland Planting in the parkland between Chowdene Bank and Woodford – not desirable – species rich grassland suggested instead • River Team planting in Coalhouse Roundabout – acceptable; • Scheme Footprint within Longacre Wood Local Wildlife Site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that Peter Shields (Ecologist) will respond to access to Culvert <p>Seeks clarification on clearance or retention of existing woodland within construction compound as shown on Figure 7.6 Landscape Mitigation Plan.</p>
04/06/2020	Email from Andrew Softley (Planning Officer)	Email containing Water and Drainage comments from Peter Burrows on Draft SOCG. These comments have been reviewed and included within this draft SOCG.
04/06/2020	Microsoft Teams meeting with Andrew Sofley (Planning), Andrew Haysey (Highways), Peter Shield (Ecology), Janet Charlton (Landscape) and Highways England (DCO, Transport, Ecology and Landscape consultants).	Discussed and reviewed the items that were shown as “under discussion” in revision 1 of the SOCG submitted at Deadline 4 in light of discussions between the parties and submissions that were made
19/06/20	Email from Peter Burrows (Water)	Confirmation of acceptance of the Allerdene Burn Design Concept and Vortex Separators (this was reconfirmed and noted at the Water Issue Specific Hearing on 23 June 2020).
01/07/20	Email exchange between Highways England and Clare	Confirmation that the wording of CH11 REAC table within the outline CEMP is acceptable.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Richardson (Conservation)	
03/07/2020	Microsoft Teams meeting with Peter Shield (Ecology), Janet Charlton (Landscape), Clare Richardson (Heritage), Neil Wilkinson (Gateshead Council Line Manager), and Highways England (Ecology and Landscape consultants)	Discussions regarding the landscaping options associated with the Angel of the North and items “under discussion” in revision 1 of the SOCG submitted at Deadline 9 in light of discussions between the parties and submissions that were made.
06/07/2020	Email from Clare Richardson (Conservation)	Confirmation of acceptance by Gateshead Council of the draft text within the Statement of Common Ground and in support of its submission at Deadline 9.
06/07/2020	Email from Peter Shield (Landscape)	Confirmation of acceptance by Gateshead Council of Highways England’s survey effort for additional land assessment.
07/07/2020	Email exchange between Highways England and Janet Charlton (Landscape)	Finalising agreement on Gateshead Council’s Landscaping Strategy.

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 each Deadline to a satisfactory standard.	No issues have been raised by Gateshead Council
Articles 1-46	-	Under Discussion	The provisions stated in Articles 1- 46 of the DCO [APP-013] are acceptable.	No issues have been raised by Gateshead Council
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.	No issues have been raised by Gateshead Council

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	<p>At a meeting on Thursday 4 June 2020, Gateshead Council advised that they find the revised landscape mitigation plan around the Angel of the North [REP5-005] broadly acceptable, and this was confirmed in an email on the 8/6/20.</p> <p>At a subsequent meeting on the 3/7/20, Gateshead Council confirmed that their position remains that the preferred option from the Southern Green Report [REP4-086] is Option 3 – Revealing the Angel, however, they are happy to continue discussions, with the Applicant outside of the examination period, in order to deliver this through into the detailed design stage.</p>	<p>Following a meeting on the 3/7/20, it was confirmed that the landscape strategy, as set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] would remain the current design, any changes that are agreed following further, without prejudice discussions, would be undertaken during the detailed design phase, and be subject to agreement with Gateshead Council. Any changes to the design will ensure that the impact assessment detailed within Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029] and Chapter 7: Landscape and visual of the ES [APP-028] will remain valid.</p>	Agreed
		<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</p>	<p>During a meeting in the 3/7/20 it was agreed that until such time as there is further discussions and agreement on the proposed changes associated with the Angel of the North location, the current landscape design, set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design</p>	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>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.</p> <p>At a meeting on the 3/7/20, Gateshead Council confirmed that their position remains that the preferred option from the Southern Green Report [REP4-086] is Option 3 – Revealing the Angel, and that they were happy to continue discussions with the Applicant in order to deliver this through into the detailed design stage. However, until such time the current landscape design, set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] remains the current design agreed within the DCO examination.</p>	<p>[APP-061] remains the current design agreed within the DCO examination.</p> <p>During the meeting a number of points were discussed on how the design could be taken forward and the constraints and opportunities that may influence the final design, not least that there should be not additional financial cost to the Applicant in delivering the aspirations of Gateshead Council, and these are outline below.</p> <p>It is confirmed that the Gateshead Council and the Applicant continue to make progress on their discussions on how the Scheme could support the aspirations of the Council in making changes to the landscape around the Angel of the North, in removing some of the established trees and shrubs and increasing visibility of the Angel of the North within views from the A1.</p>	
		<p>Prior to the submission of the updated Landscape Mitigation Plan [REP5-005], the Council did not agree that there will permanent</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		beneficial impacts on the setting of the Angel as a result of reduced planting, and the effect of the gantries will be significant Gateshead Council has advised that their concerns on this matter have been reduced and the principles set out in the landscape mitigation scheme have been agreed.	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.	
		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. An additional photomontage for the Bowes Incline area was requested. This was submitted at Deadline 4 and is currently being considered by Gateshead Council [REP3-005] Appendix 5.3.	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. 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	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>standalone Visual Effects Drawings (VED).</p> <p>Highways England has produced extra photomontage for Bowes Incline, a cross section of the Bowes Incline area submitted to the ExA and Gateshead Council at Deadline 4 [REP3-005] Appendix 5.3.</p>	
Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual	7.10 Significance of Effects	<p>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.</p> <p>Gateshead Council provided Highways England with a copy of the Council's preferred landscaping scheme: Southern Green Report 'Options Appraisal for Managing and Enhancing the Angel' [REP4-086], on 19 February 2020. This revised Landscape Mitigation Scheme is currently being reviewed by Gateshead Council in consultation with Anthony Gormley.</p> <p>At a meeting on the 3/7/20, Gateshead Council confirmed that</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is that the approach to landscaping should be in accordance with the Application unless alternative provision is made.</p> <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>Highways England considers that the Scheme is acceptable without the inclusion of the revised Landscape Mitigation Scheme the Scheme is acceptable in any event. The Council's preferred landscape mitigation scheme was prepared without consultation with Highways England and provided only on 19 February 2020.</p> <p>During construction there would be impacts on the views of 300 residential</p>	Under discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>their position remains that the preferred option from the Southern Green Report [REP4-086] is Option 3 – Revealing the Angel, and that they were happy to continue discussions with the Applicant in order to deliver this through into the detailed design stage. However, until such time the current landscape design, set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] remains the current design agreed within the DCO examination.</p>	<p>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 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>Following a meeting on the 3/7/20, it was confirmed that the landscape strategy, as set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] would remain the current design, any changes that are agreed following further, without prejudice discussions, would be undertaken during the detailed design phase, and be subject to agreement with Gateshead Council. Any changes to the design will ensure that the impact assessment detailed within Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029] and Chapter 7: Landscape and visual of the ES [APP-028] will remain valid.</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<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>In response to these requests for clarification from Gateshead Council Highways England took an action to include control measures for works within the LWS to reduce impacts on Longacre Wood. Subsequently Gateshead Council have agreed that inclusion of agreement to controls within action [G15] of Table 3-1 Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP8-007 and 008], a revised version of which is submitted at Deadline 9 (08 July 2020), as follows “Should plant and equipment be required to use the public footpath through Longacre wood to undertake headwall works, the details of such usage including arrangements for signage, will be consulted on in advance with the local authority”, with an agreement for later consultation is sufficient at this stage. Gateshead Council has also agreed to the inclusion of control measures within action [B27] of Table 3-1 REAC of the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008], a revised version of which is submitted at Deadline 9 (08</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>July 2020). The additional wording included “Control measures will be implemented to minimise impacts and, where possible, habitat loss within Longacre Wood LWS. This will include locally fencing off working areas and maintaining access as far as possible whilst maintaining worker and public safety.”, with an agreement for later consultation is sufficient at this stage.</p>	
<p>Chapter 8: Biodiversity</p>	<p>[note: section relocated from table 3.4 in revision 2]</p>	<p>At the request of Gateshead Council, prior to Deadline 4, Highways England has updated the Landscape Mitigation Plan [REP5-005] to include areas of habitat mitigation planting.</p> <p>At a meeting on the 3/7/20, Gateshead Council confirmed that their position remains that the preferred option from the Southern Green Report [REP4-086] is Option 3 – Revealing the Angel, and that they were happy to continue discussions with the Applicant in order to deliver this through into the detailed design stage. However, until such time the current landscape design, set out in Figure</p>	<p>Gateshead Council and the Applicant continue to make progress on their discussions on how the Scheme could support the aspirations of the Council in making changes to the landscape around the Angel of the North, by removing some of the established trees and shrubs and increasing visibility of the Angel of the North within views from the A1. Further discussions are required regarding location of any off-site planting, provision and standard of planting material, and ongoing management and maintenance requirements.</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] remains the current design agreed within the DCO examination.</p>	<p>Following a discussion on 3 July 2020 it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacing removed planting within an area to the south of the Allerdene Bridge crossing was undesirable, due to the proposed location's suitability for wading birds. • An off-site location, proposed by Gateshead Council, is therefore preferred, subject to further discussion and agreement; the mechanism for funding this is still to be investigated and agreed. • The preferred option for Gateshead Council remains Option 3 within the Options Appraisal for Managing and Enhancing the Angel [REP4-086], prepared on behalf of Gateshead Council by Southern Green, and the Applicant may support this aspiration, inasmuch as it does not increase costs to construct and manage the landscape within the Scheme, and that the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment are not affected. • The final agreement is unlikely to be achieved within the Development Consent Order (DCO) examination 	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>period and will be subject to further discussions during the detailed design phase. The landscape mitigation design as set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] remains the current design. Therefore, and as set out in Appendix A - ISH2 Hearing Actions Landscape, submitted at Deadline 9 [EXA/D9/004] – the Scheme habitat calculations as set out in Table 8-17 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029] remain valid. Should Option 1 of the Options Appraisal for Managing and Enhancing the Angel [REP4-086], prepared on behalf of Gateshead Council by Southern Green, be progressed, this closely resembles the current Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design of the ES [APP-061]. Therefore, this would not result in any deviations from the existing habitat calculations within Table 8-17 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029].</p> <p>As off site planting locations and areas are yet to be secured in relation to Options 2 and 3, habitat calculations have not yet been able to be finalised. However, Options 2 and 3 of the</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>Options Appraisal for Managing and Enhancing the Angel [REP4-086], prepared on behalf of Gateshead Council by Southern Green, would result in a similar alteration and reduction of woodland planting within the Order limits, ranging between approximately 8500m² and 9900m² respectively, depending upon which option is developed, and the extent to which woodland may still be included within the Order limits, resulting in the requirement for off-site planting</p> <p>Without prejudice discussions regarding the landscape mitigation design and habitat calculations will continue in relation to the potential changes associated with the Angel of the North. It is the Applicant's position that any changes to the design – including those to accommodate Southern Green Options 1, 2 or 3, must ensure that the impact assessment detailed within Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029] and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the ES [APP-028] will remain valid.</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 Scheme Wide (excluding Angel of the North) 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] identifies where existing vegetation would be removed and where new planting would be created and will remain the agreed landscape strategy within the examination period. 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> <p>During a meeting on the 3/7/20, it was confirmed that the Gateshead Council and the Applicant continue without prejudice discussions on</p>	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>land, with offsetting of tree planting numbers on another site in the Borough, to be agreed with the Council.</p> <p>At a meeting on the 3/7/20, Gateshead Council confirmed that their position remains that the preferred option from the Southern Green Report is Option 3 – Revealing the Angel, and that they were happy to continue discussions with the Applicant in order to deliver this through into the detailed design stage. However, until such time the current landscape design, set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] remains the current design agreed within the DCO examination.</p>	<p>how the Scheme could support the aspirations of the Council in making changes to the landscape around the Angel of the North, in removing some of the established trees and shrubs and increasing visibility of the Angel of the North within views from the A1. Following a discussion on 3/7/20 it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacing removed planting within an area to the south of the Allerdene Bridge crossing was undesirable, due to the proposed location's suitability for wading birds. • An off site location, to be proposed by Gateshead Council, is therefore preferred for replacement planting, subject to further discussions and agreement, the mechanism for funding this is still to be investigated and agreed. • The final agreement is unlikely to be achieved within the DCO examination period, and will be subject to further discussions during the detailed design phase, and be based on the current landscape strategy, as set out in 	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061]. As such, this would remain the current design, any changes that are agreed following further, without prejudice discussions would be undertaken during the detailed design phase, and their implementation be subject to agreement between Gateshead Council and the Applicant.</p> <p>Any changes to the design must ensure that the impact assessment detailed within Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029] and Chapter 7: Landscape and visual of the ES [APP-028] will remain valid.</p>	
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</p>	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>7.6 Landscape Mitigation Design of this ES [APP-061].</p> <p>Operational mitigation will be provided within 12 months after the Scheme becomes operational, which might result in more significant short term effects.</p> <p>A suitably worded requirement has been drafted and has been agreed in advance with Gateshead Council and has been provided at Deadline 9.</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>Gateshead Council had previously advised that once they receive the Habitat Calculation Update alongside the revised Landscape Mitigation Plan they would provide feedback to Highways England.</p> <p>However, during a meeting on the 3/7/20, it was confirmed that the landscape strategy, as set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] would remain the current design and therefore the habitat calculations detailed within Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029] remain valid.</p>	<p>During a meeting on the 3/7/20, it was confirmed that the landscape strategy, as set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] would remain the current design, any changes that are agreed following further, without prejudice discussions, would be undertaken during the detailed design phase, and would be subject to agreement between Gateshead Council and the Applicant.</p> <p>Therefore, as set out in Appendix A - ISH2 Hearing Actions Landscape, submitted at Deadline 9 [EXA/D9/004] – the Scheme habitat</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			calculations, as detailed within Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-029], remain valid.	
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>At a subsequent meeting on the 3/7/20, Gateshead Council confirmed that their position remains that the preferred option from the Southern Green Report is Option 3 – Revealing the Angel, and that they were happy to continue discussions with the Applicant in order to deliver this through into the detailed design stage. However, until such time the current landscape design, set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] remains the current design to be agreed within the DCO examination.</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>During a meeting on the 3/7/20, it was confirmed that the landscape strategy, as set out in Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061] would remain the current design, any changes that are</p>	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			agreed following further without prejudice discussions, would be undertaken during the detailed design phase, and be subject to agreement between the Applicant and Gateshead Council.	

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, 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	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>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	Noise barriers presented to Gateshead Council at meeting on 12 March 2019. No objections raised at the meeting on 19 February 2020.	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	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		Queries about the appearance of the noise barriers and programme for installation. Can noise barriers be installed?	includes the use of noise barriers at the operational phase. 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[REP8-007 and 008].	

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.	As discussed at the Traffic and Transport Issue Specific Hearing the Applicant is the strategic highway authority which is funded for that purpose. It is not a source of or destination for traffic in its own right and does not give rise to the need for the measures for which a contribution is sought. All traffic using the A1 Trunk Road will have originated somewhere on the local highway networks managed by local highway authorities like Gateshead	Under Discussion

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>Highways England are requested to consider the matter of providing update on the Highways England website that addresses walking, cycling and horse-riding matters (WCH) during construction including providing references to CEMP. This matter was discussed and agreed at ISH4 Traffic and Transport issues.</p>	<p>Council. It is not appropriate to ask the strategic roads authority to contribute to the costs of sustainable transport measures on the local road network. That is the responsibility of the local highway authority for which they are funded. There are other potential sources of funding these sorts of measures but is not an appropriate use of funds for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that regular updates will be made to the Scheme's website during construction to include WCH diversions and closures. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Appendix B of the Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP8-007 and 008]) was updated at Deadline 9 to include this.</p>	
	Bowes Cycleway	The commitment to undertake the works to the Bowes Cycleway (Long Bank) and North Dene footbridge at different times to allow a choice of	Two PRoWs: Bowes Cycleway (Long Bank); and North Dene footbridge (GA/6/1 and GA/7/1); fall	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>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 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>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 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 Flood Risk / Drainage / Water Quality

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the ES [APP-034]	Whole ES Chapter	Agreed – Noting that Gateshead Council stresses need for further discussions prior to Detailed Design.	Highways England is committed to engaging with Gateshead Council prior to and during detailed design.	Agreed
Appendix 13.1: FRA of the ES [APP-163]	Whole Document (excluding identified as under discussion below)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
Surface Water Drainage Strategy [APP-163]	Section 5 and Appendix C of Appendix 13.1: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES	An Ecologist should be involved in detail design of the attenuation basin (outfall 8) to secure potential habitat features.	Detailed design of the attenuation basin (outfall 8) is to be managed by the measures provided in W1 and L13 of the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008]. A technical note was submitted as part of the Deadline 8 submissions to demonstrate that	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
	[APP-163]		Vortex Separators are to be included in the design in place of Oil Interceptors [REP8-027].	
Appendix 13.2 – WFDa of the ES [APP-164]	Whole Document	A more naturalised channel for the realignment of the Allerdene Burn would be preferred.	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. This is to be managed by the measures provided in W10 of the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008]. A technical note was submitted as part of the Deadline 8 submissions to provide a conceptual design of the Allerdene Burn to demonstrate how this could be achieved. [REP8-027].	Agreed
		New Inlets and outlets should utilise naturalistic design features wherever possible and minimise the use of pre-cast concrete features.	This is to be managed by the measures provided in W10 of the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008].	Agreed
Appendix 13.3 – Highways Agency Water Risk Assessment Tool of the ES	Whole report	The findings of the HAWRAT and HEWRAT assessments are agreed.	Importantly, Appendix 13.3 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	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
[APP-165] and HEWRAT Assessment DMRB Updates [REP4-043].			provided through the inclusion of vortex grit separators.	
Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP6-08 and 19]		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.	Provision for the protection of these culverts is contained in the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008] in W19. The LLFA will be given the opportunity to review the detailed drawings as a requirement as set out in the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008] well in advance of the work progressing, for any ordinary watercourses/culverts that will be impacted.	Agreed
ES Addendum: Additional Land	Road Drainage and the Water Environment	Gateshead Council are in agreement with the information submitted with Highways England.	The Road Drainage and Water Environment aspects are agreed.	Agreed
ES Addendum: Three Span Viaduct Option	Road Drainage and the Water Environment	Gateshead Council confirmed in an email to Highways England on 4 June 2020 that they have no comments on the ES Addendum 3 Span Viaduct Option.	The Road Drainage and Water Environment aspects are agreed.	Agreed
Conceptual design of the	Whole document	Gateshead Council confirmed that they agree	In terms of the design, the existing channel is highly engineered and not natural, whilst the	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Allerdene Burn. [EXA/D8/005].		with Highways England's submission in relation to the existing channel on an email on 4 June 2020.	<p>Applicant has sought to improve upon the current conditions, there are many constraints that need to be considered.</p> <p>The main constraint to changes to the channel are landownership, as 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</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>conveyance, storage or bank height 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 [REP8-007 and 008]. Additionally, a technical note was submitted as part of the Deadline 8 submissions to provide a conceptual design of the Allerdene Burn to demonstrate how this could be achieved [REP8-026].</p>	
<p>Appendix 13.1: FRA / Surface Water Drainage Strategy of the ES [APP-163]</p>		<p>In an email to Highways England on 4 June 2020, Gateshead Council confirmed their agreement to the design proposals for the underground tank (Junction 65):</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 environmental impact due to the removal of established vegetation.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>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>In an email to Highways England on 4 June 2020 Gateshead Council confirmed that they agree with the inlet/outlet features:</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 mattresses from the Environment</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>Agency (due to perceived design life) but will seek a robust and environmentally acceptable design. This approach is detailed in the updated Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008] 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 [REP8-007 and 008] within W10.</p>	
		<p>In an email to Highways England on 4 June 2020 Gateshead Council confirmed that the information on Ordinary Watercourses: The culverts at Bowes View, Leyburnhold Gill, Long Acre Dene, and the two at Smithy Lane is acceptable.</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 [REP8-007 and 008], details that Ordinary Watercourse Consent is required, for the following works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal of an existing gateway crossing by means of a culvert or bridge. • Creation of a new gateway crossing by means of a culvert or bridge. • Piping a watercourse for a length of eight 	<p>Agreed</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>metres or less.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 [REP4-009] 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 required to the culverts, or their connecting watercourses. Provision for their protection is contained in the updated Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008] in W19. The LLFA will be given the opportunity to review the detailed drawings as a requirement as set out in the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008] well in advance of the</p>	

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<p>work progressing, for any ordinary watercourses/culverts that will be impacted.</p> <p>The culvert which is being altered is the southernmost 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>	
		<p>In an email to Highways England on 4 June 2020 Gateshead Council confirmed that the information submitted on mine water/ groundwater constraints on the proposed surface water drainage system is acceptable.</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</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			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.	

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 have taken place. It has been agreed that the DCO Scheme provides sufficient mitigation.	Agreed

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 supports the A1 at this point it is the Council's view that future	Discussions regarding access to enable maintenance, repairs and managing the impacts of the Scheme on structures are ongoing.	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>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>The concept of for a design proposal (which is now to be included within the 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.</p> <p>Maintenance of the embankment and position of the water run off have been agreed with Gateshead Council.</p>	

Table 3.11: Issues related to Scheme Design

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
Structures Engineering	Sheets 3, 4 & 5	Gateshead Council prefer the 6/7 viaduct option to the embankment option.	The 6/7 span viaduct option and embankment option for Allerdene Bridge	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
<p>Drawings and Sections [APP-011]</p>		<p>Highways England proposed Rochdale envelope approach that accesses the 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>Gateshead Council provides a submission at Deadline 8 and did not raise any objection to the inclusion of the three span viaduct option.</p>	<p>are both assessed in the ES [APP-021 – APP-170] and the 3 Span Viaduct Option is assessed in the Environmental Statement Addendum [REP4-058]. Each of these configurations is presented as options in the updated Draft DCO [REP8-003 and 004]. Further details on the introduction of the 3 Span Viaduct Option are considered in the Change Request to the ExA submitted on 20 April 2020 [REP4-002]. This will be discussed with Gateshead Council in ongoing discussions.</p> <p>It is Highways England’s understanding that the inclusion of the three span viaduct option is an acceptable addition to the Scheme.</p>	
<p>Structures Engineering Drawings and Sections [APP-011]</p>	<p>Sheets 10 & 11</p>	<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>Agreed</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			<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. Details are currently under discussion with Gateshead Council.</p>	
<p>Works Plans [APP-007]</p>	<p>Sheets 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7</p>	<p>Under discussion post DCO decision.</p> <p>Workshop held on 10 April 2020.</p> <p>Gateshead Council confirmed at a meeting on 4 June 2020 that feedback on the Gantries Technical Note will be provided as part of the wider landscape design review.</p>	<p>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 within the parameters marked on the Works Plans. Further details of current proposals have been included in Appendix 3.6 A Gantry Details Report [REP8-022 and 023] of the Applicant's Deadline 8 Submission.</p> <p>A telephone conversation was held with Claire 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</p>	<p>Under Discussion</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>At the ISH2 Landscape and Visual, the Council accepted at the hearing that that there will be no significant effects from the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity within the wider landscape. The Council's concerns are limited to the impacts of the gantries on the setting of the Angel of the North. Even then, the Council is not saying that the impacts would be significant. They are suggesting that the assessment material supplied is not sufficient to assess the impacts and referred to potential flicker, massing and tunnel effects from the gantries. The Council's witness suggest that a fly-through be prepared to show the impacts.</p>	<p>interface between the Angel of the North and the Scheme.</p> <p>At ISH2, Highways England disputed that there would be flicker effects. It is Highways England's view that the gantries would simply be too far apart. In relation to assessment, in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) 3rd Edition, photomontages and assessment of views provide ample evidence to prove the Applicant's case. It is inaccurate to say there is a massing effect when the interruption in views is transitory and fleeting and of low significance. This should be viewed as the correct interpretation.</p>	
<p>ES Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-023]</p>	<p>2.5 Scheme Description</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>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 record of engagement relating to lighting the underpass.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

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)		
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 as requested a larger plan has been submitted to Gateshead Council and the .	<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. This information has been provided on the revised landscaping plan.</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>	Agreed
		Gateshead Council is seeking reassurance on a commitment from		Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		<p>Highways England to support Gateshead Council’s strategic review of impacts on highway capacity and car dependence; and issues that might cause motorists to choose to travel by car rather than walking, cycling or horse riding.</p>	<p>Highways England consider that this matter relates to a strategic review of highway capacity and car dependence by Gateshead Council and falls outside the scope of the Scheme. Separate 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> <p>Whilst this remains under discussion, it falls outside the DCO process, so for purposes of this SoCG it is considered Agreed.</p>	
		<p>The temporary diversion of Bridleway through Eighton Lodge remains a concern</p>	<p>The issue of horse riders using the temporary diversion of the Longbank Bridleway Underpass at Eighton Lodge roundabout during the construction period remains under discussion with Gateshead</p>	<p>Under Discussion.</p>

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
		for Gateshead Council in relation to horse riders.	Council and as requested following the Issue Specific Hearing ISH4 Traffic and Transport, the applicant has agreed to consult with the British Horse Society regarding measures to ensure the route is suitable for horse riders.	

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	<p>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.</p> <p>Discussions regarding the CEMP itself took place on 26 March 2020. Relevant details are set out in the environmental assessment section above.</p> <p>Gateshead Council have reviewed the CEMP submitted by Highways England at Deadline 8 and confirmed its content is acceptable via emails on 1 and 6 July 2020.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Ongoing discussions with Gateshead Council will inform the content of the CEMP, the CEMP has been updated in response to issues raised on 26 March 2020 and was resubmitted at Deadline 4. The CEMP has been updated and submitted to the ExA on 9 June 2020 at Deadline 8 [REP8-007 and 008].</p>	Agreed
Chapter 1: Introduction and Background to the Scheme, Outline CEMP [APP-174]	Table 1-1	Agreed to the construction hours as set out in the CEMP submitted at Deadline 8 [REP8-016].	<p>The Indicative Construction Programme for the Network Gas Network works as updated and shown in the Outline CEMP [REP8-007 and 008]</p> <p>Northern Gas Network –autumn 2020- autumn 2021;</p>	Agreed

Section	Sub-section	Gateshead Council Position	Highways England Position	Status
			Site Mobilisation – Winter 2020/21 Main construction works – winter 2020/21- Winter 2023/24 Site demobilisation and reinstatement – Winter 2023/24	
Chapter 3: Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments – Included within Outline CEMP [APP-174]	G4	Agreed with the hours proposed by Highways England.	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.	Agreed

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

Appendix B: Construction Traffic Management Plan– Included within Outline CEMP [APP-174]	General Issues	During a meeting on 26 March 2020, it was agreed that a Transport Working Group would be established to monitor arrival and departure of traffic.	The updated Outline CTMP (Appendix B of the CEMP [REP8-007 and 008]) was submitted at Deadline 9 and it is considered all issues raised during the examination with the exception of the temporary diversion during construction through Eighton Lodge Roundabout are considered to be agreed.	Agreed
--	----------------	---	---	--------

<p>Appendix B: Construction Traffic Management Plan– Included within Outline CEMP [APP- 174]</p>	<p>2. Site Access</p>	<p>Under discussion.</p>	<p>Two main construction compounds and 2 working construction compounds.</p> <p>Access routes, signage and PROW are set out in the CTMP contained in Appendix B of the CEMP [REP8-007 and 008].</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Appendix B: Construction Traffic Management Plan– Included within Outline CEMP [APP- 174]</p>	<p>4. Construction Traffic Impact</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>The Construction Traffic Impacts have been agreed with Gateshead Council.</p>	<p>Agreed</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 (Appendix B of the CEMP [REP8-007 and 008] submitted at Deadline 8:</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpath will be closed for no longer than absolutely necessary, and in any case no longer than 15 minutes in every full hour. • 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. 	<p>Agreed</p>
--	--------------------------------------	---	--	---------------

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All overhead operations will be suspended when assisted pedestrians pass the works.• 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 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 and Eighton Lodge roundabout improvements for WCH, the representative from Gateshead Council has agreed that no improvements scheme are required. 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>
--	------------------------------------	---	--	---------------

