

A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham

Scheme Number: TR010041

6.1 Environmental Statement - Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Tracker

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

June 2020

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

**The A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham
Development Consent Order 20[xx]**

Environmental Statement

Regulation Reference:	APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010041
Application Document Reference	TR010041/APP/6.1
Author:	A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	June 2020	Application Issue

CONTENTS

1	SCOPING LOG	1
1.2	SCOPING LOG PART A: MORPETH TO FELTON	3
1.3	SCOPING LOG PART B: ALNWICK TO ELLINGHAM	40
	REFERENCES	89

TABLES

Table 1-1 – Part A Scoping Opinion Recommendations by the Planning Inspectorate	3
Table 1-2 – Part A Consultee Comments within the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 2 of Scoping Opinion)	19
Table 1-3 – Part A Comments within the Scoping Opinion on the ES Approach	34
Table 1-4 – Part B Scoping Opinion recommendations by the Planning Inspectorate	40
Table 1-5 – Part B Consultee Comments within the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 2 of Scoping Opinion)	53
Table 1-6 – Part B Comments within the Scoping Opinion on the ES Approach	82

1 SCOPING LOG

- 1.1.1. Highways England (the Applicant) issued a request to the Planning Inspectorate for a scoping opinion on 25 January 2018 for Part A: Morpeth to Felton (Part A) and 7 November 2018 for Part B: Alnwick to Ellingham (Part B), under Regulation 10(1) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017). The Applicants request for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion was accompanied by a detailed Scoping Report (refer to **Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.10)** for Part A and **Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.11)** for Part B.
- 1.1.2. The Planning Inspectorate issued their Scoping Opinion (refer to **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.12)** for Part A and **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.13)** for Part B on 7 March 2018 and 18 December 2018 respectively which details their opinion on the scope of works for each technical assessment chapter of this Environmental Statement (ES) for Part A and Part B. **Table 1-1** and **Table 1-4** provides a summary of the scoping opinion comments received for Part A and Part B respectively and our response to the comments including a cross-reference to where the comments have been addressed within the ES. The full scoping opinions are provided within the **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.12)** for Part A and **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.13)** for Part B.
- 1.1.3. The Planning Inspectorate consulted prescribed consultation bodies, relevant statutory undertakers, Section 43 consultees and non-prescribed consultation bodies to inform their scoping opinion. A total of 15 consultation bodies responded to the Planning Inspectorate's consultation as shown in Appendix 2 of the **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.12)** for Part A and **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.13)** for Part B. **Table 1-2** and **Table 1-5** summarises the consultation responses received and our response to the consultation including a cross-reference to where relevant comments have been addressed within the ES.
- 1.1.4. The Planning Inspectorate has also provided comments on the approach to the ES within the first three chapters of the **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.12)** for Part A and **Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.13)** for Part B. **Table 1-3** and **Table 1-6** includes a summary of these comments and our response to the comments including a cross-reference to the relevant sections of this ES.
- 1.1.5. **Tables 1-1 to 1-6** reference the eight volumes of this ES, as follows:
- a. Volume 1: ES introductory chapters (1 to 4) setting out an introduction to the Scheme, a description of the Scheme, an assessment of the alternatives considered and a description of the environmental assessment methodology (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.1**).
 - b. Volume 2: ES main text for Part A, setting out the environmental assessment in Chapters (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2**).

- c.** Volume 3: ES main text for Part B, setting out the environmental assessment in Chapters (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3**).
- d.** Volume 4: Assessment of cumulative effects as a result of the Scheme and a summary of environmental effects for the Scheme (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4**).
- e.** Volume 5: ES figures for Part A, including drawings, photos and other illustrative material (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.5**).
- f.** Volume 6: ES figures for Part B, including drawings, photos and other illustrative material (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6**).
- g.** Volume 7: ES technical appendices for Part A (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7**).
- h.** Volume 8: ES technical appendices for Part B (**Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8**).

1.2 SCOPING LOG PART A: MORPETH TO FELTON

Table 1-1 – Part A Scoping Opinion Recommendations by the Planning Inspectorate

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Air Quality			
ID1	7.7.1	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of air quality impacts during construction due to the temporary nature of such effects, which will be managed by the application of standard mitigation measures. The Inspectorate does not consider that there is sufficient evidence provided in the Scoping Report to support a decision to scope this matter out of the assessment. The Applicant proposes to apply the DMRB HA 207/07 methodology to the assessment, which requires an assessment of air quality impacts from construction traffic if the activity is anticipated to last for more than 6 months. Therefore, the Inspectorate considers that an assessment of the effects on air quality from construction traffic and construction dust should be assessed and reported in the ES. The baseline conditions should take into account construction traffic routes, diversionary routes and final construction compound locations. The effectiveness of mitigation measures in reducing the significance of effects should be assessed. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the consultation response of Public Health England (PHE), which states that in the assessment of impacts the construction phase should be considered.	Impacts on Air Quality as a result of construction traffic (including traffic management measures) and construction dust were assessed using the methodology outlined in DMRB HA 207/07, and consequently presented in Appendix 5.2: Construction Traffic Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7).
ID2	7.7.3	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out consideration of particulate matter. The Inspectorate does not consider that there is sufficient evidence provided in the Scoping Report to support a decision to scope this matter out of the assessment. The Inspectorate considers that the ES should include an assessment of impacts associated with all relevant pollutants under the EU ambient air quality directive, including increased particulate matter (PM _{2.5} and PM ₁₀), resulting from the Proposed Development. In determining significance the assessment should take into account performance against relevant target/limit values. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the consultation response of PHE, which states that the assessment of impacts should encompass all pollutants which may be emitted.	The impact of the emission of particulate matter was assessed as per the methodology outlined in DMRB HA 207/07. Impacts for PM ₁₀ are reported in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Impacts for PM _{2.5} was assessed using the LAQM.TG (16) methodology as emission factors do not exist for PM _{2.5} as part of IAN 185/15.
ID3	1.2.11 and 3.4.24	The Scoping Report states that the location of construction compounds is to be finalised. Once these locations are known, the potential impacts on air quality should be reassessed as part of the ES in relation to any nearby human or ecological receptors.	This has been included in the assessment and reported in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID4	7.2	The Scoping Report states that the study area for construction impacts will include areas within 200m of the site boundary for the duration of the construction phase. The Inspectorate is of the view that this is satisfactory for the assessment of dust emissions but would expect that in assessing the impacts from construction traffic the study area would be based on traffic change criteria used to define the ARN for the air quality assessments.	The study area for construction impacts is based on the DMRB criteria used to define the ARN, and reported in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID5	7.3	The Scoping Report does not identify any human receptors which may be affected by the impacts of the Proposed Development on air quality. The ES should clearly set out the type and quantity of both human and ecological receptors which could be affected and identify their locations by reference to a plan. The Applicant's attention is drawn to DMRB HA 207/07 which states that particular attention should be paid to the location of the young, elderly and other susceptible populations/receptors. The advice from PHE in Appendix 2 of this report also supports the need for the assessment to consider impacts on residential areas and sensitive receptors. The Applicant is advised to agree which receptors should be included in the assessment with Northumberland County Council (NCC) and other relevant stakeholders such as Natural England (NE). If no human receptors are likely to be affected, then the ES should provide a justification as to why this is the case.	The human and ecological receptors are specified in Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). NCC and NE have been consulted.
ID6	7.3.2	The Inspectorate notes that local planning authority data and diffusion tube monitoring will be used to establish the baseline information. The assessment in the ES should be undertaken on the basis of relevant and up to date baseline information, including the dates on which monitoring was undertaken. The chosen monitoring locations should be depicted on an accompanying plan in the ES.	This data has been applied to the assessment presented in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). The monitoring locations are presented on Figure 5.3: Air Quality Monitoring, Volume 5 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.5).
ID7	7.3.10	The Scoping Report identifies that diffusion tube monitoring has been undertaken by the Applicant over 6 months at 8 locations between February and July 2017, as shown on Figure 7.1. This does not appear to match the advice in Defra's 'Practical Guidance on using NO2 diffusion tubes for LAQM' which advises that all surveys should be carried out for a minimum of six months, comprising three summer and three winter months. The Applicant should ensure that the baseline data relied on in the ES is robust and fit for purpose.	This is addressed in Section 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Baseline monitoring was undertaken by the Applicant over a six-month period between February and August 2017. To provide an estimate of annual mean concentrations for the assessment base year of 2015, and to account for seasonal variations across the year, the data were annualised in accordance with the approach given in Defra's LAQM.TG (16) guidance. Table 5-7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) also includes details of monitoring undertaken for Part B (sites B1 to B7 and BG (B)) as these are also relevant to the Part A Study Area.
ID8	7.3.13	The Scoping Report identifies the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI where the critical NOX for the protection of vegetation has already been exceeded. Figure 1.2 appears to show Local Wildlife Sites and ancient woodland within 200 m of the red line boundary. The Applicant should ensure that in addition to designated sites which may be impacted by changes in air quality, the ES should additionally assess locally and non-designated sites that could be affected by the Proposed Development in line with the DMRB HA 207/07 methodology. The need to consider other sensitive nature conservation sites should be established through consultation with the relevant statutory consultees. Any specific mitigation measures required to address the effects on these sites from NOX should be clearly identified and secured.	These receptors are included in the assessment presented in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Additional Ecological receptors within 200 m of the ARN were assessed, with the results consequently presented to the ecological specialists for use in their assessments. Consultation has been undertaken with Natural England in relation to the sites considered.
ID9	7.5	The Scoping Report at present does not reference monitoring of air quality during construction or operation to ensure the appropriateness of mitigation. The need for and scope of monitoring during construction and operation of the Proposed Development should be presented in the ES.	The need for and scope of monitoring of air quality during both construction and operation is addressed in Section 5.11 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID10	7.7.2	The scoping report states that a revision of the traffic model is currently being undertaken. For the avoidance of doubt, the assessment in the ES should be undertaken on the basis of an accurate and up to date traffic model.	The air quality assessment was undertaken on the basis of an accurate and up to date traffic model. The results are reported and outlined in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID11	7.7.2	The Scoping Report suggests that a simple level assessment of the impact of operational traffic on local and regional air quality is undertaken. The Applicant should ensure that the ES fully justifies its position that a simple level assessment is appropriate.	A simple level assessment was indeed proposed in the Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.10) for Part A, however with some exceedances of the critical level, a more detailed assessment was deemed necessary.
ID12	7.7.13	The Scoping Report references a number of guidance documents which will inform the assessment methodology. The methodology should be agreed with the relevant local planning authorities and clearly explained in the ES, including an explanation of how significance of effect will be determined.	The methodology is outlined in detail in Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Consultation on the methodology has been undertaken with Natural England and with NCC through the scoping process.
Noise and Vibration			
ID1	8.2	The extent of the study area should be sufficient to include any consequential noise and vibration impacts arising from the Proposed Development, and should be agreed with the relevant local planning authorities. The ES should depict both the study area and the calculation area on a suitable plan.	The study area has been set according to DMRB guidance. The calculation area is also established using DMRB, and is the area within which detailed noise level predictions are undertaken. The adopted calculation area and study area is depicted in Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). NCC has been consulted upon the methodology used.
ID2	8.3.2	The Scoping Report states that baseline traffic data will be verified by a noise assessment survey, subject to consultation with Northumberland County Council, but gives no specific information on the survey. The ES should provide details on the survey undertaken, identifying the locations where monitoring has taken place, explaining how these locations were selected, confirming when the monitoring was undertaken, and highlighting the time period covered and the weather conditions at the time. The Applicant should discuss and make efforts to agree the approach with NCC. The ES should include a justification to support the extent of the survey effort.	Consultation has been undertaken with NCC to agree baseline survey and assessment methodology. Addressed in Section 6.4 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID3	8.3.4	The Scoping Report lists various general categories of noise-sensitive receptor and states that sensitive receptors will be defined once the ARN is available. The ES should clearly identify, and include assessment of, impacts to sensitive ecological and human receptors. It should be clearly explained how these receptors have been identified and chosen.	Human Receptors are identified within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Refer to Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES for ecological receptors.
ID4	8.3.6	The NIAs located in the study area should be taken into account for the purposes of the assessment in the ES. The Scoping Report includes a plan detailing the locations of the NIAs, and this should also be included in the ES.	NIAs have been taken into account and shown in the appropriate figures associated with Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID5	8.4.2	The Scoping Report does not provide details on construction activities. The ES should contain such information, providing details on the construction programme and anticipated working hours, including any night time working that may be required. Details on the type, number and location of plant and equipment should also be provided, including information on simultaneous working and the length of time plant and equipment is due to be operational. This information should be incorporated into the assessment of likely significant effects and the working hours used to inform the assessment should be consistent with those in the DCO.	Section 2.8 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides the construction programme, which includes hours of construction, notably night hours. Paragraph 2.8.41 onwards provides details of the construction compound, indicating location and size. Refer to Section 6.8 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) for detail on the impact of this construction noise.
ID6	8.5	The Scoping Report states that appropriate mitigation will be determined once detailed assessments have been undertaken. The Applicant should ensure that the effectiveness of any proposed mitigation measures are thoroughly assessed in the ES.	Mitigation proposed and assessed in Sections 6.9 and 6.10 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID7	8.5	The Scoping Report at present does not reference monitoring of noise levels during construction or operation to ensure the appropriateness of mitigation. The need for and scope of monitoring during construction and operation of the Proposed Development should be presented in the ES.	Scope of monitoring during construction and operation outlined in Section 6.11 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID8	8.7	The Applicant should seek to agree the assessment methodology with NCC as stated in the DMRB.	Consultation has been undertaken with NCC to agree baseline survey and assessment methodology. Refer to Section 6.7 and Section 6.4 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID9	8.7.6 – 8.7.12	The Scoping Report states that the assessment of vibration will be undertaken in accordance with DMRB 213/11, and BS5228:2009+A1:29014, but it does not stipulate the calculation methodology according to which vibration levels during construction and operation are to be predicted. The ES should provide information on the methodology used to calculate predicted vibration levels for the purposes of the assessment.	Assessment methodology reported in Section 6.4 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID10	8.7.10 – 8.7.12	The Scoping report refers to BS5228:2009+A1:29014 for the assessment of potential noise and vibration during construction. However, the assessment thresholds set out in Tables 8.1 and 8.2 of the Scoping Report relate to effects at residential receptor locations only. The Applicant should ensure that impacts to sensitive ecological and human receptors are appropriately assessed in the ES.	Human Receptors are identified within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Refer to Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES for ecological receptors.
ID11	8.7.18	Reference is made to SOAEL in the Scoping Report. However, in order to be consistent with the Noise Policy Statement for England, both LOAEL and SOAEL should be defined for all of the construction and operational noise and vibration matters assessed. The ES should explain how LOAEL and SOAEL have been defined, which standards have been relied on and why these standards are appropriate. Mitigation measures should then be set out accordingly.	The definition, application and justification of LOAEL and SOAEL provided in Section 6.4 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID12	8.7.25	The Scoping Report states that a detailed level assessment of operational effects will be undertaken in the ES. With regards to the assessment of long term noise level changes, the Scoping Report states that a comparison will be undertaken between the 'do minimum opening year 2023' and the 'do something design year 2038' scenarios. However, DMRB 213/11 states that for the assessment of long term noise level changes, an assessment between the 'do minimum opening year 2023' and the 'do minimum design year 2038' scenarios should also be undertaken.	Detailed in Section 6.7 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Landscape and Visual			
ID1	9.2.2	The definition of the study area in the Scoping Report is confusing. It is not clear from the description in the Scoping Report if it will be based on the ZVI or the 1 or 2 km buffers referred to in paragraph 9.2.6. The assessment should be based on the ZVI unless departures from it can be clearly explained and justified. Where professional judgement is applied to support a decision relating to the ZVI, the reasoning applicable to that judgement should be clearly explained. The ZVI and the actual study area used (if they are different) should be presented on figures in the relevant chapter of the ES.	It can be confirmed that the visual assessment is based on the ZTV, subsequently refined following site assessment to consider viewpoints within 2 km and visual receptors within 1 km which is explained within the text. The landscape assessment is based on a 5 km radius that broadly reflects the ZTV. The text in the LVIA chapter has been simplified. Section 7.6 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) has been updated to reflect these comments.
ID1	9.3.6	The Scoping Report notes that there are several areas covered by non-statutory landscape designation and states that the presence of these will be used to determine the sensitivity of Landscape Character Areas (LCA). LCAs which overlap with non-statutory landscape designations would be assigned a higher level of sensitivity than those that do not. This approach appears to conflate two different receptors and is likely to make it more difficult for the reader to determine whether these non-statutory designated areas would be adversely affected. The ES should consider effects on non-statutory landscape designations and LCAs separately.	Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) has been adjusted to assess the effects on non-statutory landscape designations and LCAs independently.
ID2	9.3.33 / Table 9-4	The justification for assigning different levels of sensitivity to different PRoW is difficult to understand. Users of local footpaths are still likely to experience the view even if they are travelling from A to B rather than walking for recreation. The Inspectorate does not agree that different levels of sensitivity should be assigned to users of PRoW depending on their reasons for using a footpath. The ES should treat all users of PRoW as receptors of equal sensitivity.	All PRoW have been judged with a high sensitivity in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID3	9.3.35	The Applicant should make an effort to agree the list of residential and non-residential receptors for the visual impact assessment NCC.	Consultation was undertaken with NCC via email in March 2018, April 2018 and on site in May 2018, where viewpoints and local receptors were discussed. This is evidenced in Section 7.4 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID4	9.3.44	The intention to consult with NCC and Northumberland Park Authority is welcomed. The Applicant should make effort to agree the sensitivity to be assigned to a receptor with relevant authorities.	Consultation was undertaken with NCC via email in March 2018, April 2018 and on site in May 2018, where viewpoints and local receptors were discussed. This is evidenced in Section 7.4 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES. Consultation was undertaken with Northumberland National Park Authority in relation to the selection of VPs within the LVIA, however, to date no written response has been received. This is evidenced in Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.
ID5	9.3.46	The Scoping Report states that Visual Effect Schedules (VES) will be produced for all properties within 1 km of the centreline of the Proposed Development but all remaining properties will be excluded from detailed assessment. The Scoping Report does not include any justification for this approach. The ES should either include VES for all affected properties or provide clear justification to support the exclusion of affected properties.	Visual assessment of residential properties within 1 km of Part A has been undertaken, and justification for this has been provided within the description of the Study Area. All of the residents within and visitors to settlements and residential properties are considered to be of high sensitivity. Reported in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID6	9.4	It is noted that there is no intention to provide lighting on the road at present. If this decision is reversed or if the DCO would permit lighting, then the ES should contain an assessment of the effect of night-time lighting.	The effect of night time lighting is considered in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). No lighting on Part A is proposed, but the assessment considers construction compound lighting and the effects from vehicle lights.
ID7	9.7.5	It is noted that that a landscape strategy will be developed to avoid, mitigate or enhance the road landscape. The assessments in the ES must make it clear which measures have been taken into account in the assessment of significant effects. The ES should include a clear distinction between measures intended to avoid or reduce adverse effects and those that will deliver enhancement.	Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) has been updated to reflect the suggested categories.
ID8	9.7.9	The Scoping Report states that an assessment of night-time effects will be undertaken for the operational phase of the Proposed Development. If the construction phase is likely to involve working at night, then a night time assessment should also be undertaken for the construction phase.	The illumination of construction compounds has been taken in to account, for the lighting of the compound on shorter winter days or extended working hours. This detail is included in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Cultural Heritage			
ID1	10.7.2	None of these [World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens and Historic Battlefields] features have been recorded within the study area defined in the Scoping Report and so have been scoped out of further assessment. The Inspectorate has identified some concerns regarding the proposed study area for the assessment (see below). The Inspectorate also notes that the Scoping Report indicates the footprint of the Proposed Development is likely to alter (paragraph 1.2.11). Having had regard to these points the Inspectorate does not agree to scope these matters out.	Following consultation with NCC it was agreed to increase the Study Area to 500 m for undesignated assets and to obtain data for a 1 km. Furthermore, following changes to the Order Limits of Part A since the scoping report was prepared one Scheduled Monument has been identified and scoped in for assessment.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID2	10.2.1	The Scoping Report states that the study areas are based on accepted best practice and the scale and nature of the development. The best practice in question has not been identified and the Scoping Report does not explain how the scale and nature of the development justifies the definition of the study area. On the basis of the evidence provided in the Scoping Report the Inspectorate is not satisfied that sufficient justification has been provided for the extent of the study area. The ES must clearly justify the definition of the finalised study area. This point is also made by Historic England (His En) in their response in Appendix 2 of this Opinion.	Study Area has been increased following consultation with NCC, and reported in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID3	10.5.4	The Scoping Report states that archaeological mitigation will be devised where sections of field boundaries that are protected under the Hedgerow Regulations are due to be removed. It is not clear however how these field boundaries would be identified in the first place. The ES should explain how these hedgerows are identified as well as describing the proposed mitigation.	Identification of hedgerows of potentially Historic Importance is based on a review of historic mapping evidence and the Historic Landscape Characterisation Data. The results are presented in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). The criteria is set out in the legislation, however, has been challenged in the past and as a result a hedgerow is now deemed to be potentially historic if the boundary is depicted on a map pre-dating 1850.
ID4	10.4.7	Operational effects on archaeological remains have been excluded. The ES should assess the potential effect on the setting of buried archaeological remains from the operation of the Proposed Development. It should also assess the potential impact from alterations to drainage patterns on the survival of buried archaeological remains as advised by His En in Appendix 2 of this Opinion.	Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) contains an assessment of the operation effects on below ground archaeological remains resulting from a change in drainage.
ID5	10.7.5 – 10.7.6	The methodology described in paragraph 10.7.6 of the Scoping Report refers to a detailed level desk-based assessment. However, section 10.5 of the Scoping Report refers to a programme of field investigation. It is difficult therefore to understand exactly what is being proposed for the archaeological assessment and how it will be reported in the ES. The ES should base its assessment on both desk studies and the field investigations as appropriate. The ES should provide a justification for the choice of methods and area covered by the field investigations.	The desk-based assessment was based on information gathered from a walkover survey and geophysical survey. No intrusive fieldwork has been undertaken to date. This has been addressed during consultations with NCC which is outlined in Table 8-4 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID6	10.5.7 – 10.5.10	The description of mitigation proposals is limited to a general discussion of good practice rather than a clear explanation of how mitigation will be developed. The ES must clearly explain how mitigation proposals have been developed and distinguish between measures to avoid or reduce harm and those which will provide enhancements.	Where relevant Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) presents mitigation measures. However, the ES Chapter and the Draft Written Scheme of Investigations (Appendices 8.5 and 8.6, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) also contain the next steps required in order to determine mitigation measures for some assets (e.g. unknown buried archaeology).

Biodiversity

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID1	11.7.1	The study area described in the Scoping Report simply relies on set distances from the Proposed Development footprint. No justification is provided as to why the set distances reflect the likely zone of influence applicable to the anticipated impacts from the Proposed Development. In addition, paragraph 1.2.11 states that the footprint of the Proposed Development has been updated from that shown in the Scoping Report, making it unclear exactly what the study area is. The Inspectorate does not agree that these matters can be scoped out in part because there remains some uncertainty regarding the extent of the Proposed Development.	Study Areas, which differ for each resource or type of assessment, have been detailed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Where appropriate, discussion of how the Study Area has been derived (through the zone of influence of Part A) has been presented. Field survey Study Area rely on fixed distances from a scheme, as informed by DMRB and CIEEM, depending on the resource assessed. The zone of influence does not necessarily inform the Study Area for field surveys given that this would require an impact assessment prior to undertaking the surveys.
ID2	11.7.3	The justification for exclusion of effects over 50 m relies on the standing advice from NE and the Forestry Commission (FC). However, the standing advice advises this as a mitigation measure rather than a statement that there will be no effects on ancient woodland beyond these distances. Effects from changes in air quality or hydrology for instance could extend over 50m from the footprint of the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate does not agree based on the evidence presented in the Scoping Report that ancient woodland over 50m from the footprint can be scoped out of further assessment. The assessment of effects on ancient woodland in the ES must adequately reflect the ecological zone of influence of the Proposed Development and explain how this has been determined.	Through consultation with other disciplines (primarily water and air quality specialists), the Study Area in relation to ancient woodland has been expanded to address likely impacts from Part A. This has been fully discussed and presented in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID3	11.7.4	Only the priority habitats known to occur within the footprint of the Proposed Development will be assessed for impacts from direct loss. The Inspectorate agrees that impacts from direct loss on other priority habitats can be scoped out.	No action required.
ID4	11.7.6	Effects have been scoped out on the grounds that no records were found for the study area during the desk study and the study area falls outside the known UK distribution for the species. The Inspectorate agrees that their significant effect to this species is unlikely and that the assessment of impacts to this species can be scope out of the ES.	No action required.
ID5	11.2	As noted above, the Scoping Report does not explain how the various set distances used to decide the study area for different receptors represents the zone of influence of the Proposed Development. The study areas in the ES should be established on the basis of the extent of the likely impacts.	Study Areas, which differ for each resource or type of assessment, have been detailed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Where appropriate, discussion of how the Study Area has been derived (through the zone of influence of Part A) has been presented. Field survey Study Area rely on fixed distances from a scheme, as informed by DMRB and CIEEM, depending on the resource assessed. The zone of influence does not necessarily inform the Study Area for field surveys given that this would require an impact assessment prior to survey organisation.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID6	Table 11-3	Twenty two ponds within the study area were identified during the Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment as having potential to support great crested newts. Of these ponds, eDNA tests returned one positive result, fourteen negative results and five ponds were not surveyed. The Scoping Report does not explain why five ponds were not surveyed or why only twenty out of twenty two ponds have been accounted for. The surveys in the ES should cover all the potential ponds for great crested newt within the study area or provide justification on ecological grounds as to why some have been excluded.	Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and relevant appendices (notably Appendices 9.5: Great Crested Newt Survey Report 2017, 9.6: Great Crested Newt Survey Report 2018, 9.24: Great Crested Newt Method Statement - River Coquet and 9.25: Great Crested Newt Method Statement - Burgham Park, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) present a full account of all surveyed ponds.
ID7	Table 11-3	It is not clear from the row in Table 11-3 which refers to terrestrial invertebrates whether a survey will actually be carried out. Given the presence of a Species of Principal Importance and the statement that that the study area may contain habitats which support protected and/ or notable species, the ES should include assessments of effects on invertebrates where significant effects are likely.	A terrestrial invertebrate survey has been undertaken, as presented in Appendix 9.19: Terrestrial Invertebrate Survey Report, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7) and discussed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID8	Table 11-3	Table 11-3 of the Scoping Report notes that 14 records of brown hare were identified in the desk study and the farmland throughout the study area has the potential to support hare. However, it is not clear from the table if any surveys have been undertaken or are planned for this species. Given the potential for effects on brown hare and in view of the fact that they are a Species of Principal Importance, the ES should include assessments of effects on hare unless otherwise agreed with relevant stakeholders.	Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) details an impact assessment with respect to brown hare.
ID9	11.4.3	It is noted that there is no intention to provide lighting on the road at present. If this decision is reversed or if the dDCO would permit lighting, then the ES should contain an assessment of the effect of night-time lighting.	It remains that lighting is not proposed along Part A, with the exception of replacement lighting at West View. Effects of lighting during the construction phase are addressed in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID10	11.5.5	The measures outlined in this paragraph of the Scoping Report could constitute mitigation but at least one of the measures (land purchase for woodland replacement planting) appears to constitute compensation rather than mitigation. The ES should clearly define and distinguish between mitigation and compensation measures. This point is also made in the Forestry Commission's response in Appendix 2 of this report.	Mitigation and compensation have been clearly detailed separately, as appropriate within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID11	11.5.6	The Scoping Report identifies a potential need for additional botanical surveys 'moving forward in order to address the potential impacts and influence mitigation proposals. The Scoping Report does not explain at what stage of the Proposed Development these surveys would be carried out. Any mitigation measures presented in the ES should be based on a full suite of relevant surveys.	Phase 1 and NVC surveys have been completed and are presented in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and relevant appendices.
ID12	11.5	The Environment Agency (EA) has advised (see Appendix 2 of this report) that fish passages should be installed on new culverts. The Applicant is advised to make efforts to agree any mitigation measures required to maintain fish passage along watercourses with the EA.	Natural beds have been incorporated in all culverts where possible. For those where design constraints prevented the inclusion of a natural bed, these have been discussed with the EA as the statutory consultee to seek agreement. Refer to Section 9.4 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) for further detail on this consultation.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID13	11.8.3	The Scoping Report states that where full ecological baseline information cannot be obtained due to access, the precautionary principle will be applied to any assessment of important ecological features. There is no explanation of how this would be done or how this would affect the scope of the assessment in the ES. The assessments in the ES must be based on adequate desk study and field surveys, so that the ExA can be confident their recommendations are based on sound evidence.	A precautionary approach has been taken with regards to building B101A and roosting bats, which is fully detailed in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and Appendix 9.20: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7).
Road Drainage and the Water Environment			
ID1	12.7.2	The Inspectorate agrees that surface and groundwater features beyond the study area which are not hydraulically connected to the Proposed Development or likely to experience impacts from it can be scoped out of further assessment.	No action required.
ID2	12.7.3	As this matter is included within the Geology and Soils aspect chapter, the Inspectorate agrees this matter can be scoped out of this Aspect chapter within ES.	No action required.
ID3	12.7.1 – 12.7.3	The Inspectorate notes that ecological impacts will be included within the Biodiversity aspect chapter and therefore the Inspectorate agrees this matter can be scoped out of this chapter within the ES.	No action required.
ID4	12-.2.1 – 12.2.3	The Scoping Report has not clearly defined the study area as ‘up to a minimum of 0.5 km’ and ‘approximately 1 km’ do not explicitly state size of the study area. This makes it difficult to understand how the study area will actually be defined and whether it captures the area affected by the Proposed Development. Within the ES the study area should be clearly defined, justified and reflect the anticipated extent of potential impacts.	Study area description amended as detailed in Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and included on Figure 10.1: Water Constraints Plan, Volume 5 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.5) for clarity.
ID5	12.3.1	The Applicant repeatedly references Figure 1.2 Environmental Constraint Plan throughout the chapter. This figure does not; clearly distinguish between Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, or show the locations of groundwater features, or label the medium to high value receptors. These matters should be presented in a figure within the ES.	Figure 10.1: Water Constraints Plan, Volume 5 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.5) has been created to provide more clarity and detail. It now includes groundwater abstractions and the main rivers are labelled. All of the watercourses are labelled in Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7) and Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES.
ID6	12.5.3 – 12.5.4	The ES should include a figure showing the location of proposed attenuation ponds, watercourse channels, watercourse crossings and other mitigation measures.	Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7) shows the location of the detention basins. Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES details all of Part A design information regarding the watercourse’s crossings and mitigation measures for each watercourse.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID7	12.5.3	The Applicant should avoid describing mitigation measures as 'potential' and instead should explicitly state in the ES which mitigation measures will be included within the design of the Proposed Development. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the recommendations from the EA in Appendix 2 of this Opinion on the use of balancing ponds and wetland filter systems to protect the River Coquet. The Applicant is advised to make efforts to agree mitigation measures with the EA and NE as far as possible.	Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) states what mitigation measures have been included for each watercourse crossing and other water environment measures. Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7) details the embedded mitigation measures in the drainage design, these include grassed detention basins and filter drains. Consultation was undertaken with the EA and NCC, which is reported in Section 10.4 of Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of this ES and Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.
ID8	12.7.12	The Scoping Report states that the Proposed Development would introduce a linear barrier and will divert the natural flow of water affecting the baseflow of rivers. The ES must provide evidence that this will not impede water flow as this a mandatory requirement stated within paragraph 2.37 DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 10. The Applicant should also ensure that the assessment of hydromorphological effects in the ES considers the effects from both temporary and permanent works. The Applicant should seek to agree the methodology to be used in the assessment with the EA as far as is possible.	Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7) and its hydraulic analysis demonstrates that the proposed culverts will maintain existing flow paths and catchments. Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES assesses the hydromorphological impacts for both construction and operation. The methodology was agreed during consultation with the EA, which is reported in Section 10.4 of Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID9	12.7.18	The intention to provide a standalone WFD assessment with the findings presented in the ES is welcomed. The Applicant is advised to respond to the points raised by the EA in their response in Appendix 2 of this Opinion.	No action required.
Geology and Soils			
ID1	13.7.1	The Inspectorate agrees that this [Effect on Statutory and Non Statutory sites of geologic importance.] matter can be scoped out of the ES due to no statutory or non-statutory sites of geological importance being situated within the proposed study area or likely to experience impacts from the Proposed Development.	No action required.
ID2	13.3.1	The Applicant states only a summary of the baseline description is included within the Scoping Report and that a full description is included within the Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR). The Applicant should ensure a full description of baseline conditions is included within the ES. The Applicant may wish to consider doing this by including the PSSR in the ES.	A full description of baseline conditions is included in Section 11.7 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2), with the PSSR presented in Appendix 11.1: PSSR, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7).
ID3	13.2.1	The Scoping Report states that the Environmental Constraints Plan Figure 1.2 summarises the baseline conditions. However, Figure 1.2 does not show any baseline conditions discussed within this aspect chapter. The ES should include figures that show the locations of the geology, mining hazards, hydrogeology, hydrology, unexploded ordinance (UXO) potential sources of contaminations and potential environmental receptors.	Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) includes figures illustrating potential sources of contamination, surface water receptors and shallow coal mining features.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID4	13.3.2	Agricultural land quality grade 3 is subdivided into grades 3a and 3b with grade 3a being considered Best and Most Versatile Land. The Applicant should ensure that agricultural land grade 3 is subdivided into grade 3a and 3b within the ES.	Agricultural soil quality is defined with a standalone Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) report (Appendix 11.3, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)). The results have been transposed into Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID5	Table 13-2	The Scoping Report explains that the criteria used to determine the potential environmental receptors is 'based on professional experience'. A detailed explanation of how the receptors are determined has not been included. The ES should include these details and justify the criteria used to determine the sensitivity of the receptors.	Detailed explanation of how the sensitive receptors are defined is included within the Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID6	Table 13-2	The Inspectorate is concerned that the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI has not been considered as a potential environmental receptor in the assessment of impacts to geology and soils. The biodiversity chapter does not explicitly identify potential impacts on the SSSI from the release of contaminants during construction. The ES should either address any potential significant effects or explain why such effects can be excluded.	River Coquet and associated SSSI is considered as a sensitive receptor in the context of contaminated land assessment in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Such effects will be discussed, at least in part, within Appendix 9.21: Ancient Woodland Strategy, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7).
ID7	13.6.1	The Scoping Report states that the use of permanent and temporary mitigation measures will be sufficient to avoid significant effects. The Inspectorate does not feel that the Scoping Report provides sufficient detail on either the nature of the likely effects or the mitigation proposals to justify this statement. The ES must contain the evidence required to support its conclusions.	Further detail on mitigation measures are included in Section 11.9 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID8	13.7.7	The Applicant's attention is drawn to the advice from the Coal Authority on the need to provide a Coal Mining Risk Assessment or equivalent. The ES should include a detailed assessment of the route and potential risks from past mining activity and any remedial measures which may be required. The Applicant is advised to have regard to the advice from the Coal Authority in Appendix 2 of this Opinion in compiling the information.	Coal mining risk assessment (CMRA) completed for Part A, pertinent information included within the baseline and CMRA Report is included within Appendix 11.4: CMRA, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7).
Population and Human Health			
ID1	14.7.1	The Inspectorate agrees that assessment of community land and development land can be scoped out of the assessment, on the basis that no community land or development land will be affected by the Proposed Development. However, if through the iterative design process, community land or development land is likely to be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, then an assessment should be provided in the ES.	No development land is affected/taken for the purposes of Part A, so this is not reported within the assessment presented in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). No community land is directly affected but those in the relevant study area are assessed against direct impacts.
ID2	14.7.1	The Scoping Report states that there is potential for the Proposed Development to change the view from the road for users of the A1. With the implementation of mitigation measures (particularly in relation to planting) any effects are not likely to be significant. However, paragraph 14.5.4 states that in relation to vehicle travellers no further mitigation is required. The Inspectorate is therefore unclear what the scope of the assessment is and exactly what mitigation has been taken into account in the decision to scope out effects on driver views. Given these concerns, the Inspectorate is not	Views from the road are now assessed within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		convinced that the potential for significant effects can be scoped out of the assessment.	
ID3	14.7.1	The Inspectorate agrees that effects on economy and employment during operation are not likely to be significant and can be scoped out of the assessment.	No action required.
ID4	14.2.7	The ES should include a clear justification for each of the chosen study areas. The justification should be supported (where relevant) with corresponding figures to aid interpretation.	Justification for the chosen study areas are presented in Section 12.6 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and the corresponding Figure 12.1: Road Sections Assessed for Driver Stress, Volume 5 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.5).
ID5	14.3.1	The Applicant is advised to include plans and figures to depict the location of receptors included within the assessment to aid understanding, such as community facilities, in addition to PRoWs which are depicted in Figure 1.2 of the Scoping Report.	The locations of all relevant receptors are presented on Figures 12.2: Commercial Properties and Community Receptors, Volume 5 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.5).
ID6	14.3.3	The Scoping Report states that PRoW in the study area do not form a coherent network. The Applicant should consider reduction of existing severance within the Proposed Development and assessment.	Where possible the Scheme design of Part A seeks to provide safer and newer provision for WCH, for instance through permanent diversions and safe crossings. Detail is provided in Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID7	14.3.7 – 14.3.8	Table 14-2 summarises WCH movements within the study area as a result of surveys undertaken in July- September 2016. The details of the surveys should be provided within the ES along with a justification that the WCH survey is still fit for purpose. The Applicant should consider whether further surveys are required, given the length of time that has passed since the original surveys were completed.	No additional surveys considered to be required in accordance with WCHAR surveys undertaken in 2016. An additional site visit was undertaken in March 2018. This site visit concluded that there have been no significant changes to the local area in terms of new local generators that would create any notable increases/decreases in the utilisation of existing WCH routes. Therefore, the 2016 survey data provides a realistic representation of how the local footways and PRoW are being used by WCH.
ID8	14.4.1	The Scoping Report notes that temporary or permanent closures or diversions of footpaths may be required. It should be clear in the ES how long any temporary diversions are anticipated to be in place and how the diversions would be secured through the DCO or other mechanism.	Permanent and temporary diversions form part of the Scheme description and are described within the Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES.
ID9	n/a	The Scoping Report states that a three point descriptive scale (Slight, Moderate, Severe) will be used for the assessment of WCH, vehicle travellers, community amenity and severance, and physical assets in accordance with DMRB. However, no further methodology or significance criteria has been provided, therefore the Inspectorate is unable to provide comment on the suitability of the criteria to be used. The people and communities aspect chapter should clearly state how significance has been determined for all effects assessed, and where professional judgement has been applied.	Significance table included in Section 4.5 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES and assessment criteria are provided in Section 12.4 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and applied in the assessment section.

Material Resources

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID1	15.7.2	It is noted that IAN 153/11 states that the lifecycles stages of extraction of raw materials and the manufacturing of products is outside the scope of the EIA. Given that the ES will cover the consumption of material resources, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out. However, paragraph 16.2.1 states that the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the manufacturing and disposal of materials will be considered. This apparent contradiction should be resolved in the ES.	As noted in the scoping response and as agreed by the Inspectorate, a full lifecycle assessment of materials has not been completed as it is disproportionate to the benefit that would be gained in the ES. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the manufacturing and disposal of materials has been considered within Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and are not within the scope of the materials chapter.
ID2	15.7.2	As only routine maintenance is anticipated to occur post operation year 1 and the Applicant states that 'current routine operation and maintenance works on the existing A1 assets generate negligible volumes of site arisings', no likely significant affects are anticipated to occur from the consumption of material resources, site arisings and generation of waste post operating year 1. Therefore, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES	Material consumption and waste generation after the first year of operation has been scoped out as agreed by the Inspectorate. Refer to Section 13.4 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID3	15.7.2	The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter [Impacts and effects of transporting material resources and waste to and from site] out as it will be assessed through other aspect chapters. The other chapters include; Air Quality, People and Communities and Water and Drainage. However, this matter has not been addressed in these chapters and therefore the Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.	This has been addressed in Section 13.4 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES.
ID4	15.7.2	The Scoping Report states that this matter [Contamination and resource sterilisation] is discussed within the Geology and Soils aspect chapter. The Inspectorate agrees that the sterilisation of agricultural soils and the risk of contamination affecting controlled waters or human health can be scoped out as these are the matters are to be assessed in the Geology and Soils chapter. Any other matters relating to contamination and resource sterilisation should still be covered in the ES.	This has been addressed in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID5	15.3.1	The Scoping report states that 'some materials' will be required and 'some waste' will be produced but does not include any specific detail regarding the quantities and type of materials and waste. The ES should include sufficient detail to ensure there is a robust description of baseline conditions within the ES.	Quantities of materials consumed, and waste generated by the existing asset are not available for inclusion in the chapter. The statements included within Section 13.7 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) are deemed to represent accurately the information available. Note: if information had been available on materials and waste from the existing asset, these data would not have altered the findings of the assessment.
ID6	15.3.22	The Applicant states that professional judgement has been used to determine the sensitivity of receptors but has not included the criteria used to determine the sensitivity. The ES should include a full explanation of how the sensitivity or receptors is determined.	Since publication of the Scoping Report for Part A, further guidance to refine the assessment process has been produced. Refer to Section 13.4 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2), and the corresponding table (Table 13-4).
Climate			

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID1	Table 16-4	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out operation and maintenance as emission sources, as no information technology services are proposed. The Inspectorate agrees that emissions from information technology services and lighting can be scoped out of the assessment, on the basis that they are not proposed within the Proposed Development.	No action required.
ID2	Table 16-4	Emissions from replacement has been excluded as it overlaps with repair. As repair has been scoped into the assessment the Inspectorate agrees that replacement can be excluded.	No action required.
ID3	Table 16-4 and 16.7.5	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out decommissioning of the Proposed Development, inclusive of deconstruction, transportation of waste arisings, waste processing for recovery, and disposal. The justification given is that decommissioning would take place decades into the future, and there is uncertainty regarding the decommissioning process and associated emissions. The Inspectorate agrees that decommissioning can be scoped out of the assessment as there is insufficient detail at this stage to provide an accurate assessment and it is uncertain what scale of decommissioning works would be.	No action required.
ID4	Table 16-6	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out drainage within the assessment of climate resilience and the following sub-matters: surface water drainage systems; cross- culverts; road-edge drainage; attenuation; outfalls; and drainage ditches. The justification given is that the climate effects on drainage will be assessed within road drainage and the water environment aspect chapter of the ES. However, drainage ditches have been identified in Table 16-5 and scoped into the assessment. The Inspectorate agrees with the justification given but advises that the clear cross reference to assessment within road drainage and the water environment aspect chapter should be provided within the climate aspect chapter.	Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) has cross-referenced Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of this ES, making sure that consideration of drainage ditches is referenced.
ID5	Table 16-6	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out incident management within the assessment of climate resilience and the following sub-matters within incident management: breakdowns; road user incidents/ accidents; and third party incidents. The justification given is that these matters are outside of the scope of the design works. However, it is not clear what this statement means. The ES should either address this point or provide a clear justification for not considering this matter.	Incident management does not form part of the Climate assessment and reference to the Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment in Appendix 4.3 of this ES and Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4) is included within Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID6	16.2.3	The Scoping Report states the climate resilience assessment will utilise UK Climate Projections (UKCP09). As set out in the NPS NN the assessment of potential impacts of climate change should take into account the latest UK Climate Projections available at the time. The assessment in the ES should therefore take account of the UKCP18 projections if these become available before the ES is finalised.	Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) has used UKCP18 data.
ID7	16.4.6, Table 16-2 and 16.6.1	The Scoping Report states that potential significant effects will be identified during the environmental assessment, and that the potential effects provided in Table 16-2 in relation to the climate resilience are not exhaustive. All potential effects considered in relation to the climate aspect chapter should be clearly outlined in the ES, providing justification for scoping additionally identified effects in or out of the assessment. The methodology to assess these effects should be clearly provided in the ES.	Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) has been prepared accordingly and in line with latest guidance.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
ID8	16.7.7	The Scoping Report states that Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTag) Chapter 4: Greenhouse Gases will be used to inform the greenhouse gas assessment. The Inspectorate notes that this guidance is an 'appraisal methodology' intended for the development of business cases, applicable to highways and public transport interventions and not necessarily for the purposes of undertaking assessment for the ES. The Applicant should take care to ensure that the methodology applied is sufficient to identify and assess the likely significant effects from the Proposed Development.	The assessment methodology is detailed within Section 14.4 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). The Transport Analysis Guidance has been utilised to quantify traffic data for the operational phase end-user GHG emissions specifically. This quantitative assessment forms the basis of the EIA assessment of this emissions source by providing emissions magnitude. This then enables the significance of emissions to be determined and is considered to be a suitable approach to identify and assess likely significant effects from Part A.
ID9	16.7.10	The Scoping Report states that emission calculations will be completed within an industry recognised carbon calculation tool. However, no further details have been provided, so the Inspectorate is unable to provide any comments on its suitability. The ES should clearly explain the calculation tool that is finally used and provide a justification for its selection.	The Applicant Carbon Assessment Tool has been used to calculate construction phase emissions, which is reported in Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
ID10	16.8.2	It has been estimated that materials for the construction of the Proposed Development will be transported 20 km. The Inspectorate expects further explanation and justification for such assumptions within the resulting ES.	Construction phase information included anticipated locations of materials source and waste disposal locations. The distance to these sites has been used as an estimation of the transport distance to inform the Applicant Carbon Assessment Tool.
ID11	16.8.5	The Scoping Report states that no guidance currently exists to determine significance for the climate aspect chapter. No methodology or significance criteria has been provided, therefore the Inspectorate is unable to provide comment on the suitability of the criteria to be used. The climate aspect chapter should clearly state how significance has been determined, and where professional judgement has been applied.	The assessment method is detailed within Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and conforms with the latest guidance at the time of writing.
Cumulative Effects			
ID1	17.2	While it is noted that the distance of 500 m for non-traffic related impacts is based on guidance in the DMRB, it is not clear which aspects or matters would be classed as non-traffic related. In addition the Scoping Report does not explain why a distance of 500m would be sufficient to capture all the potential interactions with other projects which could lead to significant effects. The ES must provide a clear justification for the adequacy of the study area. The Applicant may find the approach described in the Inspectorate's Advice Note 17 helpful.	Paragraphs 16.6.3 to 16.6.11 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) presents the Study Area for the cumulative assessment for the Scheme and a justification for the Study Area used. The Study Area for the cumulative assessment consists of a 2 km buffer from the Order Limits, plus the air quality ARN and noise and vibration Wider Network Affected Links (where it extends beyond the 2 km buffer) and 200 m around the roads included in the ARN and Wider Network Affected Links. In addition, the Study Area has been increased to the southern extent of the ARN where it follows the A1 to allow for two junctions.
ID2	17.3.6	The Scoping Report explains that criteria to determine the significance of effects will be based on Table 2.6 of DMRB HA 205/08 and professional judgement. The ES must clearly explain where professional judgement has been applied and the reasoning behind it.	The application of professional judgement in determining significance is explained in paragraph 15.4.10 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) for the combined assessment for Part A and paragraph 16.4.74 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) for the cumulative assessment of the Scheme.
ID3	17.4.1	The receptors considered will only include those that are likely to experience potential residual significant effects from more than one topic area. This appears to ignore the possibility that interaction between non-significant residual effects could also lead to a significant combined effect.	As detailed in paragraph 15.4.6 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2), residual effects of 'minor' or above have been taken into consideration for the combined assessment for Part A. This is to account for the potential for multiple 'non-significant effects' to combine to result in an overall significant combined effect.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
			The same approach has been undertaken for the Cross Topic combined effects assessment for the Scheme. Refer to paragraph 16.4.45 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4).

Table 1-2 – Part A Consultee Comments within the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 2 of Scoping Opinion)

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority records indicate that there are 4 mine entries, and areas of recorded and likely unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth along the improvement Scheme route. The Coal Authority would expect any Environmental Statement prepared to support the application to include a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, or equivalent, which sets out detailed consideration of the route and the potential risks posed by past coal mining activity, and what, if any, remedial measures are required. The Coal Authority is of the opinion that building over the top of, or in close proximity to, mine entries should be avoided wherever possible, even after they have been capped, in line with our adopted policy. Also see additional guidance in the response itself.	Coal mining risks and likely mitigation measures set out in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) based on the Ground Investigation Report (Appendix 11.2, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7) and recommendations within the CMRA (Appendix 11.4, Volume 7 of this ES).
Cumbria County Council	The County Council does not consider that the project would impact on Cumbria and, therefore, does not propose to engage further on the development of the project.	No action required.
Environment Agency - North East	With respect to flood risk modelling and climate change on Highway England road designs, we would expect the modelling to incorporate 20 – 25% climate change. This should be reflected into the flood risk modelling.	The hydraulic modelling included a 25% allowance for climate change.
Environment Agency - North East	A Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment will need to be submitted in support of the National Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) application. This should assess the impact of the proposed development upon WFD and all 31 watercourses.	No action required.
Environment Agency - North East	River Lyne has a WFD classification of poor for ecology. The Longdike Burn is also classified as moderate for ecology. Options to mitigate and improve these WFD classifications should be investigated as part of the NSIP.	River Lyne watercourse crossing facilitates fish and mammal passage through a natural bed and mammal ledge. The existing wooden baffles in the Burgham culvert along Longdike Burn are being replaced with more robust baffles. The extension of Bockenfield bridge will mimic the existing structure and maintain a natural bed and allow mammal passage.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Environment Agency - North East	<p>The following issues should be taken into consideration in the WFD assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will expansion of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton lead to deterioration of WFD status of waterbodies within the proposed area of works? - Will expansion of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton compromise the achievement of Good status in any of the WFD water bodies? - Will expansion of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton contribute towards a cumulative deterioration of WFD status or prevent cumulative enhancement of WFD status? - Will expansion of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton compromise the achievement of WFD objectives in those waterbodies that are hydrologically linked? - Can expansion of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton support the delivery of the measures identified in the Northumbria River Basin management Plan (2016) that are required to achieve its waterbody objective? - What are the WFD impacts during the construction phase and the completion of the proposed works? Compensatory works may be required to mitigate WFD impacts. 	<p>The WFD Assessment (Appendix 10.2, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) includes details which addresses these points.</p>
Environment Agency - North East	<p>The requirement for oil traps and hydrodynamic vortex separators will need to be considered to prevent surface water pollution and any deterioration in WFD status.</p>	<p>HAWRAT assessments (refer to Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) have been undertaken for each new outfall to assess the suitability of mitigation within the drainage strategy. The outfalls all passed both Method A and D with the proposed treatment measures therefore there was no need to incorporate oil traps and vortex separators.</p>
Environment Agency - North East	<p>The Agency welcomes the inclusion of a section in relation to mitigation for sediment management options within the scoping report. It is vital is mitigation for sediment management is taken into account, in order to prevent any deterioration in WFD status of the receiving watercourses.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
Environment Agency - North East	<p>An assessment using HAWRAT and the Water Risk Assessment Tool will need to be carried out to quantify the impacts of routine runoff and spillages on the receiving watercourses. Mitigation for the increase in flow to receiving surface waters, especially during storm events will also need to be considered. This will prevent scouring and sediment mobilisation within the watercourses and around the highway drain outfalls.</p>	<p>HAWRAT assessments (refer to Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) have been undertaken for each new outfall to assess the suitability of mitigation within the drainage strategy.</p>
Environment Agency - North East	<p>Due to the potential impact on water quality for the River Coquet SSSI and all other sites, it is recommended that drainage is directed into balancing ponds and runoff is attenuated into wetland filter systems. These should be appropriate to the landscape and support native flora and fauna where possible.</p>	<p>HAWRAT assessments (refer to Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) have been undertaken for each new outfall to assess the suitability of mitigation within the drainage strategy. Filter drains and grassed detention basins with sediment forebays are proposed.</p>

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Environment Agency - North East	A Diffuse Water Pollution Plan has been developed to look at the sources of diffuse pollution throughout the catchment. The Agency would welcome the inclusion of mitigation options to reduce diffuse pollution within the River Coquet and the other water courses within the study area. This should also be included as part of a wider catchment based approach to improving WFD status.	Wider catchment initiatives such as agricultural improvements as part of the plan are not part of the scope of assessment as this requires land owner agreements. The proposed drainage outfalls have assessed to not have a significant impact. Wider catchment initiatives maybe taken forward for consideration for designated funds.
Environment Agency - North East	Paragraph 12.7.1 states that the hydromorphological condition of the watercourses will be assessed. It is vital that all watercourse crossing surveys demonstrate how the temporary and permanent works will be carried out and the impact they will have on the hydromorphology.	This has been assessed in the WFD Assessment (Appendix 10.2, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)).
Environment Agency - North East	The impact upon the hydromorphology should be used to directly assess the impact upon ecology including fish and their habitat, invertebrates and macrophytes. This could be incorporated into the WFD Assessment and mitigation included where appropriate.	This has been assessed in the WFD Assessment (Appendix 10.2, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)).
Environment Agency - North East	In support of the hydromorphology assessment, River Habitat Surveys, watercourse crossing surveys and geomorphological surveys will be required.	A standalone geomorphological assessment of the River Coquet has been undertaken (Appendix 10.4: Geomorphology Assessment - River Coquet, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)). Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) details baseline ecological surveys and topographic surveys of all watercourses were undertaken.
Environment Agency - North East	Where river crossings are to be undertaken, these crossings should be open and must not pose a barrier to migrating fish.	Consultation with the project ecologist was undertaken regarding fish passage and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design. Consultation was also undertaken with the EA (refer to Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.
Environment Agency - North East	The scoping report indicates there will be eight culverts along the Scheme, three of these will be new culverts and five existing. The Agency does not generally support the development of new culverts. Therefore, it is recommended that discussions are held between Highway England and the Agency to discuss the impact of the proposed development on fish passage and ecology.	Consultation was undertaken with the EA and the project ecologist regarding fish and mammal passage requirements (refer to Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.
Environment Agency - North East	If culverts are to be installed, fish passage on the new culverts must be incorporated into the Scheme. Fish passage improvement should also be investigated and considered within the existing culverts.	Consultation with the project ecologist was undertaken regarding fish passage and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design. Consultation was also undertaken with the EA (refer to Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.
Environment Agency - North East	Where any stabilisation to banks is required, we would support the use of soft engineering, before hard engineering techniques are used.	Areas where scour protection will be provided have been included in Part A descriptions and design drawings. The details of the scour protection will be finalised at the detailed design stage.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Environment Agency - North East	The Agency are currently undertaking a white clawed crayfish conservation project that incorporates Northumberland Country Zoo. This will involve setting up a captive ark site. The Agency would welcome any involvement from Highways England in this project.	Impacts to white-clawed crayfish were screened out from assessment. EA has not raised this during consultation and therefore currently not included as part of Part A.
Environment Agency - North East	The designated sites included in the scope are sufficient and Natural England will need to be consulted regarding the impact on these.	Natural England have been consulted, with details presented in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.
Environment Agency - North East	The applicant should consider whether any potentially contaminative current and previous land uses are located along the route of the development. If there is a possibility of encountering land contamination, an assessment of the risk posed to controlled water receptors should be undertaken with remediation and/or mitigation undertaken as required to manage the risks identified.	Contaminated land assessment undertaken along the route of Part A as part of the ground investigation. The assessment results are included within baseline with associated mitigation measures in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Environment Agency - North East	We are aware of the presence of shallow groundwater along some parts of the route. Therefore, consideration will need to be given to whether this may pose a risk to any part of the proposed Scheme. For example, infiltration is unlikely to be a suitable drainage option.	Infiltration is not proposed as part of the drainage strategy. The detention basins will be lined - therefore there are no impacts to groundwater ingress that might increase flood risk and no risk of pollution of groundwater resources. Upheave will be considered by the drainage designers during the detailed design stage.
Environment Agency - North East	The storage and use of any chemicals used on site during the development works should not pose a risk to controlled waters. Thus, consideration should be given to the use of suitable pollution prevention measures. For example, the storage of chemicals within appropriately sized bunds	Considered in the Outline Construction Environmental Plan (CEMP) (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3). Measures detailed in WFD Assessment (Appendix 10.2, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)).
Environment Agency - North East	The rivers within your proposed road design are designated "main river" and under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016. You may require an environmental permit for flood risk activities. If you want to do work within 8metres of a non-tidal sections, or 16 m of the tidal section, instance where work is proposed: a)in, under or near a main river (including where the river is in a culvert; b)on or near a flood defence on a main river c)in the floodplain of a main river d)on or near a sea defence.	No action required. This will be included in the detailed design stage.
ESP Gas Group Limited	I can confirm that ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works.	No action required.
Forestry Commission - Yorkshire and North East	We recognise that there are proposed "Direct loss of landscape features such as hedges, trees and woodlands (including potential loss of Ancient Woodland)". We note that where they are irreplaceable habitats, their loss cannot be fully compensated for. It is not possible to offset the potential impacts to ancient woodland (Paragraph 11.5.5) Paragraph 9.5.4 and Section 11.5 should therefore refer to compensation actions as well as mitigation.	Terminology has been defined within the Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) to avoid confusion with regards to mitigation and compensation when discussing irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Forestry Commission - Yorkshire and North East	We also suggest that a management plan is required, as set out in Paragraph 11.5.6, to ensure long term viability of created habitat. This is particularly the case for woodlands created as compensation for loss of ancient woodland, especially those with translocated soil from ancient woodland sites. This paragraph should also refer to compensation as well as mitigation.	Management practices in relation to ancient woodland compensatory woodland planting are presented within the Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)).
Health and Safety Executive	The road section crosses pipeline National Grid Gas PLC 13 Feeder Wooler/Corbridge. It is advised that the Applicant should approach the Pipeline operator	All relevant operators engaged. Detailed works are presented in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES.
Historic England - North East	We would expect the Environmental Statement to consider the potential impacts on non-designated features of historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, since these can also be of national importance and make an important contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of an area and sense of place	Following consultation with NCC, High Highlaws Farmhouse and New houses Farm were scoped in for assessment as non-designated built heritage assets (refer to Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES).
Historic England - North East	The assessment should also take account of the potential impact which associated activities (such as construction, servicing and maintenance, and associated traffic) might have upon perceptions, understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets in the area.	The assessment addresses the potential impacts on heritage assets during and their setting during both construction and operation (Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)). This includes construction compounds and access tracks.
Historic England - North East	The assessment should also consider, where appropriate, the likelihood of alterations to drainage patterns that might lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits and can also lead to subsidence of buildings and monuments.	The assessment includes this as a potential impact on below ground remains in the operation phase (Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)).
Historic England - North East	We would expect the assessment to clearly demonstrate that the extent of the proposed study area is of the appropriate size to ensure that all heritage assets likely to be affected by this development have been included and can be properly assessed.	No additional assets outside of the 1 km Study Area were identified during the assessment or in consultation with NCC and Historic England (Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES).
Historic England - North East	It is important that the assessment is designed to ensure that all impacts are fully understood. Section drawings and techniques such as photomontages are a useful part of this. This would be of particular importance in relation to the proposed new junctions and bridge.	The assessment has assumed worst case scenario and is based on the designs available at the time of the assessment.
Historic England - North East	We would strongly recommend that you involve the Northumberland County Council Conservation Officer and archaeological advisers in the development of this assessment. They are best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities; how the proposal can be tailored to avoid and minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of heritage assets.	NCC archaeological advisors and conservation team were consulted as part of the assessment (Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES. A draft of the DBA was sent for their comment and followed up in a meeting afterwards in August 2018.
Historic England - North East	The setting assessment should follow best practice standards and guidance as set out in “Good Practice Advice in Planning - Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets” and “Good Practice Advice in Planning - Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment”. The latter is in addition to guidance mentioned in paragraph 10.7.6 of the Scoping Report.	The Setting assessment has been done in accordance to this guidance and is set out in the DBA and the ES chapter methodology sections.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Human Rights Commission	No response received.	No action required.
National Grid	We would request that the potential impact of the proposed Scheme on National Grid's existing assets as set out above and including any proposed diversions is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application. see detailed guidance also in their response.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents this detailed information together with drawings. The proposed works are assessed within each relevant technical topic.
Public Health England	We believe the summation of relevant issues into a specific section of the report provides a focus which ensures that public health is given adequate consideration. The section should summarise key information, risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures, conclusions and residual impacts, relating to human health. Compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statements and relevant guidance and standards should also be highlighted.	This is presented in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Public Health England	In terms of the level of detail to be included in an ES, we recognise that the differing nature of projects is such that their impacts will vary. Any assessments undertaken to inform the ES should be proportionate to the potential impacts of the proposal, therefore we accept that, in some circumstances particular assessments may not be relevant to an application, or that an assessment may be adequately completed using a qualitative rather than quantitative methodology. In cases where this decision is made the promoters should fully explain and justify their rationale in the submitted documentation.	This is addressed in this ES where appropriate.
Public Health England	It is noted that the current proposals do not appear to consider possible health impacts of Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF). The proposer should confirm either that the proposed development does include or impact upon any potential sources of EMF; or ensure that an adequate assessment of the possible impacts is undertaken and included in the ES. (see additional guidance in the response letter)	This has been assessed and scoped out. The findings are presented in Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES.
Royal Mail Group	The ES should include information on the needs of major road users (such as Royal Mail) and acknowledge the requirement to ensure that major road users are not disrupted though full advance consultation by the applicant at the appropriate time in the DCO and development process - see info about nearest office etc.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents details of likely traffic disruption. Technical topics consider road users in their assessment where relevant, particularly Population and Human Health (refer to Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)). Royal Mail have been consulted on design, as detailed within the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/5.1) .
Royal Mail Group	The ES and DCO application should include detailed information on the construction traffic mitigation measures that are proposed to be implemented by the Applicant / its contractor, including a draft Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents these details. A CTMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4) has been prepared to outline measures to manage the effects of construction traffic upon the local road network resulting from the construction of the Scheme. The CTMP would be further developed by the main contractor prior to works commencing, and agreed with Applicant and NCC.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Royal Mail Group	Royal Mail is fully pre-consulted by the Applicant / its contractor on any proposed road closures / diversions/ alternative access arrangements, hours of working and the content of the CTMP. The ES should acknowledge the need for this consultation with Royal Mail and other relevant major road users.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents these. Technical topics consider road users in their assessment where relevant, particularly Population and Human Health (refer to Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)). Royal Mail have been consulted and engaged. Contractor / public liaison officer will consult with Royal Mail on construction phasing at detailed design prior to construction.
Northumberland Clinical Commissioning Group	We realise the current consultation centres around the Environmental Impact Assessment, but there does not appear to be an indication of significant enhancements to opportunities for active lifestyles. There is a recognition that a number of rights of way will need to be addressed and re-routed to fewer, but safer crossing points of the A1. There is a statement in section 3.2.2 about supporting the environment for walkers, cyclists and other vulnerable users, but little suggestion that the Scheme will consider real enhancements for these activities. We would hope this is considered as part of the overall scheme, particularly where parts of the existing A1 are to be retained for local traffic and could incorporate enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes.	Consideration of the potential impacts on WCHs is provided in Sections 12.8, 12.9, and 12.10 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland Clinical Commissioning Group	It should be noted in section 14.3.17 that there is an additional GP surgery in Felton itself and an additional GP surgery in Morpeth (alongside Morpeth NHS centre) – the Wellway Medical Group.	The Health Centre is more than 1 km from the Order Limits of Part A so is not included within the list of community facilities (as per the study area outlined earlier in the document).
Northumberland County Council County Archaeologist	In order to reduce the risk of unnecessary or abortive work being undertaken I recommend that the scope of an appropriate assessment is discussed and agreed with the Conservation Team. Please note that this would be a chargeable service.	The Conservation team were consulted as part of the assessment work. Details of consultation has been logged and a summary provided in the Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council County Archaeologist	The Report advocates the avoidance of impacts to known heritage assets where possible (10.5.1). A programme of archaeological assessment is advocated to inform an assessment of presence and significance of currently unrecorded archaeological sites. In the first instance, programmes of geophysical survey and intrusive evaluation trenching are suggested (10.5.1).	A geophysical survey has been undertaken. The trial trenching will be undertaken post-DCO. This was addressed in the subsequent consultation and logged in Table 8-4 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council County Archaeologist	Overall, the site is considered to retain a high potential for significant unrecorded archaeological remains. It is understood that a programme of archaeological geophysical survey is currently being undertaken within the proposed construction corridor. The results of this exercise are awaited.	The survey was completed and reported early 2018. The results have been presented in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and the report included in Appendix 8.2: Geophysical Survey, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7). The survey found few anomalies of potential archaeological origin.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council County Archaeologist	The proposed development has potential to impact the setting of designated and undesignated heritage assets, including the archaeological and built heritage. The Scope of an appropriate visual impact assessment should be discussed and agreed with the conservation Team, including the identification of appropriate viewpoints for visual simulations / photomontages or similar.	The Conservation team were consulted as part of the assessment work prior to the site walkover and logged in Table 8-4 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council County Archaeologist	Since the detail of the proposed route may potentially be subject to revision prior to final design freeze, it is recommended that a precautionary approach is taken when agreeing the scope of the assessment. Non-intrusive phases of work (such as geophysical survey and fieldwalking) should ideally extend beyond the wayleave corridor. This will both contextualise the data and assess the archaeological potential of areas which might be drawn into the Scheme via revisions or consequential impacts (such as fencing, landscaping planting or diverted tracks or utilities) on a cost-effective basis.	The assessment presented in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) has addressed the wider DCO application boundary for Part A, and not just the Order Limits of Part A itself. It has included all the temporary access tracks and compound areas.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	"Principle of Biodiversity Enhancement - The ES scoping report states that one of the aims of the proposal is to commit to the principle of no net loss for biodiversity (This is enhancement not no net loss). The principle toward biodiversity should be to aim to deliver biodiversity enhancement over and above mitigation proposals, this is in line with the NPPF (para 109 and 118)."	A Biodiversity No Net Loss assessment (Appendix 9.20, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)). has been undertaken to inform Part A. The findings of the assessment has been used to quantify the impacts to biodiversity (loss and gain) across Part A and identify requirements for mitigation and enhancement.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The mitigation and enhancement should take opportunities to create and join ecological networks, again in line with the NPPF (para 109). For example, creating continuous north south semi natural vegetation linking the Wansbeck corridor to the Coquet corridor.	Landscape connectivity has been considered within the mitigation strategy and incorporated into the Scheme design for Part A to maintain and, where possible, improve connectivity.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	I would strongly encourage that there is an aim that all grassland created should be species rich grassland, which utilise locally appropriate wild provenance seed mixture, potentially including the only Northumberland wild provenance seed from B & K Wharf Farming (as detailed on the Flora Locale supplier directory). Where species rich grassland is to be established a full topsoil profile should not be restored, indeed topsoil could be omitted completely.	Grassland incorporated into the landscape plan is extensively species rich in the majority, with the exception of some small areas.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	I cannot see note of bat transect surveys and static monitoring. Given the potential for severance effects from the proposal it is imperative that an understanding of how bats are travelling through the landscape is gained through appropriate survey work in accordance with BCT guidance.	Bat transects (BCT and Defra) and static monitoring have been undertaken to inform Part A (refer to Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The presence and location of veteran trees, including those without ancient woodland, should be carefully mapped and unless absolutely impossible veteran trees should be retained and protected. Veteran trees host a disproportionately large range of taxa and for this reason the NPPF gives aged and veteran trees the same status as other irreplaceable habitats (para 118).	A survey for the presence and location of veteran trees has been undertaken and documented within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	I welcome that road is not to be lit as this limits the impact to bats and other nocturnal mammals and birds. The water quality of the River Coquet under The Inspectorate many of the special interest features of the SSSI, therefore measures to alleviate pollution including those to remove and trap sediment (oversized vegetated balancing ponds) are essential, particularly in the Coquet catchment area.	No further action required regarding lighting. Impacts to the River Coquet have been addressed and appropriate mitigation proposed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Natural England - Detail Appendix A - Advice related to EIA Scoping. Generic principles	No action required.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	We note at paragraph 11.6.1 of the Scoping Document that 'potential significant impacts on biodiversity and suitable enhancement measures will be recommended to ensure a minimum target of no net loss of biodiversity is achieved' – given the size and scale of this proposal there should be a minimum target of a net gain in biodiversity value, and suitable enhancement measures should be recommended to achieve this aspiration.	A Biodiversity No Net Loss assessment (Appendix 9.20, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) has been undertaken to inform Part A. The findings of the assessment has been used to quantify the impacts to biodiversity (loss and gain) across Part A and identify requirements for mitigation and enhancement.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The Environmental Statement should include a full assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the development on the features of special interest within this site and should identify such mitigation measures as may be required in order to avoid, minimise or reduce any adverse significant effects.	Direct and indirect effects of Part A have been considered within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and mitigation has been developed to address impacts.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	2.3 Regionally and Locally Important Sites - The EIA will need to consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites. Local Sites are identified by the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or a local forum established for the purposes of identifying and selecting local sites. They are of county importance for wildlife or geodiversity. The Environmental Statement should therefore include an assessment of the likely impacts on the wildlife and geodiversity interests of such sites. The assessment should include proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures. Contact the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or local sites body in this area for further information.	Local wildlife sites have been included within the impact assessment, as detailed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). This includes identification of impacts as a result of changes in air quality extending beyond the limits of Part A and above and beyond the requirements of the DMRB.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Numerous Natural England habitat/biodiversity general principle comments to adhere to.	No action required.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable resource of great importance for its wildlife, its history and the contribution it makes to our diverse landscapes. Local authorities have a vital role in ensuring its conservation, in particular through the planning system. The ES should have regard to the requirements under the NPPF (Para. 118) 2 which states: 'Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.'	The impacts on ancient woodland have been extensively discussed with statutory consultees, particularly Natural England, which has been reported in Section 9.4 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). An Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) has been developed which addresses impacts to ancient woodland and includes woodland planting to address loss.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas which can be found on our website.	Assessment contained in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) refers to National Character Areas.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The EIA should consider potential impacts on rights of way in the vicinity of the development. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts. We also recommend reference to the relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.	The impacts on PRowS are considered within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Impacts from the development should be considered in light of the Government's policy for the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as set out in paragraph 112 of the NPPF. We also recommend that soils should be considered under a more general heading of sustainable use of land and the ecosystem services they provide as a natural resource in line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF.	The impact on BMV is considered within Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	We would anticipate the EIA to consider the impacts during the construction phase when sections of the Local Road Network are closed for any significant lengths of time. There would be particular interest where the A1 itself is required to be completely closed and the impacts during this time on the subsequent diversion route.	The details of the construction works, and the potential impacts that could occur during the construction phase are reported within Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES and relevant Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	In respect to the cumulative impacts assessed, the applications listed in the Scoping Report appear to omit some larger scale developments in Morpeth and some relatively large scale development sites within Felton. These development will add traffic to the network and the EIA should consider whether these are significant enough to warrant inclusion in the cumulative effect's assessment	Other developments which could lead to cumulative effects have been reconsidered and are presented within Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The Highways Officer welcomes the opportunity for continued involvement in the project including the scope of a Transport Assessment that is likely to be required as part of the Development Control Order submitted to the Inspectorate.	A Case for the Scheme has been produced (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.1).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Water Resources and Flood Risk - As set out in the Scoping Report, the ES should assess the impacts on groundwater features, surface watercourses and water bodies and on flood risk of the construction and operation separately. The impacts of construction should take account of the measures proposed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).	Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) assesses the impacts during both the construction and operation phases of Part A. Appropriate measures are included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) .
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The assessment of the impacts of the operation of the development on water resources should consider the potential effects described in the Scoping Report. It should also consider the potential for, and effects of, changes to surface water and groundwater interactions, together with any impact this could have on private water supplies, that may arise as a result of the development.	The Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 10.5, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) states that the denotation basins will be lined. As a result, there is no risk of pollution of groundwater resources.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Comments from the NCC LLFA include: A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy will be required with any formal submission. These documents will need to look at existing flood risk and the impact of this risk and any increased flood risk as a result of any development. Surface water from new hardstanding areas will need to be assessed and mitigated.	A standalone Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 10.5, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) has been produced and summarised within the FRA (Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of this ES) which presents how the increased area of hardstanding has been mitigated using the surface water drainage system. The FRA details the existing flood risks along Part A.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Furthermore, flood risk impacts will be addressed in a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and this should be reported in the ES. The FRA should consider, in detail, the potential for flood risk impacts downstream of the development via appropriate modelling. It must be demonstrated that there is no increase in flood risk to the environment and the local community, no changes to the channel conveyance, or reduction in the Standard of Protection of the EA's Flood Defences. River modelling (where appropriate), based on the most up to date modelling and survey data, must be undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed development will not increase flood risk.	Hydraulic modelling was undertaken to inform the FRA (Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) and the results of this modelling show that flood risk does not increase as a result of Part A.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Some information has been addressed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise Screening - Artificial Lighting - “assumed not significant” - Dust Management - to form part of a CEMP - Odours - not addressed but comments provided here - Hours of Operation - not addressed but comments provided here. - Statutory Nuisance. - not addressed but comments provided here. 	<p>The Public Health Protection Unit (consulted as part of the planning process) are of the opinion that aspects of the development relating to Air Quality, Cultural Heritage, and Noise are fully addressed. Others are provided adjacent.</p> <p>The proposed developments for the dualling of the A1 from Fairmoor (Morpeth) to the west of Felton and joins two sections of dual carriageway at these locations.</p> <p>The Public Health Protection Unit have provided comments to both the Highways Agency and consultants involved in this project.</p>
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Air Quality Impacts - The Public Health Protection Unit were approached by Emily Waterfall of the Applicant on the assessment of air quality impacts from the proposed development and a detailed response was provided on the 09 August 2016. This was for the previous Scheme which incorporated duelling up to Brownieside.</p>	<p>All relevant stakeholders were consulted. This was not pursued further as the comparison of previous models is beyond the scope of this assessment.</p>
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Historic land uses in proximity to the defined working area which would have the potential to contaminate, any regionally important geological and geomorphological sites (RIGS) and information on any private water supplies within a buffer around the defined working area. The information was determined to fall within the scope of The Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and the full information was provided on the 25 January 2018.</p>	<p>Addressed and considered within Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).</p>
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Comments upon the proposed methodology and asking for any relevant noise information which might be pertinent to the locale and the proposed duelling. The Public Health Protection Unit provided a detailed response to this outside of the planning process on the 21 November 2017. Vibration would normally only be of concern where piling works are required with receptors in close proximity. In such situations, assessment and mitigation of impact may be required. Where vibration might be caused by the proposed development, it is recommended that the applicant liaises with local receptors at an early stage and agree if any structural assessment of dwellings may be required.</p>	<p>Addressed or considered within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). Part A is not anticipated to generate significant effects from vibration. Where queries from specific landowners have been raised, discussions have taken place.</p>
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Noise Screening - The Public Health Protection Unit would recommend that the applicant carefully considers screening options, particularly in the Causey Park area, where earthworks (cuttings and embankments) may be required to provide a more level profile for the carriageway. Where the carriageway is to be placed closer to residential receptors, who aren't currently near the existing A1, the use of cuttings and/or earth bunds to provide noise attenuation would be welcomed.</p>	<p>Noise barriers and earth bunds have been considered in line with policy and guidance documents. Refer to Section 6.9 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).</p>
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Where there are compounds or night-time works requiring artificial illumination for health and safety and/or security reasons, then lighting should conform to the Institution of Lighting Professionals: Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Lighting Pollution (2011, Ref GN01:2011), this guidance can be viewed / downloaded from: https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light/ It is likely that most of this stretch of the A1 would fall within Environmental Zone E2 (Rural) as it clearly would not fall within the examples of zone E1 and is somewhat altered by vehicles lights using the A1 at night. Therefore, light intrusion (trespass) should not exceed 5 lux pre-curfew and 1 lux post-curfew (curfew being 2300 to 0700). The impact from illumination of the carriageway during the operational phase will not be required.</p>	<p>These requirements will be considered through the next stages of the Scheme and discussed with NCC during detailed design.</p>

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Dust minimisation and control shall have regards to accepted guidance and in particular The Institute of Air Quality Management has produced very current documentation entitled "Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction. It would be expected that a dust management plan (DMP) is produced for such a development identifying the risks and appropriate mitigation which would form part or tie into any construction management plan (CEMP) which should reinforce the correct working procedures and operation of equipment and plant.	Noted. Mitigation measures for control of dust are presented within Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) .
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Although daytime, temporary and/or short-term works generating substantial noise might be acceptable, such noise during the evening, night, weekends and Bank Holiday may be less tolerable to local receptors. It is recommended that works are organised with local receptors at the forefront of the planning of these works. Where possible, night-time noisy works near to residential receptors should be avoided and every effort made to accommodate the necessary noisy works at these locations during the day (or early evening) period. Where late evening and night-time noisy works are unavoidable, then it is recommended that a high level of communication is maintained with local receptors and should as a minimum be through letter drops informing of the dates, times and duration of any night-time works. Even then, it is recommended that there should still be a protected period which would allow some respite during the night.	Noted for the purposes of the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) and other documents where appropriate.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The applicant may wish to consider submitting a Statement of Statutory Nuisance which would provide an explanation of the matters set out in Section 79(1) of the EPA 1990 in respect of statutory nuisance, the potential implications of the proposed development and the measures that have been incorporated into the project design to limit any such potential nuisances.	A Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance has been prepared for this Scheme which addresses these factors (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.15)
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Sections 10.3.8-10.3.11 of the EIA Scoping Report outline the historic buildings and conservation areas that have been identified within the study area. A preliminary desktop assessment considers that at this stage the provided list of heritage assets is an accurate record of listed buildings within the study area. This should be confirmed again when preparing a detailed assessment for these items during the EIA process. In accordance with the NPPF, the EIA should include a detailed assessment that addresses any potential or actual impacts to heritage assets, including listed and non-designated assets. Sections 10.4.8-10.4.14 outline the potential impacts to heritage assets in the study Area.	Presented in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) together with associated appendices in Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The EIA Scoping Report anticipates that the construction would result in the removal of a Grade II listed milestone (No. 1153544), located on the grass verge east of the A1 at Low Espley. It is proposed that this asset is to be subject to photographic recording prior to the start of construction to create a permanent record of its existing setting. This would be followed by the careful removal of the asset and its safe storage and reinstated as close as possible to its original location. It is understood that at this stage this would be the only item to be directly impacted by the development.	This has been included in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The EIA Scoping Report identifies the Bockenfield Farmhouse, a Grade II* listed building is located within 300 m east of the Scheme. A number of other Grade II listed buildings have been identified as being located close to the Scheme, and their settings would potentially be harmed as a result of construction related noise and visual impact. The potential impacts and mitigation measures should be assessed individually for identified heritage assets, which includes a statement of heritage impact as part of the EIA.	The impacts on and associated mitigation for Bockenfield Farmhouse are reported in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) and the HEDBA (Appendix 8.1, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The Council Building Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposal in principle. However, based on the EIA Scoping Report provided, it is not totally clear if there would be any significant impacts to heritage assets in the study area. The final environmental statement should demonstrate that the extent of the proposed study area is sufficient in ensuring that all heritage assets likely to be affected have been included and can be assessed in as much detail as required.	Significant effects on heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). It found that permanent significant effects are anticipated upon below ground archaeology.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	We would also expect the Environmental Statement to consider the potential impacts on non-designated features of historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, since these can also be of national importance and make an important contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of an area and sense of place. This information is available via the local authority Historic Environment Record (www.keystothepast.info) and relevant local authority staff. The Scoping Report does identify a number of non-designated assets within a 300m study area of the proposed development.	Impacts on non-designated assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The route corridor is considered to retain potential for significant unrecorded archaeological remains spanning the prehistoric to post-medieval / modern periods. The Scoping Report indicates mitigation measures should be devised in consultation that the County Archaeologist (10.5.3).	Proposed mitigation is presented in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). The WSIs (Appendix 8.5 and 8.6, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) have been issued to NCC.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	In order to reduce the risk of unnecessary or abortive work being undertaken I recommend that the scope of an appropriate assessment is discussed and agreed with the Conservation Team. Please note that this would be a chargeable service. Note that these comments relate only the assessment and mitigation of impacts to the archaeological resource. I recommend that the Building Conservation team are consulted regarding the assessment and mitigation of impacts to the built historic environment.	Scope and method of assessment and mitigation has been discussed with NCC and documented in Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	It is understood that a programme of archaeological geophysical survey is currently being undertaken within the proposed construction corridor. The results of this exercise are awaited.	Programme of Archaeological Geophysical Survey has been issued to NCC.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Following the completion and review of the initial geophysical survey, further stages of assessment will be appropriate, potentially including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fieldwalking (surface collection of artefactual material) - Additional geophysical survey - Topographic survey (or review of LiDAR data, if available). - Intrusive evaluation trenching The proposed development has potential to impact the setting of designated and undesignated heritage assets, including the archaeological and built heritage. The scope of an appropriate visual impact assessment should be discussed and agreed with the Conservation	LiDAR was undertaken and has informed the assessment, which is presented in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). The WSIs (Appendix 8.5 and 8.6, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) have been issued to NCC. Full consultation has been undertaken with NCC, including on the topic of viewpoints (Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES).

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
	<p>Team, including the identification of appropriate viewpoints for visual simulations / photomontages or similar.</p>	
<p>Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion</p>	<p>Since the detail of the proposed route may potentially subject to revision prior to final design freeze, it is recommended that a precautionary approach is taken when agreeing the scope of the assessment. Non-intrusive phases of work (such as geophysical survey and fieldwalking) should ideally extend beyond the wayleave corridor. This will both contextualise the data and assess the archaeological potential of areas which might be drawn into the Scheme via revisions or consequential impacts (such as fencing, landscape planting or diverted tracks or utilities) on a cost-effective basis.</p>	<p>A Geophysical Survey (Appendix 8.2, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7)) was undertaken within a larger boundary than that assessed. There are some gaps however, so assumptions have been made and were discussed with NCC.</p>
<p>Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion</p>	<p>The EIA should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on public rights of way within and adjacent to the development corridor - Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts on public rights of way and non-motorised users. - Cognizance of the aims and objectives of the Northumberland County Council Rights of Way Improvement Plan. - Potential enhancements to public rights of way and WCH facilities in mitigation for any lost rights. - The impact of the Scheme in terms of visual/noise intrusion for users using public rights of way and other routes used for recreational purposes. - Detailed assessment of the need for temporary closures and/or diversions of public rights of way during the construction phase and once the development is complete - Detailed assessment of any proposals to sever/extinguish public rights of way. <p>I would advise that you should submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as part of the planning application so that the impacts on the highway network during construction can be adequately dealt with.</p>	<p>Presented in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2). A CTMP is a standalone draft DCO document (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4).</p>

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Historic Mining / Mining Risks The Coal Authority response, the proposed EIA development is located within the defined Development High Risk Area; the site has therefore been subject to past coal mining activity. In accordance with the agreed risk-based approach to development management in Development High Risk Areas, past coal mining activities within the site should be fully considered as part of the Environmental Statement (ES); this should take the form of a risk assessment, together with any necessary mitigation measures. The Coal Authority notes the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report, Section 13.7.2 of which confirms that coal mining impacts have been scoped in the EIA. The Coal Authority welcomes the commitment to undertake investigations to determine ground conditions and that bridge structures will be treated as areas where possible coal workings would pose an unacceptable risk.</p>	Coal mining risk assessment has been included within the Ground Investigation Report (Appendix 11.2, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7), including outline mitigation measure associated with ground gas and historical collapse.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>Consideration of Coal Mining Issues in the ES There are a number of coal mining legacy issues that can potentially pose a risk to new development and therefore should be considered as part of an Environmental Statement for development proposals within coalfield areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The location and stability of abandoned mine entries - The extent and stability of shallow mine workings - Outcropping coal seams and unrecorded mine workings - Hydrogeology, minewater and minegas 	Aspects and associated impacts have been included within the Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	<p>In addition, consideration should be afforded as part of development proposals and the ES to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If surface coal resources are present, whether prior extraction of the mineral resource is practicable and viable. - Whether Coal Authority permission is required to intersect, enter, or disturb any coal or coal workings during site investigation or development work. 	Coal Authority permission and permit was sought and gained to enter potentially worked stratum as part of the GI. Coal extraction not considered feasible as part of the Scheme.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The landscape baseline conditions are largely agree with however omissions within the Scoping Report include the additional chapters of the Northumberland Landscape Character Assessment (Part B and Part C). Primary weight should be afforded to the Northumberland Landscape Character Assessment in assessing the landscape character of the area as this is the current and established evidence base.	Landscape Character Assessments are referred to in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The technical principles of the LVIA are supported by the Specialist Planning Services Team however significant additional work has been carried out by both consultants and the Council in determining the scope of works to undertake as part of the LVIA. This has delayed the formal Scoping Opinion being submitted as the scope of works continued to change throughout discussions and site visits with the consultants. This additional work related to all parts of the LVIA (including receptors such as PRow, residential, highways, landscape and heritage assets).	No action required.

Consultee	Consultee Comment	How this has been addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	A material concern is that it appears to the Council that the assessment, viewpoints, landscape sensitivity and therefore the scope of works related to the LVIA has been provided through a desktop assessment. This generates levels of ambiguity and discrepancies as the landscape requires a detailed assessment to identify the scope of works and associated data. Issues have included incorrect locations of PRoW, limited knowledge of key settlements, spelling mistakes for established facilities / locations and this causes and undermining of the robustness of the Scoping Report and reduces the confidence in the scope of works, methodology and evidence.	Site visits have been undertaken to determine the viewpoints and landscape sensitivity, including with NCC.
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	Therefore, the Council offers agreement to the high level scope of works set out in the Scoping Report but raises concern as to the robustness and soundness of the Scoping Report in terms of the LVIA. The Council therefore does not agree with the full extent of Chapter 9 of the Scoping Report and confirms that significant additional evidence related to the scope of works, methodology and the supporting evidence be presented in the ES.	Full landscape and visual impact assessment and limitations are presented in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Northumberland County Council Scoping Opinion	The Council reserves the right to revise its opinion in the light of new legislation or new information which comes to light during any planning application process. This Scoping Opinion does not represent the Council's final view in relation to any future ES submitted in support of an application for planning permission.	No action required.

Table 1-3 – Part A Comments within the Scoping Opinion on the ES Approach

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
General	1.1.14	The Inspectorate notes the potential need to carry out an assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations). This document must be co-ordinated with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), to avoid duplication of information between assessments.	It is mentioned in Chapter 1: Introduction of this ES that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be produced to support the ES. Section 4.6 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES indicates that the HRA supports the ES and is complimentary rather than duplicate. The HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.14) is referenced as a separate draft DCO document in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
General	1.2.3	The ES submitted by the Applicant should demonstrate consideration of the points raised by the consultation bodies. It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in the ES.	Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES summarises stakeholders consulted at all stages including statutory consultation. This Scoping Opinion Response Tracker presents a summary of all Scoping Report comments and how they have been addressed. Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation of this ES provides evidence of all consultation with stakeholders as referenced in the technical chapters. Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives of this ES presents the consultation regarding options assessment.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
General	5.0.2	Applicants are also advised to review the list of information required to be submitted within an application for Development as set out in The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (as amended).	The list of information has been reviewed. Chapter 1: Introduction of this ES refers to the Infrastructure Planning Regulations 2009 as suggested.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.1	Chapter 3 of the Scoping Report provides a description of the Proposed Development, but lacks in-depth detail on the various elements, and does not include dimensions or detailed drawings. The proposed improvements are broken down by reference to various distinct sections of the A1, but these sections are not identified on any of the plans provided. The ES must include a description of the physical characteristics of the Proposed Development.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents a comprehensive description of the Scheme, together with detailed plans and drawings.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.1	The description should also explain the maximum parameters, limits of deviation, and the dimensions, locations and alignments of the various project elements, including points of access and key structures e.g. culverts and bridges to be constructed. The ES should provide figures to support the project description and depict the necessary detail.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents a comprehensive description of the Scheme, together with detailed plans and drawings. This chapter presents the Assessment Parameters, which are subsequently considered in each technical chapter.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.2	The redline footprint of the Proposed Development provided in the Scoping Report currently provides flexibility to the final design, including options for temporary construction site compounds and balancing ponds, along with allowance for variation in the alignment of a section of the proposed offline bypass. The Applicant should ensure that the ES provides specific information on each of these elements, including the number, size and location of construction compounds and balancing ponds. [...] figures should be provided, setting out the necessary detail for ease of reference.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents a comprehensive description of the fixed Scheme elements, including construction site compounds and detention basins, together with detailed plans and drawings of these elements (refer to Figure 2.3: Existing Junctions and Structures: Part A of this ES).
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.3	The ES should contain a general construction programme so that it is clear how and when the specific works will take place, and how resulting effects on the road network are to be managed. It should provide a description of the land use requirements during both the construction and operational phases. It is also important that the ES clearly identifies and distinguishes areas of land or works which are required either permanently or on a temporary basis.	Details of the construction programme and permanent/temporary land use requirements during construction are provided in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.4	The Scoping Report states that the Proposed Development will require the diversion of an existing National Grid high-pressure gas main and may also require diversion of a section of Northern Gas Networks pipeline and a Northern Powergrid overhead electricity line. This will necessitate associated ground moving activities such as excavation and the establishment of temporary work areas. However, limited further information is provided on these diversions. The Applicant should ensure that the ES provides specific detailed information on this element of the Proposed Development, including plans to identify the diversions, and should ensure that any assessment is consistent with DCO specifications.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents this information relating to the diversion of the gas main/pipeline/electricity line, together with relevant drawings. It is consistent with DCO specifications. The proposed works are subsequently assessed within each appropriate technical topic chapter in this ES.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.5	The ES should provide a clear and specific textual description of the proposed drainage arrangements, indicating the location of any pipework or balancing ponds by reference to plans.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents the proposed drainage arrangements and refers to the Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 10.5, Volume 7 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.7).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.6	Should the Applicant decide that lighting is required the ES should assess any impacts associated with lighting, such as light spill, as part of the relevant aspect assessments with evidence as to how this has been taken into account.	As identified in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES no new lighting is required.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.7	Demolition works are referenced throughout the Scoping Report, but in- depth details have not been provided, or referenced in the description of the Proposed Development. The ES should provide full details of the necessary demolition works and it should be clear at what point in the programme this would occur. Where relevant, the Applicant should ensure that the ES aspect chapters assess the likely significant effects resulting from demolition activities.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides the demolition details and specifies when they occur within the overall programme of works.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.8	Diversions and closures of roads, footpaths and public rights of way are highlighted throughout the Scoping Report. The ES should contain a full explanation of such closures and diversions, including whether they are temporary or permanent, and associated impacts should be fully assessed.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides details of road, footpath and public right of way closures and diversions. The associated impacts are assessed in full in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.8	The Scoping Report states that where existing traffic communication technology does not meet current standards, it would be replaced to ensure operational expectations are met. Information on any such replacement will also be required in the ES, and figures should again be provided to show the location of any technology to be installed by way of upgrading.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES outlines the replacement/upgraded traffic communication technology.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.9	Paragraph 9.4.2 of the Scoping Report refers to temporary spoil heaps and borrow pits during the construction phase. No further details are provided such as the number and location, and they have not been referenced in the description of the Proposed Development in the Scoping Report. The ES should describe and depict the dimensions of these elements, and the locations where they will be sited.	Detail about number and location of spoil heaps is presented within Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES and on Figure 2.3: Existing Junctions and Structures: Part A of this ES. There are no borrow pits within the Order Limits of Part A.
2. The Proposed Development	2.3.10	Table 15-4 of the Scoping Report also outlines the materials to be used and waste to be generated by the Proposed Development. The nature and volume of materials should also be included in the description of the Proposed Development, including justification of any key assumptions made.	Detail about the materials used and likely waste generation is presented within Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES and also considered within Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Alternatives	2.3.13	The Inspectorate would expect to see a discrete section in this ES that provides details of the alternatives considered and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects.	The alternatives considered for this Scheme, as well as reasons for the chosen option are presented in Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives of this ES.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Flexibility	2.3.14, 2.3.15, 2.3.16	<p>The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine 'Using the Rochdale Envelope'1, which provides additional details on the recommended approach.</p> <p>The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively different developments. The development parameters will need to be clearly defined in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (dDCO) and in the accompanying ES. It is a matter for the Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from a large number of undecided parameters.</p> <p>The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>It should be noted that if the Proposed Development changes substantially during the EIA process and prior to submission of the DCO application the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion.</p>	<p>Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents the fixed Scheme design and the Assessment Parameters. There are no current Scheme options to assess.</p>
3. EIA Approach	3.1.3	<p>Where relevant, the ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent/minimise adverse effects is secured through DCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultees agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.</p>	<p>Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES as well as relevant technical chapters, present this information as appropriate. A reference to the Outline CEMP is included, and the Outline CEMP, which contains relevant mitigation measures, has been produced as a standalone draft DCO document (refer to the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3)).</p>
3. EIA Approach	3.3.1	<p>The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion; - To identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each of the aspect chapters, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects; - To set out the proposed mitigation and/or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures (e.g. a dDCO requirement); - To describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; and - To identify where details are contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA report) (where relevant), such as descriptions of European sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, are to be found in the ES. 	<p>Chapter 17: Summary, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) clearly presents the outcomes of the assessment of significant effects, including the cumulative assessment, as explained throughout the ES. The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, contained within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) outlines all mitigation and monitoring measures applicable to the design, construction and operation of the Scheme. This Scoping Opinion Response Tracker (which forms Appendix 4.1 of this ES) presents the Scoping Opinion comments and outlines how they have been addressed in this ES. Section 4.6 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES indicates that the HRA supports the ES and is complimentary rather than duplicate. The HRA is referenced as a separate draft DCO document in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2) (refer to the HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.14)).</p>

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
3. EIA Approach	3.3.2	The Inspectorate considers that where a DCO application includes works described as 'associated development', that could themselves be defined as an improvement of a highway, the Applicant should ensure that the ES accompanying that application distinguishes between; effects that primarily derive from the integral works which form the proposed (or part of the proposed) NSIP and those that primarily derive from the works described as associated development, for example through a suitably compiled summary table. This will have the benefit of giving greater confidence to the Inspectorate that what is proposed is not in fact an additional NSIP defined in accordance with s22 of the PA2008.	This is not applicable for this Scheme, all works are included within the DCO boundary and set out in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES.
3. EIA Approach	3.3.3	The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the development as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.	Details about the baseline scenario are contained in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES and all relevant technical chapters (Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)).
3. EIA Approach	3.3.4	The ES should provide a clear description of the baseline particularly in respect of the existing road network that is to be affected. This is essential to the accurate assessment of the Proposed Development's effects.	This has been addressed in all technical chapters (Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)).
3. EIA Approach	3.3.5	The ES should contain the timescales upon which the surveys that underpin the technical assessments have been based. For clarity, this information should be provided either in the introductory chapters of the ES (with confirmation that these timescales apply to all chapters), or in each aspect chapter.	This has been addressed in all technical chapters (Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)).
3. EIA Approach	3.3.6	The study areas used for the assessments in the ES should reflect the zone of influence for the Proposed Development. It is acknowledged that this will vary for different aspects of the environment, but the ES must clearly explain the justification for the extent of each study area. The Applicant should seek to agree the study areas with the relevant stakeholders wherever possible.	This has been addressed in all technical chapters (Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)).
3. EIA Approach	3.3.1	Strategic traffic modelling will underpin a number of assessments in the ES. It must be based on growth figures that take account of permissions already being implemented, extant permissions yet to be implemented and allocations in the relevant Local Plan documents. It should also take account of traffic growth associated with any other major developments.	The traffic model produced for this Scheme meets the specified requirements. This is documented in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.1) .
3. EIA Approach	3.3.2	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the EIA, which clearly states which effects are 'significant' and 'non-significant' for the purposes of the EIA. Any departure from that methodology should be described in individual aspect assessment chapters.	This is presented in detail in its own discrete chapter: Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES.
3. EIA Approach	3.3.3	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES presents details about the difficulties surrounding the assessment and the main uncertainties. Where appropriate, this detail is also provided in technical chapters (Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
3. EIA Approach	3.3.4	The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant. This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.	Details about expected emissions are presented, where relevant, within each technical chapter (Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)) of this ES. Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES also provides some detailed information.
3. EIA Approach	3.3.5	Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES. The likely efficacy of the mitigation proposed should be explained with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation proposed is secured, ideally with reference to specific DCO requirements or other legally binding agreements.	Each technical chapter (Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2)) presents the mitigation proposed together with the residual effects taking into account the mitigation. Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES presents details about how mitigation is secured. Mitigation will be secured through the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) .
3. EIA Approach	3.3.6	The Scoping Report identifies high level proposals as mitigation for effects on several aspects of the environment. If mitigation is being relied upon to avoid significant effects, the ES should clearly state what these measures are and how their delivery would be secured.	Each technical chapter presents the proposed mitigation together with the residual effects (taking into account the mitigation). Chapter 2: The Scheme of the ES presents details about how mitigation is secured. Mitigation will be secured through the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) .
3. EIA Approach	3.3.7	The ES should include a description of the potential vulnerability of the Proposed Development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters, including vulnerability to climate change, which are relevant to the Proposed Development. Relevant information available and obtained through risk assessments pursuant to European Union legislation such as Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council or Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom or relevant assessments carried out pursuant to national legislation may be used for this purpose provided that the requirements of this Directive are met. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.	Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES and the Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment which forms Appendix 4.3 of this ES present the assessment of the Scheme's vulnerability to major accidents and disasters, including any measures to prevent or mitigate any expected effects.
3. EIA Approach	3.3.8	Paragraph 6.3.15 of the Scoping Report uses the term 'major events' to cover both major accidents and disasters. Potential major events have been identified in paragraph 6.3.23 of the Scoping Report as severe weather and transport accidents based on the location and nature of the Proposed Development, the likelihood of occurrence and the surrounding land uses. The ES should clearly explain in detail the approach taken by the Applicant in arriving at this conclusion. The Scoping Report states that a qualitative assessment of significance for the vulnerability of the Proposed Development will be carried out and reported for relevant individual topics in the ES. The ES should clearly explain the assessment methodology, if specific guidance documents are relied upon and are necessary to understand the approach taken, they should be readily available or provided with the ES.	Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES and Appendix 4.3: Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment of this ES presents this assessment of the Scheme's vulnerability to major accidents and disasters. All requested detail can be found in these two sections.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
3. EIA Approach	3.3.9	The Inspectorate recommends that the ES should identify whether the Proposed Development has the potential for significant transboundary impacts and if so, what these are and which EEA States would be affected.	Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES presents details about transboundary effects, as well as the reasons why it has been scoped out of the ES.
3. EIA Approach	3.3.12	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	A list of references is provided at the end of every chapter in the ES.
3. EIA Approach	3.4.1	In some circumstances it will be appropriate for information to be kept confidential. In particular, this may relate to information about the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species such as badgers, rare birds and plants where disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation may result from publication of the information. Where documents are intended to remain confidential the Applicant should provide these as separate paper and electronic documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title and watermarked as such on each page. The information should not be incorporated within other documents that are intended for publication or which the Inspectorate would be required to disclose under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.	The Badger Survey Report is considered to contain confidential information. The recommendations will be adhered to.

1.3 SCOPING LOG PART B: ALNWICK TO ELLINGHAM

Table 1-4 – Part B Scoping Opinion recommendations by the Planning Inspectorate

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Air Quality			
4.1.1	6.7.3	The Inspectorate considers that the ES should include an assessment of impacts associated with all relevant pollutants under the EU ambient air quality directive, including increases of both PM _{2.5} and PM ₁₀ , resulting from the Proposed Development. In determining significance, the assessment should take into account performance against relevant target/ limit values.	The impact of emissions of all relevant pollutants were assessed as per the methodology outlined in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HA 207/07 and associated documents. With no emission factors available in IAN 185/15 for PM _{2.5} , a conservative approach of assuming all the PM ₁₀ fraction was PM _{2.5} was used. The assessment is presented in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.1.2	6.2	For the avoidance of doubt, the assessment in the ES should be undertaken on the basis of an accurate and up to date traffic model.	The air quality assessment was undertaken based on an accurate and up to date traffic model. The results are reported and outlined in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.1.3	6.2	The Scoping Report states that the study area for construction impacts will include areas within 200m of the site boundary for the duration of the construction phase. The Inspectorate is of the view that this is satisfactory for the assessment of dust emissions but would expect that in assessing the impacts from construction traffic the study area would be based on traffic change criteria used to define the ARN for the air quality assessments.	Impacts on air quality as a result of construction traffic (including traffic management measures) and construction dust were assessed using the methodology outlined in DMRB HA 207/07, and consequently presented in Appendix 5.2: Construction Traffic Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
4.1.4	6.3.2	The assessment in the ES should be undertaken on the basis of relevant and up to date baseline information, including the dates on which diffusion tube monitoring was	The assessment has been undertaken using appropriate monitoring data to verify the model using the approach as set out in Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) (TG16) and the DMRB HA 207/07. The monitoring

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		undertaken. The chosen monitoring locations should be depicted on an accompanying plan in the ES.	results are presented in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), Figure 5.3: Air Quality Monitoring, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6) and Appendix 5.3: Methodology and Verification, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
4.1.5	6.3.12	The Scoping Report identifies that diffusion tube monitoring has been undertaken by the Applicant over 6 months at 8 locations between February and July 2017. This does not appear to match the advice in Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' (Defra's) 'Practical Guidance on using NO ₂ diffusion tubes for LAQM' which advises that all surveys should be carried out for a minimum of six months, comprising three summer and three winter months. The Applicant should ensure that the baseline data relied on in the ES is robust and fit for purpose and make effort to agree the location of any diffusion tube monitoring with relevant consultation bodies.	This is addressed in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). The monitoring data provided from the Options Selection stage had been validated to account for seasonal adjustments and bias adjusted to provide a weighted average concentration from the 2017 exposure period to a 2016 annual mean, as per LAQM.TG(16) guidance. Furthermore, the base year traffic provided was for 2015, so a further annualization (as per LAQM.TG(16)) to 2015 concentrations was undertaken.
4.1.6	6.3.13	The Scoping Report identifies no nationally or internationally designated sites within 200m of the Proposed Development, but states that this will be revisited upon review of the ARN. The ES should additionally assess locally and non-designated sites that could be affected by the Proposed Development in line with the DMRB HA 207/07 methodology. The Applicant's approach to the identification of such sites and the need to consider other sensitive nature conservation sites should be established through consultation with the relevant statutory consultees. Any specific mitigation measures required to address the effects on these sites from NO _x should be clearly identified and secured.	No locally and non-designated sites were identified within 200 m of the Scheme Affected Road Network (ARN). Receptors identified within 200 m of the ARN for the Scheme were assessed as part of the Within Topic combined assessment. These receptors are included in the assessment presented in Appendix 16.4: Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4).
4.1.7	6.3.13	The ES should clearly set out the type and quantity of both human and ecological receptors which could be affected and identify their locations by reference to a plan. The Inspectorate notes that the Applicant's proposed methodology for the assessment (DMRB HA 207/07) states that particular attention should be paid to the location of the young, elderly and other susceptible populations/receptors. The Applicant should make effort to agree which receptors should be included in the assessment with the relevant consultation bodies. If no human receptors are likely to be affected, then the ES should provide a justification as to why this is the case.	The human and ecological receptors are specified in Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Details of these receptors can also be found in Appendix 5.4: Receptors, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) with locations shown in Figure 5.2: Human Receptors Assessed, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6). NCC and Natural England (NE) have been consulted (as part of the combined scenario with Part A).
4.1.8	6.5	The need for and scope of monitoring during construction and operation of the Proposed Development should be addressed within the ES.	The need for and scope of monitoring of air quality during both construction and operation is addressed in Section 5.11 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.1.9	6.7.2	The Applicant should ensure that the assessment in the ES fully justifies its position that a simple level assessment is appropriate.	A simple level assessment was indeed proposed in the Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.11) for Part B, however with some exceedances of the critical level in the combined scenario, a more detailed assessment was deemed necessary.
4.1.10	6.7.14	The Applicant should make effort to agree the methodology for the assessment with relevant consultation bodies. The methodology should be clearly explained in the ES and includes a description of how significance of effect will be determined.	The methodology is outlined in detail in Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Consultation on the methodology has been undertaken with NE and with NCC through the scoping process.
Noise and Vibration			
4.2.1	N/A	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	N/A

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
4.2.2	7.2	The Scoping Report proposes a 'reduced study areas' for construction noise and vibration effects and operational vibration effects. The Inspectorate considers that the study area for the assessment should be established according to the extent of the impacts and the potential for likely significant effects. The Applicant should make effort to agree the suitable study areas with relevant consultation bodies. The ES should include figures to depict the relevant study areas applied to the assessment.	Explanation of why construction noise and vibration effects are expected to encompass a smaller area than that applicable to the operational phase is provided in paragraph 6.6.1 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). The adopted construction noise and vibration Study Areas are shown within Figure 6.4: Construction Noise Study Area and Figure 6.5: Construction Vibration SOAEL Zones, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6) respectively. The operational noise and vibration study areas have been defined according to DMRB HD213/11 guidance. The adopted operational noise calculation area and study area are also depicted in Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.2.3	7.2.5	The Applicant should ensure that the ES clearly sets out the anticipated construction programme and working hours, including any night time working that may be required. Details on the type, number and location of plant and equipment should also be provided, including information on simultaneous working and the length of time plant and equipment is due to be operational in order to provide justification for the final construction noise study area. The final study area with the local planning authorities and the information on the construction programme should be incorporated into the assessment of likely significant effects.	Details of adopted assumptions regarding construction activities, the location of plant and equipment along with assumed operational times is presented within Section 6.8 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 6.4: Source Information and Assumptions for Construction Noise Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Additional information is provided within paragraphs 6.5.1 to 6.5.10 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES and Appendix 6.4: Source Information and Assumptions for Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES.
4.2.4	7.3.2	The ES should provide details on the noise assessment survey undertaken, identifying the locations where monitoring has taken place, explaining how these locations were selected, confirming when the monitoring was undertaken, and highlighting the time period covered and the weather conditions at the time. The applicant should discuss and make efforts to agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies.	The scope of the baseline noise survey was discussed and agreed during consultation with Gary Park of NCC. Details of the survey approach, including measurement locations, measurement durations, equipment used, and prevailing weather conditions are presented within paragraphs 6.7.9 to 6.7.24 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). A plan showing adopted measurement locations is presented within Figure 6.2: Baseline Noise Measurement Locations, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6) and a detailed breakdown of measured levels is presented within Appendix 6.7: Noise Monitoring Results, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
4.2.5	7.3.6	The ES should clearly identify, and include assessment of, impacts to sensitive ecological and human receptors. The ES should address how receptors have been identified and chosen. This accords with the comments received from the Environment Agency, which highlight that the impact from noise should include an ecological assessment, and that sensitive receptors can include species or habitats.	Sensitive receptors identified and adopted within the assessment are discussed within paragraphs 6.7.27 to 6.7.33 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Chapter 9: Biodiversity and supporting Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). This includes a description of how the receptors were identified and chosen.
4.2.6	7.3.9	As the study area will be finalised on the basis of traffic modelling and the ARN, the applicant should ensure that if any NIAs do fall within the final study area the impacts associated are adequately assessed.	Paragraph 6.7.29 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) states that there are no Round 3 Noise Important Areas (NIAs) falling within the Study Area.

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
4.2.7	7.5	The Applicant should ensure that the effectiveness of any proposed mitigation measures is thoroughly assessed in the ES.	An assessment of appropriate mitigation options has been undertaken and is presented within Section 6.9 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.2.8	7.7.7 - 7.7.12	The Scoping Report states that the assessment of vibration will be undertaken in accordance with DMRB 213/11, and S5228:2009+A1:29014, but it does not stipulate the calculation methodology according to which vibration levels during construction and operation are to be predicted. The ES should provide information on the methodology used to calculate predicted vibration levels for the purposes of the assessment.	The method of construction vibration prediction is set out within paragraphs 6.8.30 to 6.8.38 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). An assessment of airborne vibration nuisance has been undertaken and details are provided within Appendix 6.3: Noise and Airborne Vibration Nuisance Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
4.2.9	7.7.15	The Scoping Report highlights that BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites refers to two methods for assessing construction noise, being the ABC method and the 5dB(A) change method. The Applicant should ensure that the method applied is described and justified in the ES and effort is made to agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies.	The BS5228 - 1:2008+A1:2014 ABC method has been adopted for the purpose of the construction noise assessment. The ABC methodology is described within Appendix 6.2: Legislation, Policy and Guidance, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
4.2.10	7.7.16	The Scoping Report refers to BS5228:2008+A1:2014 for the assessment of potential vibration during construction. However, the assessment thresholds set out in Table 5 of the Scoping Report relate to effects at residential receptor locations only. The applicant should ensure that impacts to sensitive ecological and human receptors are also assessed where significant effects are likely to occur.	The assessment has adopted the most sensitive and closest receptors to the possible worst-case vibration generative activities as identified within Figure 6.5: Construction Vibration SOAEL Zones, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6). The adopted assessment thresholds are appropriate for application at these receptors and relate to human perception.
Landscape and Visual Amenity			
4.3.1	N/A	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	N/A
4.3.2	8.2	The definition of the study area in the Scoping Report is confusing. It is not clear from the description in the Scoping Report if it will be informed by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) or a prescribed 2 km buffer referred to in paragraphs 8.2.4 and 8.2.5. The assessment should be based on the extent of the impacts informed by ZTV and where significant effects are likely to occur. If professional judgement is applied to support a decision relating to the ZTV, the reasoning applicable to that judgement should be clearly explained. The ZTV and the actual study area used (if they are different) should be presented on figures in the relevant chapter of the ES.	The Study Area and identified visual receptors are illustrated on Figure 7.2: Visual Receptors Plan, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6). Further narrative has been provided in paragraphs 7.4.13 to 7.4.18 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.3.3	8.3.2	The Inspectorate notes that the Northumberland Coast AONB lies approximately 5 km from the Proposed Development and ask that consideration be given to the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape within the ES.	Consideration of the potential view from a range of locations during fieldwork for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) led to the conclusion that significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity were unlikely beyond 2 km from Part B. Areas of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) shown by the ZTV to have potential views of Part B were visited during October 2018. Views to the A1 were found to be limited and partly screened by intervening vegetation. It was concluded that where long distance views are available the proposed construction activities and Part B would be a feature within the backdrop of wider landscape views, not affecting the character of the AONB or visual amenity of the area. It was therefore scoped out of the assessment
4.3.4	8.3.20	The Scoping Report states that the assessment will take into consideration the effect on regional landscape character assessments only. The Inspectorate considers that	Following the Scoping Opinion, the effects on local landscape character areas has been considered within the assessment. The character areas that are anticipated to have significant effects are set out at paragraph 7.7.16 and

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		impacts to local landscape character should be assessed where significant effects are likely.	Table 7-14 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) .
4.3.5	8.3.27	The Applicant should make effort to agree the list of receptors with relevant consultation bodies.	The proposed viewpoint locations, methodology and residential receptors (considered to be of the highest sensitivity) were shared with the relevant consultees in September 2018. The consultation responses are set out at paragraph 7.4.11 and Table 7-4 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) .
4.3.6	8.6	The Scoping Report states that the Options Selection Stage assessment highlighted that the Proposed Development is not anticipated to have any significant effects on landscape receptors during construction or operation, but that a detailed assessment will be undertaken. The applicant should ensure that the detailed assessment is thoroughly outlined in the ES and that an in-depth justification is provided for any conclusions reached.	The detailed methodology of the assessment is set out within Section 7.4 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). The detailed assessment findings are contained within Appendix 7.2: Visual Effects Schedule and Appendix 7.3: Landscape Effects Schedule, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
4.3.7	8.6	The Scoping Report states that the Options Selection Stage assessment highlighted that the Proposed Development is likely to result in adverse visual impacts on various categories of receptors during both construction and operation but provides no further details. The applicant should ensure that the ES clearly assesses impacts associated with all elements of the Proposed Development where significant effects are likely to occur.	The detailed assessment findings are contained within Appendix 7.2: Visual Effects Schedule and Appendix 7.3 Landscape Effects Schedule, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
4.3.8	8.7.6	The Scoping Report proposes a landscape strategy to be developed in order to avoid, mitigate or enhance the road landscape. The assessments in the ES must make it clear which measures have been taken into account in the assessment of significant effects. The ES should include a clear distinction between measures intended to avoid or reduce adverse effects and those that will deliver enhancement.	Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES sets out the Part B design including incorporated mitigation measures. Section 7.9 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) sets out the proposed landscape Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures within the construction and operation of Part B. The proposed measures are illustrated on Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6).
4.3.9	8.7.11; 8.7.3; 8.7.26	The Scoping Report states that professional judgement will be used for various aspects of the LVIA. The use of such professional judgement should be thoroughly explained and justified within the ES.	Paragraph 7.4.7 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) sets out the development of the methodology and the use of professional judgement.
4.3.10	8.7.23	The applicant should make effort to agree viewpoint locations with relevant consultation bodies.	The proposed viewpoint locations, methodology and residential receptors (considered to be of the highest sensitivity) were shared with the relevant consultees in September 2018. The consultation responses are set out at paragraph 7.4.11 and Table 7-4 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Cultural Heritage			
4.4.1	9.7.1	The Inspectorate agrees that World Heritage Sites and Historic Battlefields can be scoped out of the ES.	N/A
4.4.2	9.2	The Scoping Report states that the study areas are defined according to 'accepted best practice' but does not give any further justification. The ES must clearly explain and justify the approach taken to define the chosen study area.	The Study Areas are defined and justified in Section 8.6 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
4.4.3	9.3.26	Section 9.3.26 states that there is a high potential for the presence of hedgerows of historic importance within the Scheme, but that 'any hedgerows identified as being of historic importance would be of low to medium importance as defined in the DMRB'. The Applicant should justify in the ES how they have established importance for relevant receptors including hedgerows with reference to the relevant field surveys undertaken. The ES should also agree the importance assigned to receptors, including historic landscape features with the relevant consultation bodies.	The methodology for assessing hedgerows and other relevant historic landscape receptors is provided in Section 8.4 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Impacts on Historic Landscape are provided in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES and an assessment of the effects in Section 8.10 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES. The assessment is cross referenced with Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES and Appendix 7.1: Arboricultural Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Biodiversity			
4.5.1	10.7.1	The Inspectorate considers that impacts could extend to designated statutory and non-statutory ecological sites. On that basis the Inspectorate does not agree to scope these matters out and the ES should include an assessment where likely significant effects may occur.	Statutory and non-statutory designated sites have been identified within 10 km of Part B and an assessment made of potential impacts upon such sites in line with best practice guidelines. Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and supporting Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) provide details on designated sites and assess potential impacts. Further, given the presence of international and European designated sites within 10 km of Part B, a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.14) screening has been prepared assessing potential adverse or beneficial effects upon such sites as a result of the construction and operation of the Scheme.
4.5.2	10.7.4 and Table 66	The Inspectorate notes an inconsistency with regard to the approach relating to Terrestrial Invertebrates. In section 10.3.40, terrestrial invertebrates are proposed to be scoped out for further surveys. However, in Table 66, they have been scoped in. Therefore, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out. An assessment should be carried out to assess where likely significant effects would occur.	Following a review of desk study data, given the prevailing habitats present across Part B, and the minimal land-take associated with construction of Part B, invertebrates have been reassessed and robust justification provided for their absence from consideration of likely significant effects and presented within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.5.3	10.7.3	Paragraph 10.7.3 of the Scoping Report documents the habitats and species that are likely to be present in and around the Proposed Development site and which will be scoped in to the assessment. The Scoping Report confirms that these have been established according to the zone of influence from the Proposed Development. The Scoping Report does not explain how the zone of influence has been established relevant to the impacts associated with the Proposed Development. The applicant should make effort to agree relevant study areas and survey requirements with consultation bodies.	The Zone of Influence for habitats and species has been informed by recognised best practice guidelines and methodologies for individual receptors. Where necessary, these have additionally been influenced by the knowledge and experience of professional and competent ecologists, with experience of similar schemes and parameters. Any such deviations to that of standard best practice methods of guidelines have been appropriately justified and explained within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendices 9.1 to 9.10, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8), detailing individual receptors and methodologies employed.
4.5.4	10.3.3	Chapter 10 of the Scoping Report explains that an extended Phase 1 Habitats Survey was undertaken in June 2016. However, paragraph 10.3.3 of the Scoping Report highlights that the main scheme area has been extended since the Phase 1 Habitat Surveys were completed. The Inspectorate notes that a number of species specific surveys necessary to inform the assessment were undertaken in April 2016. These surveys will be several years old at the point of application and may not be a suitable	Given the period of time since original surveys were completed, where necessary, and considered as required, habitats and species surveys have been repeated and approaches to survey tailored in response to the refined Part B boundary and design. Such further surveys have been undertaken to provide a robust and up-to-date baseline with which to assess potential impacts of Part B and are presented and discussed within Chapter 9:

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		<p>representation of the baseline position. Paragraph 10.8.2 of the Scoping Report also indicates that survey effort was established relevant to an earlier red line boundary. The Applicant should consider whether new surveys should be undertaken taking into account the most current red line boundary for the Proposed Development. The Applicant should make effort to agree the need, location and timing of any targeted species surveys with consultation bodies. The Applicant should ensure that the assessment in the ES is informed by relevant and up to date information.</p>	<p>Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and the supporting technical appendices for relevant receptors Appendices 9.1 to 9.10, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).</p> <p>Where new and repeat surveys have been undertaken these have been completed in line with best practice methods and guidelines, with any deviations from such guidelines and best practice robustly justified.</p>
4.5.5	Chp. 10	<p>The Inspectorate is aware that the EclA guidelines have been updated in 2018. The applicant should ensure that the approach to the assessment is in accordance with recognised and up to date guidance.</p>	<p>The Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA), encompassing Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and all its supporting appendices, has been completed in line with current best practice guidelines and methods presented within Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2018).</p>
Road Drainage and the Water Environment			
4.6.1	11.2.1	<p>The applicant proposes to scope out assessment of surface and groundwater features beyond the proposed study area. However, the information provided in the Scoping Report does not detail the rationale for the approach. The inspectorate does not agree to scope out this matter and that the ES should include an assessment where a likely significant effect may occur.</p>	<p>As stated in the Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.11) for Part B and Section 10.6 of Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) any sensitive receptors identified outside of the Study Area but that are hydraulically linked to the Study Area have been considered.</p>
4.6.2	11.7.2	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that impacts to groundwater quantity, groundwater flows and the release of contaminants can be appropriately assessed within the Geology and Soils aspect chapter.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
4.6.3	11.7.2	<p>The Inspectorate notes that ecological impacts, including impacts on ecological status of water bodies, will be included within the Biodiversity aspect chapter and therefore the Inspectorate can be appropriately assessed within the Biodiversity aspect chapter.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
4.6.4	General	<p>The ES should describe the proposed drainage design and explain how the necessary attenuation measures and design flow rates have been taken into account. The proposed drainage design should take into account climate change scenarios and existing drainage capacity. The Applicant should make effort to agree details of the drainage design with relevant consultation bodies including the Environment Agency (EA).</p>	<p>Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the design flow rates and how climate change has been taken into account. The Lead Local Flood Authority (NCC) has been consulted on the drainage strategy.</p>
4.6.5	11.5	<p>The ES should clearly describe the mitigation measures relied upon for the assessment of likely significant effects. Measures which are not an inherent part of the design should be appropriately secured. It is noted that the use of balancing ponds and (run off) filter systems are to be included in the design stage. The applicant should make effort to agree the implementation of such measures with relevant consultation bodies.</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) states what mitigation measures have been included for each watercourse crossing and other water environment measures. Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the embedded mitigation measures in the drainage design, these include grassed detention basins and filter drains. Consultation was undertaken with the EA and NCC, which is reported in Section 10.4 of Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
4.6.6	11.5.1-11.5.2	<p>The ES should include a figure detailing the location of any temporary drainage systems to capture, manage and attenuate flow (to prevent an increase to flood risk).</p>	<p>The exact nature of the temporary drainage design would be developed at detailed design. It is not available at this time.</p>

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
4.6.7	11.5.4-11.5.7	The ES should include a figure showing the location of proposed attenuation ponds, enhanced drainage systems, watercourse channels, watercourse crossings and other mitigation measures (e.g. treatment/SuDS systems).	Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) shows the location of the detention basins. Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES details all the Part B design information regarding the watercourse's crossings and mitigation measures for each watercourse. The General Arrangement Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.4) shows the Scheme's general arrangement including the detention basins.
4.6.8	11.5.4	The applicant should ensure that the assessment of hydromorphological effects in the ES considers the effects from both temporary and permanent works. The applicant should seek to agree the methodology to be used in the assessment with the EA as far as is possible.	As detailed in Table 10-4 of Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8), consultation with the EA has been undertaken and the Water Framework Directive assessment considers the hydromorphological effects.
4.6.9	11.7.22	The intention to provide a standalone WFD assessment with the findings presented in the ES is welcomed. The consultation received from the EA indicates the expectancy for a full WDF assessment to be undertaken on all watercourse in the scheme area (irrespective of classification). The applicant may find the approach described in the Inspectorate's Advice Note 18 helpful.	No action required.
Geology and Soils			
4.7.1	12.3.27 & 12.7.1	The Inspectorate agrees that sites of geologic importance (statutory & non-statutory) can be scoped out of the assessment in the ES.	No action required
4.7.2	12.3	The Applicant should ensure a full description of baseline conditions is included within the ES. Information that is not readily available, but which has been used to inform the baseline conditions should be clearly referenced and appended to the ES.	Section 11.7 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) provides full details of the baseline conditions within the Part B area. All data sources are fully referenced in the text and reference list within Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.
4.7.3	12.3.2, 12.3.7 & 12.3.16 - 12.3.18	The assessment in the ES should take into account the proximity of the Proposed Development to the Development High Risk Area identified in the consultation response by the Coal Authority. The Inspectorate considers that the assessment takes into account any impacts associated with historic mine workings. The approach to the proposed ground investigation works should take such matters into account.	A Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA) has been completed, as requested by the Coal Authority's consultation response. The CMRA is included within Appendix 11.6: CMRA, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Pertinent information from the CMRA has been included in Section 11.7 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Impacts associated with ground instability are included in Section 11.8, Table 11-11 and paragraphs 11.9.20 to 11.9.21 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.
4.7.4	12.3.23	There are inconsistencies in the Scoping Report with regards to the study area and number of watercourses likely to experience impacts from the Proposed Development. The ES should ensure there is consistency between assessments and that relevant receptors are appropriately assessed.	With regard to Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), there is a 500 m buffer applied to the assessment. The Geology and Soils assessment uses as 250 m buffer based on migration potential of contamination as per best practice guidance for the assessment of potential contamination. Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES lists and assesses all watercourses located within 250 m of Part B. The

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
4.7.5	12.3.25 & 12.3.26	<p>Within 12.3.25, A 'Pre Desk Study Assessment' is mentioned which indicates 'no readily available records of bombing or other significant military activity'. The report then goes on to state that the completion of a further detailed investigation will inform future requirements. Such an assessment should be undertaken in accordance with industry guidance, such as CIRIA 681, Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) A guide for the construction industry (2009). Section 12.3.26 references a detailed desk study assessment undertaken for a different scheme namely, the proposed widening of the A1, between Morpeth and Felton. This report lists a strategic target as being present in proximity to the proposed development. Accordingly, the Inspectorate considers further works are required to assess the potential presence of UXO.</p>	<p>discrepancy in the number of watercourses is directly related to the difference in buffer size.</p> <p>With regard to the Main Scheme Area, Charlton Mires Site Compound and the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound, there is considered to be a low risk from UXO as confirmed by the Pre-Desk Study Assessment (PDSA) as detailed within Appendix 11.1: Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR), Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and as stated in paragraphs 11.7.94, 11.7.122, and 149-150 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p> <p>As detailed in paragraphs 11.7.149 to 11.7.150 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES, a detailed desk study assessment was carried out as part of the PSSR for Part A. Eshott Airfield, located to the south of the Main Compound, was identified as a strategic target and was subject to a detailed assessment for UXO. However, this detailed assessment does not cover the area of the Main Compound.</p> <p>Should the proposed works in the Main Compound change to include excavations or below ground works, then a detailed assessment has been recommended.</p>
4.7.6	12.3.32	<p>A historic landfill is discussed in land adjacent to the Lionheart Enterprise Park. Beyond the years of its operation, no information is forthcoming in relation to the types and volumes of wastes deposited. Due consideration will need to be given to this feature in the ES. The EA has identified that some of the disposal sites considered are no longer active. The Applicant should revisit this matter and ensure that appropriate disposal sites are considered. Being that the scheme involves some demolition of existing carriageway, consideration should be given to the potential presence of coal tar bearing materials within the road construction (a hazardous waste).</p>	<p>Further information regarding this landfill including the type of waste accepted is included in paragraph 11.7.125 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES.</p> <p>It should be noted that the inclusion of information relating to landfills within Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES is to assess their potential as a source of contamination and not as a potential disposal route for waste generated during construction. Section 13.8 and Table 13-17 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES assesses potential recovery options. Available landfill capacity is detailed in Section 13.7, paragraphs 13.7.16 to 13.7.18 and Tables 13-11 and 13-12 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
4.7.7	12.5.1	<p>The Inspectorate notes an intention to use the Definition of Waste Code of Practice (DoWCoP) to compile a Material Management Plan (MMP). The ES should include a definition of the volumes and classification of materials to demonstrate the extent to which classification of materials to demonstrate the extent to which materials are firstly eligible for re-use and secondly, are both chemically and physically suitable (from an engineering perspective supported by an approved Earthworks Specification).</p>	<p>A contaminated land assessment has been carried out in accordance with CLR11: Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination as part of the Ground Investigation Report (GIR) and is set out in Appendix 11.3: Ground Investigation Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and is summarised in paragraphs 11.7.158 to 11.7.164 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Anticipated volumes of earthworks material (both cut and fill) are detailed in Table 11-11 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES. Further details on the volumes and types of materials to be re-used on Part B can be found in Section 13.8 and Table 13-16 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
4.7.8	Chp. 12	The Inspectorate considers that the ES should include figures that depict the location of the geology, mining hazards, hydrogeology, hydrology, unexploded ordnance (UXO), potential sources of contamination and any identified environmental receptors.	Figure 11.1: Superficial Geology, Figure 11.2: Bedrock Geology, Figure 11.3: Coal Mining Hazards, Figure 11.4: Hydrology – Surface Watercourses and Figure 11.5: Potential Contamination Sources, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6) outline these elements and are included as part of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Population and Human Health			
4.8.1	13.7.1	The Applicant does not give an approximate distance of the nearest open green space/ recreational facilities in relation to the main site compound which will be in use during the construction phase. Therefore, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope out this matter and considers that an assessment of impacts to open/green space or recreational facilities should be undertaken where significant effects are likely.	Paragraphs 12.8.30 to 12.8.33, 12.8.56 to 12.8.58, 12.9.18 and 12.10.31 – 12.10.34 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) assess the impacts in relation to recreational activities and open space.
4.8.2	13.7.1	The Inspectorate does not agree that physical assets and land use during operation can be scoped out. The Scoping Report provides insufficient information in relation to likely significant effect.	Likely significant impacts on physical assets have been assessed in paragraphs 12.10.18 to 12.10.36 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). The assessment of land use in relation to Part B is focused on the potential impact on farm viability as a result of Part B intersecting agricultural fields. Paragraphs 12.7.64 to 12.7.66 and Table 12-28 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES provide details of the assessment.
4.8.3	13.7.1	The Inspectorate is content that impacts to community amenity and severance during operation from construction compounds can be scoped out of the assessment. However, the operational road is a permanent structure and has the potential to impact community amenity and severe key links during operation. The Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out of the ES and expects an assessment of any likely significant effects associated with these impacts.	Assessment of the likely significant effects on journey amenity and community severance is reported in paragraphs 12.10.6 to 12.10.17 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Effects on noise sensitive receptors, air quality receptors and landscape and visual receptors are described in Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 5: Air Quality and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES, respectively.
4.8.4	13.7.1	The Inspectorate agrees that effects on local economy and employment during operation is not likely to be significant and therefore can be scoped out.	No action required.
4.8.5	13.7.1	The Inspectorate is content that impacts to driver views during operation are unlikely to result in significant effects on the population and human health in general. On that basis the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out of the ES in relation to this aspect.	No action required.
4.8.6	13.7.1	The Scoping Report does not anticipate any significant effects on development land in relation to the main scheme and both site compounds. However, justification is not provided. Furthermore, the location of the construction works is stated to be primarily located outside of the development land, which suggests that some development land will be impacted.	As detailed in paragraph 12.7.67 to 12.7.68 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), development land has not been considered for the Main Scheme Area. Although land within the Northumberland Local Plan Draft Policies Map has been identified as suitable for wind turbine development it is not a designated allocation for development and therefore has not be considered further. The impacts of the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound on development land are reported in paragraphs 12.8.61 to 12.8.63 of Chapter 12:

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
			<p>Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p> <p>The Main Compound would be used by both Part A and Part B and is located within the Order Limits of Part A. As detailed in paragraph 12.8.71 of Chapter 12 Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), there would be a negligible impact on Population and Human Health as a result of using the Main Compound for Part B. The effects of the Main Compound on Population and Human Health are therefore reported in Part A Chapter 12: Population and Health, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).</p>
4.8.7	13.2	The study area should be defined with relevance to the extent of the anticipated impacts associated with the Proposed Development.	The Study Area is defined in Section 12.6 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.8.8	Chp. 13	The Scoping Report does not clearly explain if works to divert nearby high voltage power cables will form part of the works that fall within the scope of the DCO application. The ES should clearly describe all works necessary to facilitate delivery of the Proposed Development and ensure that an adequate assessment of the likely significant effects associated is included in the ES. The ES should explain the extent to which the diversion of high voltage cables could lead to significant effects from Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF). The applicant should make effort to agree the approach to the assessment of EMF with relevant consultation bodies.	The diversion of the high voltage power cable is included within the scope of the DCO application and has been assessed in the ES. The potential effects of the Scheme on EMF is covered within paragraphs 4.2.31 to 4.2.33 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES.
Material Resources			
4.9.1	14.7.1	The Inspectorate is content and agrees that lifecycles stages of extraction of raw materials, site arisings and waste production beyond the first year of operation can be scoped out.	No action required.
4.9.2	14.7.1	The Inspectorate agrees that impacts associated with the consumption of material resources, site arisings and waste production during operation is unlikely to result in significant effects. On that basis the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter from the assessment.	No action required.
4.9.3	14.3.1	The ES should include sufficient detail to ensure there is a robust description of the materials that will be required and the waste that will be produced within the ES.	Refer to Section 13.8 , in particular Tables 13-14, 13-15, 13-16, 13-17 and 13-18 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
4.9.4	14.3.6, 14.3.13 Table 49, 14.7.19	The Scoping Report states that professional judgement has been used to assess the sensitivity of the following: materials; landfill capacity; effects from operation in the first year; and the significance of effect. No information is provided on the criteria used to determine the resulting sensitivities. The ES should include a full explanation of how the sensitivity is determined and where professional judgment has been applied. The construction phase of the Scheme has the potential to generate road planings/waste which contains coal tar. The ES does not consider such arisings during demolition and construction. Such materials are classified as hazardous waste and should be dealt with accordingly. The ES should assess impacts associated with these materials where significant effects are likely to occur.	The Assessment Methodology is described fully and in detail in Section 13.4 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). <p>Coal tar – the presence of coal tar has not been confirmed at the time of writing. Therefore, it has been included as a potential demolition arising in Table 13-14, Table 13-16 and Table 13-17 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES, as a worst-case scenario.</p>

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
4.9.5	14.4.5	The Scoping Report indicates that the result of transportation of material resources and waste (to and from site) is not assessed in this chapter. Instead, it directs the reader to chapters 'as appropriate' regarding this matter. The applicant should ensure this is addressed in the chapters listed where significant effects are likely to occur.	The transportation of materials and waste to and from site has been assessed in the following chapters of this ES: Section 6.8 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) provides a high level quantitative construction traffic noise assessment. This included consideration of anticipated noise level changes along routes expected to be used by construction traffic. Section 14.10 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES includes an assessment of GHG emissions with regard to transport of materials and waste.
4.9.6	Table 49	Section 2.4.9 & 13.4.1 references two residential properties that are proposed to be demolished to facilitate the proposed development (at the proposed Charlton Mires Junction). These features are not specifically referenced in demolition section of Table 49. Due consideration should be given in the ES and the impact and waste(s) generated should be factored into the assessment.	Noted and amended in Table 13-14 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). The demolition arisings are also included in Table 13-16 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES.
Climate			
4.10.1	Table 58	The Inspectorate agrees that land use, land use change and forestry can be scoped out of the assessment due to the construction of an additional carriageway, junction and accommodation bridge are in existing agricultural areas along the existing alignment.	No action required.
4.10.2	Table 58	The Inspectorate agrees that associated Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions likely to affect climate associated with operation and maintenance activities will be negligible. The Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out of the ES.	No action required.
4.10.3	Table 58 & 15.6.1	The Inspectorate agrees that decommissioning can be scoped out of the assessment as there is insufficient detail at this stage to provide an accurate assessment and it is uncertain what scale of decommissioning works would be.	No action required.
4.10.4	15.3.30	The Scoping Report discusses changes in relative humidity. The projections for Winter mean relative humidity changes indicate a decrease 10% (under high emissions scenario) by 2050s and increase of 5% by 2080s. With respect to Summer mean humidity; a decrease of 10% by 2050s and 10% by 2080s is expected. The Inspectorate questions the anticipated increase of 5% in Winter mean humidity by occurrence (and the others mentioned) should be provided in the ES.	The baseline for relative humidity has been updated within Appendix 14.1: Vulnerability to Climate Change Baseline, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) using UKCP18 projections. The projections for winter and summer mean relative humidity for the 2050s and 2080s have been updated from those reported in the Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.11) for Part B, showing an increase in humidity for both time slices in winter and summer.
4.10.5	15.5.1	The Scoping Report indicates that efforts will be made to source materials locally; no further information is forthcoming with respect to the likely buffer(s) associated with procuring materials. If the assessment in the ES seeks to rely upon any such assumptions it should be clear how they are secured with reference to relevant legally robust methods.	The sourcing of materials locally is primarily addressed within Section 13.10 of Chapter 13: Materials Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Material assets to be imported to the site during the construction phase are detailed in Table 13-15 within Chapter 13: Materials Resources, Volume 3 of this ES. Table 14-10 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES of this ES details the assumptions relating to locally sourced materials used for the climate assessment.
4.10.6	Table 56	The Scoping Report states that potential significant effects will be identified during the environmental assessment, and that the potential effects provided in Table 56 in relation to the climate resilience are not exhaustive. All potential effects considered in relation to the climate aspect chapter should be clearly outlined in the ES, providing	The likely significant effects identified in Table 56 of the Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.11) for Part B are indicative of the level of Scheme design at the time of the production of the Scoping Report. Section 14.4 of Chapter 14: Climate Volume 3 of this ES

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		justification for scoping additionally identified effects in or out of the assessment. The methodology to assess these effects should be clearly provided in the ES.	(Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) outlines the methodology undertaken for the assessment, including a detailed list of the Part B receptors. Section 14.8 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES presents the potential climate impacts during construction and operation, of which the effects identified are in relation to detailed Part B components.
4.10.7	15.7.4	The Scoping Report states that Transport Analysis Guidance Chapter 4: Greenhouse Gases will be used to inform the greenhouse gas assessment. The Inspectorate notes that this guidance is an 'appraisal methodology' intended for the development of business cases, applicable to highways and public transport interventions and not necessarily for the purposes of undertaking assessment for the ES. The Applicant should take care to ensure that the methodology applied is sufficient to identify and assess the likely significant effects from the proposed development.	Section 14.4 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) sets out the methodology for the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment. paragraphs 14.4.7 to 14.4.10 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES describe the method for calculating GHG emissions associated with Part B. Construction and replacement emissions calculations have been completed using Highways England's carbon tool. TAG Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal - Chapter 4 Greenhouse Gases has been utilised to quantify traffic data for the operational phase end-user GHG emissions. Appraisal methodology has not been used as part of the assessment.
4.10.8	15.7.6	The ES should clearly explain the carbon calculation tool that is finally used and provide a justification for its selection.	Paragraph 14.4.7 of Chapter 14: Climate Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES explains the choice of carbon calculation tool. Construction and replacement emissions calculations have been completed using Highways England's carbon tool which is an industry recognised carbon calculation tool focusing on emissions throughout the project lifecycle.
4.10.9	15.7.14	The Scoping Report states that the potential hazards associated with the Scheme will be assessed in line with 'emerging guidance'. No detail or discussion is provided with respect to this guidance. The Applicant should ensure that full details of all guidance utilised in the assessment should be documented and appropriately referenced.	Full details of the guidance utilised in the assessment is outlined in Section 14.3 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES.
4.10.10	15.8.2	The Scoping Report states that no guidance or carbon emissions thresholds currently exist when considering GHG to determine significance for the climate aspect chapter. No methodology or significance criteria has been provided; therefore, the Inspectorate is unable to provide comment on the suitability of the criteria to be used. The climate aspect chapter should clearly state how significance has been determined, and where professional judgement has been applied.	Section 14.4 of Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES outlines the assessment methodology. The significance of emissions is assessed with reference to the magnitude of emissions, their context, the UK carbon budgets, IEMA guidance and professional judgement.
4.10.11	15.8.3	The Scoping Report states the climate resilience assessment will utilise UK Climate Projections (UKCP09). As set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) the assessment of potential impacts of climate change should take into account the latest UK Climate Projections available at the time. The assessment in the ES should therefore take account of the UKCP18 projections as these will be available before the ES is finalised.	The UKCP18 projections have been used to define the future baseline against which vulnerability of Part B to climate change is assessed. UKCP09 projections have been used where data from UKCP18 was unavailable.
Assessment of Cumulative Effects			
4.11.1	N/A	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	No action required.
4.11.2	16.1.6	While it is noted that the spatial extent of study areas for both non-traffic related topics and traffic related topics is based on guidance in the DMRB, it is not clear which aspects or matters would be classed as non-traffic related. In addition, the Scoping Report does not explain why a distance of 500m for the traffic related topics would be	Paragraphs 16.6.3 to 16.6.11 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) presents the Study Area for the cumulative assessment for the Scheme and a justification for the Study Area used. The Study Area

ID	Ref	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		sufficient to capture all the potential interactions with other developments which could lead to significant effects. The ES must provide a clear justification for the adequacy of the study area and effort should be made to agree the approach with relevant stakeholders, including the public and statutory environmental bodies. The Applicant may find the approach described in the Inspectorate's Advice Note 17 helpful.	for the cumulative assessment consists of a 2 km buffer from the Order Limits, plus the air quality ARN and noise and vibration Wider Network Affected Links (where it extends beyond the 2 km buffer) and 200 m around the roads included in the ARN and Wider Network Affected Links. In addition, the Study Area has been increased to the southern extent of the ARN where it follows the A1 to allow for two junctions. As detailed in Section 16.4 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4), NCC were consulted in October 2018, March 2019, July 2019 and February 2020 regarding the initial proposed methodology for the cumulative assessment.
4.11.3	16.1.16	The Scoping Report explains at paragraph 16.1.5 that the cumulative assessment will be based upon expert professional judgement, and specifically at paragraph 16.1.6 that criteria to determine the significance of effects will be based on Table 2.6 of DMRB HA 205/08 and professional judgement. The ES must clearly explain where professional judgement has been applied and the reasoning behind it.	The application of professional judgement in determining significance is explained in paragraph 15.4.11 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) for the combined assessment for Part B and paragraph 16.4.74 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) for the cumulative assessment of the Scheme.
4.11.4	16.2.1	The receptors considered will only include those that are likely to experience potential residual significant effects from more than one topic area. This appears to ignore the possibility that interaction between non-significant residual effects could also lead to a significant combined effect, which the Inspectorate would expect to see assessed in the ES.	As detailed in paragraph 15.4.7 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), residual effects of 'minor' or above have been taken into consideration. This is to account for the potential for multiple 'non-significant effects' to combine to result in an overall significant effect. The same approach has been undertaken for the Cross Topic combined effects assessment for the Scheme. Refer to paragraph 16.4.45 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4).

Table 1-5 – Part B Consultee Comments within the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 2 of Scoping Opinion)

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
General			
Natural England	73	Schedule 4 of the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, sets out the necessary information to assess impacts on the natural environment to be included in an ES, this should be adhered to.	The ES includes an assessment of the potential impacts of Part B on the natural environment. For example, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) includes the following assessment chapters of this ES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 9: Biodiversity - Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment - Chapter 11: Geology and Soils

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Natural England	73	It will be important for any assessment to consider the potential cumulative effects of this proposal, including all supporting infrastructure, with other similar proposals and a thorough assessment of the 'in combination' effects of the proposed development with any existing developments and current applications. A full consideration of the implications of the whole scheme should be included in the ES. All supporting infrastructure should be included within the assessment.	<p>As detailed in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4), an assessment of both combined effects (different impacts of the Scheme on a single receptor) and cumulative effects (impacts from the Scheme and another development on a single receptor) have been undertaken for the Scheme. The combined effects assessment considers effects for the Scheme from a single environmental topic (Within Topic) and between environmental topics (Cross Topic).</p> <p>The cumulative assessment considers both the construction and operation of the Scheme, including all the infrastructure associated with the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) details the assessment of combined effects of Part B.</p>
Northumberland County Council	79	<p>It would be expected that the EIA or the application generally should cover, at least, the following aspects of the development (details of these are provided below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air Quality - Historic Land Use Impacts - Noise and Vibration - Noise Screening - Artificial Lighting - Dust Management - Odours - Hours of Operation - Statutory Nuisance 	<p>The ES covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air Quality (Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3)) – including both air quality and dust management - Noise and Vibration (Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES) – including noise and vibration as well as noise screening - Landscape and Visual amenity (Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES) – this chapter considers artificial, security lighting during construction. The operational Part B would not be lit. - Cultural Heritage (Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES) – including historic land use impacts <p>The detailed assessment has considered construction hours of operation as set out in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES.</p> <p>A Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.15) has been prepared for the Scheme.</p>
Northumberland County Council	82	It is likely that the most pervasive odour during the development will be from the use of hot asphalt when carriageways are being laid. Little can be done to mitigate such an odour regardless of whether any resurfacing will employ road surface recycling plant or hot asphalt imported to be laid.	No action required.
Northumberland County Council	83	The applicant may wish to consider submitting a Statement of Statutory Nuisance which would provide an explanation of the matters set out in Section 79(1) of The Environmental Protection Act 1990 in respect of statutory nuisance, the potential implications of the proposed development and the measures that have been incorporated into the project design to limit any such potential nuisances. The requirement for a Statement of Statutory Nuisances is set out in the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 at Regulation 5(2)(f), which states that " <i>The application must be accompanied by.....a statement whether the proposal engages one or more of the matters set out in section 79(1) (statutory nuisances and inspections therefore) of The Environmental</i>	A Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.15) has been prepared for the Scheme.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		<i>Protection Act 1990(b), and if so how the applicant proposes to mitigate or limit them."</i>	
Northumberland County Council	84	When considering the environmental impacts of road traffic in isolation, i.e. not air quality, noise and severance etc, the change of flows is considered. The impact of the new road will create traffic at that location, which is unavoidable, but in terms of the local road network and the de-trunked sections of the A1, the proposals will result in a decrease in traffic. It is possible that some local links will increase in traffic flows due to redistribution of traffic to access the new A1, but we are satisfied that this will be considered adequately in the EIA.	The air quality and noise assessments consider potential impacts along the ARN. The ARN is calculated based on a set of traffic criteria and considers traffic changes along the Part B itself and surrounding road network. The ARN for the air quality and noise assessment differ due to a different set of criteria that relate to the type of impacts associated with the topic. Both the air quality and noise assessment consider increases and decreases in traffic flows along the ARN. Refer to Chapter 5: Air Quality and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) for further detail on the affected roads considered within the assessments.
Northumberland County Council	85	We welcome the opportunity for continued involvement in the project including the scope of a Transport Assessment that is likely to be required as part of the Development Control Order submitted to the Inspectorate.	Noted.
Public Health England	94	Consideration of alternatives (including alternative sites, choice of process, and the phasing of construction) is widely regarded as good practice. Ideally, EIA should start at the stage of site and process selection, so that the environmental merits of practicable alternatives can be properly considered. Where this is undertaken, the main alternatives considered should be outlined in the ES.	Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives of this ES details the alternative route options and design options considered through the development of the Scheme.
Public Health England	94	The ES should clearly identify the development's location and the location and distance from the development of off-site human receptors that may be affected by emissions from, or activities at, the development. Off-site human receptors may include people living in residential premises; people working in commercial, and industrial premises and people using transport infrastructure (such as roads and railways), recreational areas, and publicly-accessible land. Consideration should also be given to environmental receptors such as the surrounding land, watercourses, surface and groundwater, and drinking water supplies such as wells, boreholes and water abstraction points.	Sensitive receptors are detailed in the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Public Health England	94	Any assessment of impacts arising from emissions due to construction and decommissioning should consider potential impacts on all receptors and describe monitoring and mitigation during these phases. Construction and decommissioning will be associated with vehicle movements and cumulative impacts should be accounted for.	The assessments consider impacts on the identified receptors as detailed within the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects, Volume 3 of this ES details the combined assessment undertaken for Part B. Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) details the cumulative assessment undertaken for the Scheme. As detailed in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES, it is highly unlikely that the Scheme would be demolished before the end of its design life as the road is likely to have become an integral part of the infrastructure in the area. Demolition would not be either feasible or desirable and is therefore not considered within the ES.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Public Health England	94 - 95	<p>We would expect the promoter to follow best practice guidance during all phases from construction to decommissioning to ensure appropriate measures are in place to mitigate any potential impact on health from emissions (point source, fugitive and traffic-related). An effective Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (and Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP)) will help provide reassurance that activities are well managed. The promoter should ensure that there are robust mechanisms in place to respond to any complaints of traffic-related pollution, during construction, operation, and decommissioning of the facility.</p>	<p>An Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) which covers design, construction as well as operation and monitoring has been prepared for the Scheme. A Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan has not been prepared for the Scheme. As detailed in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES, demolition of the Scheme is highly unlikely.</p>
Public Health England	95	<p>Significant impacts are unlikely to arise from installations which employ Best Available Techniques (BAT) and which meet regulatory requirements concerning emission limits and design parameters. However, PHE has a number of comments regarding emissions in order that the EIA provides a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts. When considering a baseline (of existing environmental quality) and in the assessment and future monitoring of impacts these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should include appropriate screening assessments and detailed dispersion modelling where this is screened as necessary - Should encompass all pollutants which may be emitted by the installation in combination with all pollutants arising from associated development and transport, ideally these should be considered in a single holistic assessment - Should consider the construction, operational, and decommissioning phases - Should consider the typical operational emissions and emissions from start-up, shut-down, abnormal operation and accidents when assessing potential impacts and include an assessment of worst-case impacts - Should fully account for fugitive emissions - Should include appropriate estimates of background levels - Should identify cumulative and incremental impacts (i.e. assess cumulative impacts from multiple sources), including those arising from associated development, other existing and proposed development in the local area, and new vehicle movements associated with the proposed development; associated transport emissions should include consideration of non-road impacts (i.e. rail, sea, and air) - Should include consideration of local authority, Environment Agency, Defra national network, and any other local site-specific sources of monitoring data - Should compare predicted environmental concentrations to the applicable standard or guideline value for the affected medium (such as UK Air Quality Standards and Objectives and Environmental Assessment Levels) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · If no standard or guideline value exists, the predicted exposure to humans should be estimated and compared to 	<p>The Technical Chapters 5 to 14 , Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) have considered all the points relevant to the Scheme and EIA. Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects, Volume 3 of this ES details the combined assessment undertaken for Part B. Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) details the cumulative assessment undertaken for the Scheme. Due to the nature of the Scheme, decommissioning has not been considered within the ES.</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		<p>an appropriate health-based value (a Tolerable Daily Intake or equivalent). Further guidance is provided in Annex 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This should consider all applicable routes of exposure e.g. include consideration of aspects such as the deposition of chemicals emitted to air and their uptake via ingestion - Should identify and consider impacts on residential areas and sensitive receptors (such as schools, nursing homes and healthcare facilities) in the area(s) which may be affected by emissions, this should include consideration of any new receptors arising from future development 	
Public Health England	96	<p>Whilst screening of impacts using qualitative methodologies is common practice (e.g. for impacts arising from fugitive emissions such as dust), where it is possible to undertake a quantitative assessment of impacts then this should be undertaken. PHE's view is that the EIA should appraise and describe the measures that will be used to control both point source and fugitive emissions and demonstrate that standards, guideline values or health-based values will not be exceeded due to emissions from the installation, as described above. This should include consideration of any emitted pollutants for which there are no set emission limits. When assessing the potential impact of a proposed installation on environmental quality, predicted environmental concentrations should be compared to the permitted concentrations in the affected media; this should include both standards for short and long-term exposure</p>	<p>A qualitative assessment has been undertaken in both Chapter 5: Air Quality and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p> <p>The methodology for the air quality assessment and noise and vibration assessment are provided in Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Air Quality and Section 6.4 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES respectively.</p>
Public Health England	97	<p>Within the EIA PHE would expect to see information about how the promoter would respond to accidents with potential off-site emissions e.g. flooding or fires, spills, leaks or releases off-site. Assessment of accidents should: identify all potential hazards in relation to construction, operation and decommissioning; include an assessment of the risks posed; and identify risk management measures and contingency actions that will be employed in the event of an accident in order to mitigate off-site effects.</p>	<p>Potential off-site effects have been considered within the ES, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) - Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) - Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES - Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES <p>The assessment methodologies, potential impacts and mitigation measures are detailed within the relevant ES chapters and appendices.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the Scheme, decommissioning has not been considered within the ES.</p>
Air Quality			
Natural England	76	<p>The assessment should take account of the risks of air pollution and how these can be managed or reduced. Further information on air pollution impacts and the sensitivity of different habitats/designated sites can be found on the Air Pollution Information System (www.apis.ac.uk). Further information on air pollution modelling and assessment can be found on the Environment Agency website.</p>	<p>This has been taken into account and presented in Chapter: 5 Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council	80	The Public Health Protect have previously indicated that it is not expected that air quality should be adversely impacted by the operational use of this section of the A1 once dualled. Any supporting information on an improvement in traffic flows from the dualling of this section should support this expectation.	The assessment of impacts on receptors is presented in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) .
Northumberland County Council	82	Dust minimisation and control shall have regards to accepted guidance and in particular The Institute of Air Quality Management has produced very current documentation entitled “Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction” available at: http://iaqm.co.uk/quidance/ The Mayor of London’s office supplementary guidance document entitled “The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition” which is available at: https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/implementing-london-plan/supplementary-planning-guidance/control-dust- and HSE guidance on construction dust: http://www.hse.gov.uk/construction/healthrisks/hazardous-substances/constructiondust.htm CITB through the Construction Dust Partnership: https://www.citb.co.uk/health-safety-and-other-topics/health-safety/construction-dustpartnership/ It would be expected that a dust management plan (DMP) is produced for such a development identifying the risks and appropriate mitigation which would form part or tie into any construction management plan (CMP) which should reinforce the correct working procedures and operation of equipment and plant.	Construction Dust has been assessed according to the methodology in DMRB HA 207/07. Appropriate mitigation is proposed and is presented in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). It is anticipated that these measures are integrated into a DMP/CMP.
Public Health England	96	When considering a baseline (of existing air quality) and in the assessment and future monitoring of impacts these: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should include consideration of impacts on existing areas of poor air quality e.g. existing or proposed local authority Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) - Should include modelling using appropriate meteorological data (i.e. come from the nearest suitable meteorological station and include a range of years and worst case conditions) - Should include modelling taking into account local topography 	Assessment of Air Quality effects, along with detailed methodology and baseline information are found within Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Noise and Vibration			
Environment Agency	58	Whilst noise and vibration appears to have been considered in detail, it is not clear whether the impact from noise will include any ecological assessment. Sensitive receptors can include species or habitats and we would like to see this incorporated into the assessment methodology.	Potential impacts of noise on protected and/or notable species has been addressed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and its supporting appendices, where relevant provisions for avoidance and mitigation have been prescribed where assessed as required for such species (e.g. bats, badger, etc.).
Northumberland County Council	81	Vibration would normally only be of concern where piling works are required with receptors in close proximity. In such situations, assessment and mitigation of impact may be required. Where vibration might be caused by the proposed development, it is recommended that the applicant liaises with local receptors at an early stage and agree if any structural	Assessment of potential ground borne vibration effects from piling activities has been undertaken within paragraphs 6.8.30 to 6.8.38 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		assessment of dwellings may be required.	
Northumberland County Council	81	The Public Health Protection Unit would recommend that the applicant carefully considers noise screening options to mitigate for noise from the operational road traffic, where this might be particularly beneficial at West Lodge (Charlton Hall) where the additional carriageway will be placed closer to this receptor and there is intervening land that could accommodate some kind of earthen bund and upon which trees could be planted to replace any removed. This could serve a dual purpose of mitigating any potential noise impact and also ensuring the visual barrier is maintained.	Noise screening has been considered within paragraphs 6.9.26 to 6.9.29 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) for a number of properties, including West Lodge. It has been concluded that for a barrier at this location, the cost of the barrier would outweigh the predicted benefits.
Northumberland County Council	82	Although daytime, temporary and/or short-term works generating substantial noise might be acceptable, such noise during the evening, night, weekends and Bank Holiday may be less tolerable to local receptors. It is recommended that works are organised with local receptors at the forefront of the planning of these works. Where possible, night-time noisy works near to residential receptors should be avoided and every effort should be made to accommodate the necessary noisy works at these locations during the day (or early evening) period. Where late evening and night-time noisy works are unavoidable, then it is recommended that a high level of communication is maintained with local receptors and should as a minimum be through letter drops informing of the dates, times and duration of any night-time works. Even then, it is recommended that there should still be a protected period which would allow some respite during the night.	Appropriate construction noise mitigation measures have been set out in detail within paragraphs 6.9.3 to 6.9.17 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and within Appendix 6.9: Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Such measures include the implementation of Best Practicable means as defined in Section 72 of the Control of Pollution Act, including the avoidance of working outside of normal hours where practicable and limiting the timing and duration of works. This is also considered within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) and Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.15) .
Landscape and Visual Amenity			
Forestry Commission	62	In relation to the main compound 10.30.46 I would refer you to the previous consultations for the A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Felton Scheme from the Forestry Commission to the Planning Inspectorate Forestry Commission ref YNE/02/I&R/Statutory/2018.	The Main Compound would be used by both Part A and Part B and is located within the Order Limits of Part A. As detailed in paragraphs 7.8.7 and 7.8.8 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), there would be a negligible effect on landscape and visual receptors as a result of using the Main Compound for Part B. The effects of the Main Compound on landscape and visual receptors are therefore assessed and reported in Part A Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.2).
Forestry Commission	62	The Forestry Commission is essentially satisfied with what has been scoped in and out, as well as the level of assessment of what has been scoped in as described in the Assessment Methodology 10.7.1. Although we would seek confirmation that the desk study for Ancient Woodland mentioned has been carried out by using the Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory in accordance to the standing advice mentioned above. We are keen to engage with the Highways Agency and their consultants in relation to "Lowland mixed deciduous woodland – encompassing broadleaved/mixed/coniferous plantation and broadleaved	Section 7.9 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) sets out the proposed design, mitigation and enhancement measures embedded into the construction and operation of Part B. The proposed measures are illustrated on Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6).

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		semi-natural woodland recorded on Site”, particularly those sites that currently have Forestry Commission current approved Management Plans and have had grants in the past. We have no further comments at this stage of the process.	
Natural England	75	As the development site is approximately 5km from the Northumberland Coast AONB, consideration should be given to the direct and indirect effects upon this designated landscape and in particular the effect upon its purpose for designation within the environmental impact assessment, as well as the content of the relevant management plan for the AONB.	The consideration of the effects of Part B on the AONB is set out in Table 7-4 and at paragraph 7.8.5 within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Natural England	75	Natural England would wish to see details of local landscape character areas mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography. The European Landscape Convention places a duty on Local Planning Authorities to consider the impacts of landscape when exercising their functions.	Paragraph 7.7.13 to 7.7.33 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) sets out the baseline landscape character of the corridor and Study Area. Table 7-14 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES sets out the landscape character areas taken forward for assessment.
Natural England	75	The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. We encourage the use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.	The character areas that are anticipated to have significant effects are set out in Table 7-15 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Natural England	75	Natural England supports the publication Guidelines for LVIA, produced by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment and Management in 2013 (3rd edition). The methodology set out is almost universally used for LVIA.	The detailed methodology is set out within Section 7.4 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Natural England	75	In order to foster high quality development that respects, maintains, or enhances, local landscape character and distinctiveness, Natural England encourages all new development to consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics and, wherever possible, using local materials. The Environmental Impact Assessment process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.	Paragraphs 7.7.13 to 7.7.33 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) set out the baseline landscape character of the corridor and Study Area. Table 7-15 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES sets out the landscape character areas taken forward for assessment. Section 7.9 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES sets out the proposed design, mitigation and enhancement measures embedded into the construction and operation of Part B. The proposed measures are illustrated on Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6).

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Natural England	76	The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. In this context Natural England advises that the cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application	Existing completed projects form the baseline situation and therefore have been considered within all the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) details the cumulative assessment for the Scheme. Paragraph 16.4.61 sets out the planning applications searched for on NCC's website. Planning applications that were 'awaiting decision' and 'approved', and have 'refused' status but are still within the timescales for appeal (six-months from decision notice) were included in the long list.
Natural England	76	The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas which can be found on our website. Links for Landscape Character Assessment at a local level are also available on the same page.	Paragraphs 7.7.13 to 7.7.33 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) set out the baseline landscape character of the corridor and Study Area. Table 7-15 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES sets out the landscape character areas taken forward for assessment.
Northumberland County Council	81	Where there are compounds or night-time works requiring artificial illumination for health and safety and/or security reasons, then lighting should conform to the Institution of Lighting Professionals: Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Lighting Pollution (2011, Ref GN01:2011), this guidance can be viewed / downloaded from: https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light/ It is likely that most of this stretch of the A1 would fall within Environmental Zone E2 (Rural) as it clearly would not fall within the examples of zone E1 and is somewhat altered by vehicles lights using the A1 at night. Therefore, light intrusion (trespass) should not exceed 5 lux pre-curfew and 1 lux post-curfew (curfew being 2300 to 0700). The impact from illumination of the carriageway during the operational phase will not be required.	Noted.
Northumberland County Council	81	The impact from illumination of the carriageway during the operational phase will not be required.	Noted.
Cultural Heritage			
Historic England	68	This development could, potentially, have an impact upon a significant number of designated heritage assets and their settings in the area around the site. In line with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we would expect the Environmental Statement to contain a thorough assessment of the likely effects which the proposed development might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets.	The Order Limits of Part B have been altered meaning that no designated heritage assets are located within it, and therefore would not be subject to direct physical impacts. Assessment of setting of the heritage assets is undertaken following Historic England guidance. The ES assesses the potential impacts on the setting of the designated assets up to 1 km from the Order Limits of Part B during construction and operation as set out in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). The assessment of the contribution of the setting to the value of the asset is provided in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES and in Appendix 8.1: Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
			<p>Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). The significance of effects is provided in Section 8.10 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
Historic England	68	<p>Our initial assessment agrees with the list of designated heritage assets within 1 km of the proposed development as identified by the EIA Scoping Report in Figure A.3. Designated Heritage Assets, Appendix A.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Historic England	68	<p>We would expect the Environmental Statement to consider the potential impacts on non-designated features of historic, architectural, archaeological or artistic interest, since these can also be of national importance and make an important contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of an area and sense of place. This information is available via the local authority Historic Environment Record (www.keystothepast.info) and relevant local authority staff.</p>	<p>Section 4 of Appendix 8.1: Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and Section 8.7 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) identifies the non-designated heritage assets impacted by Part B and is based on information provided by the NCC Historic Environment Record (HER). The assessment has also identified and scoped in additional heritage assets not recorded in the HER following the walkover survey, geophysical survey and the historical map regression exercise. The value of the heritage assets has been determined following DMRB and NPPF guidance.</p> <p>The impacts on non-designated heritage assets is presented in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES and the significance of effects in Section 8.10 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
Historic England	68	<p>The assessment should also take account of the potential impact which associated activities (such as construction, servicing and maintenance, and associated traffic) might have upon perceptions, understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets in the area. The assessment should also consider, where appropriate, the likelihood of alterations to drainage patterns that might lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits and can also lead to subsidence of buildings and monuments.</p>	<p>Section 8.8 and Section 8.10 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) provides an assessment of direct physical impacts and impacts from a change in setting includes temporary effects from the construction phase and permanent effects from the operation phase.</p> <p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES sets out the impacts also comprise those associated with the changes in ground water and hydrology, where information is available.</p>
Historic England	69	<p>Given the scale of the proposed development and the surrounding landscape character, this development is likely to be visible across a very large area and could, as a result, affect the significance of heritage assets at some distance from this site itself. We would expect the assessment to clearly demonstrate that the extent of the proposed study area is of the appropriate size to ensure that all heritage assets likely to be affected by this development have been included and can be properly assessed.</p>	<p>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) sets out the wider Study Area applied for assessment of settings impacts at 1 km. The walkover survey was extended to assess the potential impacts on the heritage assets contained within the Alnwick Castle Grade I Registered Park and Garden, including the Grade I Listed Building Alnwick Castle, which lies outside of the 1 km Study Area. Refer to Appendix 8.1: Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).</p>
Historic England	69	<p>It is important that the assessment is designed to ensure that all impacts are fully understood. Section drawings and techniques such as photomontages are a useful part of this. This would be of particular importance in relation to the two proposed new junctions and most particularly in relation to the likely impacts of the proposed Broxfield overbridge on to the grade I Alnwick Park and Garden. We would strongly recommend that you involve the Northumberland County Council Conservation Officer and archaeological advisers in the</p>	<p>The assessment that is set out within Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) has been developed in consultation with the County Archaeologist. It includes assessment of the Grade I Alnwick Castle Registered Park and Garden.</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		development of this assessment. They are best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities; how the proposal can be tailored to avoid and minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of heritage assets.	
Historic England	69	We would like to highlight that any trial trenching will require Scheduled Monument Consent - as identified in paragraph 9.5.1 of the EIA Scoping Report. This will likely be prior to determination of the consent in order to better understand the nature of the archaeology and to inform suitable mitigation strategies.	The Order Limits of Part B have been updated following scoping to exclude the Scheduled Monument.
Historic England	69	The setting assessment should follow best practice standards and guidance as set out in “Good Practice Advice in Planning - Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets” and “Good Practice Advice in Planning - Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment”. The latter is in addition to guidance mentioned in paragraph 9.7.7 of the EIA Scoping Report.	Section 8.8 and Section 8.10 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) sets out the assessment of settings which has been undertaken in line with the Historic England guidance.
Natural England	76	You should consider whether there is land in the area affected by the development which qualifies for conditional exemption from capital taxes on the grounds of outstanding scenic, scientific or historic interest. An up-to-date list may be obtained at http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/gds/heritage/lbsearch.htm www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/lbsearch.htm	The list has been reviewed and no assets have been identified.
Northumberland County Council	84	We support the scoping in of the grade I Alnwick Castle Registered Park and Garden and the inclusion of viewpoints within it but suggest a viewpoint also be considered for that part at Ratcheugh.	The walkover survey was extended to Ratcheugh part of the Grade I Alnwick Registered Park and Garden, where public access was available.
Northumberland County Council	84	It may be prudent to include the Alnwick and Denwick Neighbourhood plan.	Noted. Refer to Section 8.3 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) for further detail.
Northumberland County Council	87	I can confirm that the identified search area provides a sufficient understanding of the known archaeological remains within the site and in the surrounding area, in order to provide insight into the nature and range of potential, previously unidentified remains which may be present on site. The document highlights the extent of assessment work which will be required, both for the Desk-Based Assessment, but also the Visual Impact Assessment.	N/A
Northumberland County Council	87	I agree with the need for geophysical survey. The extent of the geophysical survey will need to be formulated based on the impact of the proposed road widening, associated infrastructure and disturbance, potentially with a buffer in order to place the results within their context.	Appendix 8.2: Geophysical Survey Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) sets out the outcome of Geophysical Survey. The survey area was wider than the Order Limits of Part B.
Northumberland County Council	87	I would like to highlight that while the desk-based assessment and geophysical survey will help to inform the trial trenching strategy, unless this work clearly demonstrates that archaeological remains have been removed by later disturbance, trial trenching will usually be required as standard.	Appendix 8.3: West Linkhall Intrusive Survey Information and Appendix 8.4: North Charlton Intrusive Survey Information, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) sets out the outcome of two trial trench evaluations.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
			<p>Appendix 8.5: Draft Written Scheme for Investigation for Post DCO-Consent Trial Trenching, Volume 8 of this ES sets out the approach to trial trenching post-DCO to inform the requirement for mitigation.</p>
Northumberland County Council	87	<p>The shallow nature of many archaeological sites in Northumberland and the potential presence of discrete features, such as Bronze Age burials, mean that geophysical surveys and aerial photographic analysis do not always identify the extent and range of all archaeological remains on site. The trial trenching will therefore be positioned to test geophysical anomalies of potential archaeological origin, known earthworks and cropmarks and also blank areas. As identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report, the scope of the evaluation will be agreed in consultation with NCC Conservation Team.</p>	<p>Appendix 8.3: West Linkhall Intrusive Survey Information and Appendix 8.4: North Charlton Intrusive Survey Information, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) sets out the outcome of two trial trench evaluations.</p> <p>Appendix 8.5: Draft Written Scheme for Investigation for Post DCO-Consent Trial Trenching, Volume 8 of this ES sets out the approach to trial trenching post-DCO to inform the requirement for mitigation.</p>
Biodiversity			
Environment Agency	55	<p>We support references to Highways England's Biodiversity Plan and the assessment of the scheme against the No Net Loss requirements.</p> <p>The proposed development should seek to ensure that any compensatory works maximise the ecological benefits through consideration of all options available, and through an appropriate consultation to include the Environment Agency. Engagement with the Environment Agency should be sought at each stage in line with the Highways England Biodiversity Plan statements:</p> <p>Part 1 – 5.0. 2 – “Other government bodies, particularly Defra and Natural England – as they set national policy to support biodiversity.”</p> <p>Part 2 – Outcome 3, Action 3.3 - “Project teams to liaise with local wildlife partners as part of their project design and development to identify how the project could best contribute towards landscape scale biodiversity gains. Information on these opportunities to be provided to the relevant regional programme board and technical working group.”</p>	<p>Part B has been assessed using Defra Biodiversity Metric and in line with best practice to attempt to achieve, as a minimum, no net loss of biodiversity, with aims of achieving net gains in biodiversity. The assessment can be found in the Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).</p>
Environment Agency	56	<p>The Statutory Designated Sites included in the scope are sufficient. Although no designated sites lie within the scheme area, Natural England may need to be consulted regarding the impact on the nearby sites.</p>	<p>A full assessment of designated sites within 10 km of the Scheme has been included within the EclA in line with best practice guidelines and methodologies and can be found in Sections 9.4 and 9.6 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) specifically.</p>
Environment Agency	56	<p>In order to ensure that the proposed development can be fully assessed, we would expect a full suite of species surveys to be undertaken as part of the DCO submission.</p>	<p>Additional habitat and species surveys have been completed to provide a robust and appropriate baseline with which to inform the EclA. All surveys have been completed in accordance with best practice guidelines and methodologies, with any deviations from such justified within the ES. Details of surveys completed can be found within Section 9.4 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and technical supporting appendices – Appendices 9.1 to 9.10, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Environment Agency	58	Improved fish passage is welcomed and river continuity and processes at crossing points supported. Where river crossings are to be undertaken, we would require these to be open and not pose a barrier to migrating fish.	A full assessment of riverine and aquatic ecology has been completed as part of this EclA. Specific mitigation measures have been detailed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES and Appendix 9.10: Aquatic Ecology Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Environment Agency	58	The possibility of replacing existing culverts with bridges or in the very least, modifying them to improve fish passage and local habitats should be considered. The culverting of watercourses will result in habitat loss. Options for mitigating this habitat loss within the waterbodies effected should be explored. The Environment Agency would be happy to discuss options for this.	A full assessment of riverine and aquatic ecology has been completed as part of this EclA. Specific mitigation measures have been detailed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.10: Aquatic Ecology Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Environment Agency	58	Surveys should be undertaken to identify the risks present within the Scheme area and detailed method statement will be required to ensure the appropriate control and where possible eradication of any Invasive non-native species (see also 'Materials' section of this table).	Invasive species have been identified during surveys along the Shipperton Burn. Whilst prescriptive means of treatment and removal have not been included in the ES, engagement of an appropriately qualified specialist is recommended. Biosecurity measures and recommendations to prevent the spread and propagation of invasive species have also been included within Section 9.9 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Environment Agency	58	The Northumberland Rivers Trust host the Northumberland Rivers Catchment Partnership. They have identified a number of potential projects within the Northumberland Catchment that could act a mitigation/enhancement measures for this scheme.	Considerations for engagement with the Northumberland Rivers Trust has been accounted for during mitigation considerations within Appendix 9.10: Aquatic Ecology Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES has also taken into account this consideration.
Environment Agency	59	The Northumberland Rivers Trust have recently submitted a bid for the Water Environment Grant (WEG) to improve fish passage along the River Aln and its tributaries near Alnwick. If successful, there will be a significant amount of investment, in the region of £590,000 within the River Aln catchment to improve fish passage. With this in mind, Highways England should consider improving fish passage on all their assets within the Aln catchment to support this project.	Where possible and where required, improvements to watercourses to encourage fish passage have been incorporated within mitigation and design. Details of mitigation and proposals are presented within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.10: Aquatic Ecology Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Forestry Commission	62	The Forestry Commission is essentially satisfied with what has been scoped in and out, as well as the level of assessment of what has been scoped in as described in the Assessment Methodology 10.7.1 of the EIA Scoping Report. Although we would seek confirmation that the desk study for Ancient Woodland mentioned has been carried out by using the Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory in accordance to the standing advice mentioned above. We are keen to engage with the Highways Agency and their consultants in relation to "Lowland mixed deciduous woodland – encompassing broadleaved/mixed/coniferous plantation and broadleaved semi-natural woodland recorded on Site", particularly those sites that currently have Forestry Commission current approved Management Plans and have had grants in the past. We have no further comments at this stage of the process.	Desk study for ancient woodlands was carried out using Natural England's Multi Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) map and in accordance with Standing Advice, which includes Natural England's data set of Ancient Woodland locations. Information regarding Ancient Woodland presence is presented within Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and summarised in Section 9.7 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Natural England	73	<p>Natural England advises that the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters. Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) have been developed by the CIEEM and are available on their website.</p> <p>The NPPF sets out guidance in S.118 on how to take account of biodiversity interests in planning decisions and the framework that local authorities should provide to assist developers.</p>	<p>The EclA, is reported in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) including its supporting appendices, and has been prepared in cognisance of, and with reference to, CIEEM's 2019 EclA guidance, whilst additionally taking account of other specific relevant best practice guidelines and methods to support the impact assessment.</p>
Natural England	73	<p>Natural England notes the proposal to scope out impacts on nationally and internationally designated sites from the EIA due to the separation distance between the designated sites and the scheme, and the fact that the majority of the works will be 'on-line' along the existing route of the A1. We agree that these impacts can be scoped out, but also note that a Habitats Regulations Screening Assessment will be produced.</p> <p>Natura 2000 network site conservation objectives are available on our internet site http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/category/6490068894089216</p>	<p>An HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.14) screening has been prepared for the Scheme.</p>
Natural England	74	<p>The EIA will need to consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites. Local Sites are identified by the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or a local forum established for the purposes of identifying and selecting local sites. They are of county importance for wildlife or geodiversity. The Environmental Statement should therefore include an assessment of the likely impacts on the wildlife and geodiversity interests of such sites. The assessment should include proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures. Contact the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or local sites body in this area for further information (see also Geology and Soils section of this table).</p>	<p>A full assessment of local designated sites within 2 km of Part B has been included within the EclA in line with best practice guidelines and methodologies and can be found in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8), specifically Section 4: Results. ERIC North-East were contacted for information regarding local wildlife and geological sites.</p>
Natural England	74	<p>The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species (including, for example, great crested newts, reptiles, birds, water voles, badgers and bats). Natural England does not hold comprehensive information regarding the locations of species protected by law but advises on the procedures and legislation relevant to such species. Records of protected species should be sought from appropriate local biological record centres, nature conservation organisations, groups and individuals; and consideration should be given to the wider context of the site for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area, to assist in the impact assessment.</p> <p>In order to provide this information, there may be a requirement for a survey at a particular time of year. Surveys should always be carried out in optimal survey time periods and to current guidance by suitably qualified and where necessary, licensed, consultants. Natural England has adopted standing advice for protected species which includes links to guidance on survey and mitigation.</p>	<p>Historic records of protected and/or notable species have been requested from the relevant recording centre (ERIC North-East) for the area, as well as local wildlife interest groups, where applicable, with results detailed within Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Further, such records have helped inform requirements for further protected and/or notable species surveys to determine impacts upon such habitat and faunal species/groups.</p> <p>All surveys have been completed in line with best practice methodologies and guidance, and impact assessments completed on the basis of results accrued. All information relating to historic records and field surveys undertaken to inform this EclA is included within Section 9.6 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and its supporting appendices (Appendices 9.1 to 9.10, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8)) which pertain to individual species or species groups.</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Natural England	74	The ES should thoroughly assess the impact of the proposals on habitats and/or species listed as 'Habitats and Species of Principal Importance' within the England Biodiversity List, published under the requirements of S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 places a general duty on all public authorities, including local planning authorities, to conserve and enhance biodiversity.	Habitats and Species of Principal Importance have been considered within the impact assessment and reported in Section 9.6 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and detailed further within Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Natural England	74	Government Circular 06/2005 states that Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species and habitats, 'are capable of being a material consideration...in the making of planning decisions'. Natural England therefore advises that survey, impact assessment and mitigation proposals for Habitats and Species of Principal Importance should be included in the ES. Consideration should also be given to those species and habitats included in the relevant Local BAP.	Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) has been completed with reference and recognition of BAP species and habitats, with such habitats and species highlighted within relevant supporting Appendices 9.1 to 9.10, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Where required, mitigation for such species has been prescribed within the above referenced appendices and compiled within Section 9.8 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES.
Natural England	74	<p>Natural England advises that a habitat survey (equivalent to Phase 2) is carried out on the site, in order to identify any important habitats present. In addition, ornithological, botanical and invertebrate surveys should be carried out at appropriate times in the year, to establish whether any scarce or priority species are present. The Environmental Statement should include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any historical data for the site affected by the proposal (e.g. from previous surveys); - Additional surveys carried out as part of this proposal; - The habitats and species present; - The status of these habitats and species (e.g. whether priority species or habitat); - The direct and indirect effects of the development upon those habitats and species; - Full details of any mitigation or compensation that might be required. <p>The development should seek if possible, to avoid adverse impact on sensitive areas for wildlife within the site, and if possible, provide opportunities for overall wildlife gain.</p>	<p>The biodiversity assessment has been completed utilising both historic records and data, habitat surveys and protected and/or notable species surveys to provide a robust baseline for assessment against the impacts of Part B. All information pertaining to prescribed designations or conservations statuses has been included where required.</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy has been adopted from the outset, with avoidance of sensitive receptors adopted where feasible. Where avoidance has not been possible, reduction of impacts and thereafter mitigation and compensation have been prescribed.</p> <p>Results used to inform the impact assessment and any prescriptions for mitigation and compensation have been included throughout Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and its supporting appendices (refer to Appendices 9.1 to 9.11, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8)).</p>
Natural England	76	The England Biodiversity Strategy published by Defra establishes principles for the consideration of biodiversity and the effects of climate change. The ES should reflect these principles and identify how the development's effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained. The NPPF requires that the planning system should contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment 'by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures' (NPPF Para 109), which should be demonstrated through the ES.	Mitigation and compensation required as a result of construction of Part B has been prescribed in cognisance of the changing climate with all efforts made to reconnect 'fragmented' habitats to provide a more resilient larger network and enhance opportunities for biodiversity. All efforts are encompassed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and its supporting appendices (refer to Appendices 9.1 to 9.11, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8)).
Northumberland County Council	80	There does not appear any of Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGS) / Local Wildlife and Geological Sites (LWGS) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within the immediate	Consultation has been requested from all interested parties throughout the assessment process. Responses and considerations received from consultees have informed and been included within the assessment process

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		area of the proposed dualling. However, it is expected that Ecology at Northumberland County Council are also a consultee to this application and will confirm these matters.	and captured within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and its supporting appendices (refer to Appendices 9.1 to 9.11, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8)).
Northumberland County Council	85	The ES scoping report states that one of the aims of the proposal in line with Highways England policy is to commit to the principle of no net loss for biodiversity. This approach is at odds with planning policy and environment policy as a whole; the NPPF and the recently published 25 Year Environment Plan, states the principle toward biodiversity should be to aim to deliver net gain for biodiversity over and above mitigation proposals, this is in line with the NPPF (para 8 and 170).	Whilst Highways England policy for Part B has been to commit to no net loss, this has been set as the minimum for Part B, with the aim of Part B to achieve net gains for biodiversity where possible. The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment is included within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Northumberland County Council	85	The mitigation and enhancement should take opportunities to create and join ecological networks, again in line with the NPPF (para 170).	Where possible mitigation has sought to connect fragmented or isolated habitats and enhance ecological networks. All mitigation and landscape mitigation enhancement measures have been captured within Section 9.9 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES.
Northumberland County Council	85	In general, the scope and scale of ecological survey, including protected species, appears to be thorough and to conform to relevant survey guidance. However, given that some survey work was undertaken in 2015 and early 2016, then those surveys may not be sufficiently up to date in order to support an informed decision. For example, breeding bird survey was undertaken last in spring 2016. Surveys should therefore be updated where appropriate and where not updated thorough explanation must be provided as to why older surveys may continue to be robust.	Where required protected species and habitat surveys have been completed to inform this assessment. Where update surveys have not been undertaken robust justification for such a decision has been provided. All information pertaining to survey works completed, methods, and justifications for a lack of update survey are provided within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and supporting Appendices 9.1 to 9.10, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Repeat breeding and wintering bird surveys have not been undertaken as part of this assessment with previous survey information considered sufficient to inform this assessment. Full justification is provided within Appendix 9.6: Breeding and Wintering Birds Report, Volume 8 of this ES.
Northumberland County Council	85	Bird survey method and effort should be appropriate to the species. For example, the scoping report states that woodcock may be breeding within the study area, therefore survey for this species should be undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance.	Assessment of bird assemblage and potential impacts resulting from construction of Part B have been addressed within Section 9.8 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES and Section 6 of Appendix 9.6: Breeding and Wintering Birds Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8), with barn owl captured individually within Appendix 9.7: Barn Owl Survey Report, Volume 8 of this ES.
Northumberland County Council	85	Vantage point survey is to be undertaken for barn owl which I concur is necessary.	A suite of barn owl surveys has been completed as part of this assessment. Section 2 of Appendix 9.7: Barn Owl Survey Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the method of baseline identification and Section 4 details the results and impact assessment. The assessment is (summarised within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3)).
Northumberland County Council	86	I concur that priority habitats should be scoped into the EIA. The quality of grasslands to be impacted should be clearly described, even where semi-improved grasslands fall below the threshold to be considered to be priority	Habitats have been resurveyed through the inclusion of an updated Phase 1 habitat survey. Grasslands, as well as all other habitats recorded, have been assessed for their potential to be included as Habitats of Principal Importance

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		<p>habitat those grasslands may be considered to be habitat that falls under the Northumberland BAP. Where such grasslands are to be impacted, commensurate mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>and/or BAP habitats. Appropriate mitigation and landscaping have been provided within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Mitigation has also been illustrated and discussed within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6).</p>
Northumberland County Council	86	<p>The presence and location of veteran trees, including those outside ancient woodland, should be carefully mapped and unless absolutely impossible veteran trees should be retained and protected. Veteran trees host a disproportionately large range of taxa and for this reason the NPPF gives aged and veteran trees the same status as other irreplaceable habitats (para 175).</p>	<p>A full arboriculture assessment has been completed of trees across Part B and wider survey area and presented in Appendix 7.1: Arboricultural Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) Section 4 highlights historic presence of veteran trees. All efforts have been made to retain such trees where feasibly possible, with details provided within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 7.1: Arboricultural Report, Volume 8 of this ES. A desk study search of locations of ancient woodland has been included within Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES and summarised in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES with ancient woodland located within 2 km of the Order Limits of Part B, but not within the Order Limits of Part B.</p>
Northumberland County Council	86	<p>I welcome that landscape scale effects on bats shall be investigated. This should utilise bat transect surveys and static monitoring survey work in accordance with BCT guidance. I welcome that reptile survey is planned to be undertaken as suitable habitat for reptiles is present in the study area.</p>	<p>Following best practice guidelines, surveys for bats have included transects, static bat detector deployment and Defra transects to assess the potential impacts of Part B on landscape scale bat movements. All methods employed to inform this assessment and subsequent impact assessment results are provided in Appendix 9.5: Bat Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and summarised within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Surveys for reptiles have been completed where suitable habitat to support such species has been identified with results used to inform the impact assessment for this species group. All information relating to reptile survey and impact assessment is captured within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES and Appendix 9.9: Reptile Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES.</p>
Northumberland County Council	86	<p>Mitigation for water vole regarding pollution prevention (during and post construction) and avoiding habitat severance should be clearly presented.</p>	<p>Effects upon water vole have been assessed and recommendations for mitigation during, and post, construction have been detailed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.3: Otter and Water Vole Survey Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).</p>
Northumberland County Council	86	<p>I concur that due to the scale of the proposal and that European sites are within 10km of the study area that the proposal would need to be screened for a likely significant effect on the conservation objectives of interest features of those sites in</p>	<p>An HRA Screening Assessment (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.14) has been prepared, owing to the presence of international and European designated sites within 10 km of the Scheme. The Screening Assessment has assessed the potential Likely Significant Effects, as a result of construction of the Scheme, upon such sites.</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		accordance with the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017. It is incumbent upon the developer to provide this information to the competent authority.	
Northumberland County Council	86	I welcome that the road is not to be lit as this limits the impact to bats and other nocturnal mammals and birds.	Beyond the requirement for temporary lighting during construction, lighting would not be included along the length of Part B. Mitigation and best practice guidance on the implementation and utilisation of lighting to prevent adverse impacts upon species and habitats has been included within Section 9.9 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and supporting appendices and the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) .
Northumberland County Council	86	Given that water quality underpins the ecology of those water courses, including protected species such as water vole and otter, measures to alleviate pollution including those to remove and trap sediment (oversized vegetated balancing ponds and reedbeds) are essential, particularly in the catchments where the WFD classification for ecological or chemical properties of those watercourses are rated as good.	Recommendations and mitigation have been provided within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and its supporting appendices (notably Appendix 9.10: Aquatic Ecology Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8)), discussing prevention measures and opportunities to reduce potential pollution events and/or sedimentation of watercourses and waterbodies across Part B and wider area. Requirements for necessary consents (e.g. EA consents) has been prescribed within mitigation. Additional information has been provided within Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES. The consents required for the Scheme are also detailed within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) .
Northumberland County Council	86	I would strongly encourage that there is an aim that all grassland created should be species rich grassland, which utilise locally appropriate wild provenance seed mixture, potentially including the only Northumberland wild provenance seed from B & K Wharf Farming (as detailed on the Flora Locale supplier directory). Where species rich grassland is to be established a full topsoil profile should not be restored, indeed topsoil could be omitted completely. The aim for the scheme should be to secure a net gain in biodiversity, accordingly where priority and irreplaceable habitats such as veteran trees are impacted biodiversity enhancement over, and above mitigation should be clearly proposed.	Opportunities for enhancement have been included within mitigation landscape designs where possible, including the provision of species rich grasslands, which is illustrated on Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.6). All recommendations for planting and reseedling have stipulated a preference for the inclusion of locally sourced, native species, as discussed within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.1: Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). A Biodiversity No Net Loss assessment has been completed for Part B and presented within Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report, Volume 8 of this ES with an aspiration of providing net gains for biodiversity. No net loss to biodiversity as a result of construction of Part B has been targeted as a minimum. All details of mitigation proposed is included within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES and its support appendices.
Road Drainage and the Water Environment			
Environment Agency	Pg. 56	A full Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment will need to be carried out to ensure the proposed development does not result in any WFD deteriorations. A WFD Assessment should be carried out on all watercourses with the scheme area. This should assess the impact upon all WFD qualifying elements of all watercourses, regardless if Main River or Ordinary Watercourse.	A full WFD assessment has been undertaken for Part B, as set out in Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Environment Agency	Pg. 56	Under WFD, we would wish to see any works contribute to maintenance of the current status or an improvement, not a decline. As the route crosses several failing waterbodies, it is vital that the proposed development does not prevent future improvement of these waterbodies and where appropriate identify compensatory works.	The WFD assessment set out in Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) concludes that there would be no detrimental impact or change to the WFD status of the waterbodies.
Environment Agency	56	With respect to the methodology, consideration will need to be given to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will expansion of the A1 lead to deterioration of WFD status of waterbodies within the proposed area of works? - Will expansion of the A1 compromise the achievement of GOOD status in any of the WFD water bodies? - Will expansion of the A1 contribute towards a cumulative deterioration of WFD status or prevent cumulative enhancement of WFD status? - Will expansion of the A1 compromise the achievement of WFD objectives in those waterbodies that are hydrologically linked? - Can the expansion of the A1 support the delivery of those measures identified in the current River Basin Management Plan that are required to achieve waterbody objective? - Statement of compliance with WFD 	The methodology undertaken for the WFD assessment has taken these points into consideration and is outlined in Section 2 of Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Environment Agency	57	WFD Assessment Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stage 1: Pre-screening; - Stage 2: Screening; Look at each WFD quality element within each catchment – potential impact on status – is further assessment required? - Stage 3: Further assessment; followed by, if required; - Stage 4: Identification and evaluation of measures; and Stage 5 Article 4.7 considerations 	The methodology undertaken for the WFD assessment has taken these points into consideration and is outlined in Section 2 of Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Environment Agency	Pg. 57	The WFD should consider both potential WFD impacts during construction and following completion of construction once the new stretch of A1 is operational. Guidance on WFD assessments is set out in the Environment Agency's 'Clearing the Waters for All' publication. Although this guidance specifically relates to estuarine and coastal water bodies, the principles can be applied to surface water bodies.	Both operation and construction impacts have been considered as part of the WFD assessment, as set out in Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8).
Environment Agency	Pg. 57	It is vital that Highway England go over and above to ensure that the quality of the water entering the watercourses from the highway is as clean as it can be, ensuring no risk of WFD deterioration.	A standalone Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment using the Highways Agency [now Highways England] Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) has been undertaken to support the WFD assessment, as outlined in Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). The proposed mitigation measures included within the surface water drainage strategy are deemed to be appropriate and would provide an appropriate level of treatment to the surface water runoff discharged into the watercourses.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Environment Agency	Pg. 57	Due to the potential impact on water quality, we would like to see any drainage directed into balancing ponds and runoff to be attenuated in wetland filter systems. These should be appropriate to the landscape and should seek to enhance the biodiversity of the area, supporting native flora and fauna where possible	Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the grassed detention basins and filter strips embedded within the surface water drainage design. The landscape mitigation plan considers appropriate planting in relation to the proposed drainage features.
Environment Agency	Pg. 57	There are no details as to what assessment will be used to assess the current hydromorphological condition and how the construction and permanent works will affect this. River Habitat Survey, watercourse crossing surveys, geomorphological surveys will be required to support the hydromorphology assessment.	The WFD assessment outlined in Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) considers the hydromorphological aspects of Part B, with the assessment methodology outlined in Section 3 . The WFD methodology was also discussed during the consultation meeting held with the EA during October 2018.
Environment Agency	Pg. 57	It is vital that all watercourse crossing surveys should demonstrate how the temporary works will be carried out, and the impact they will have on the hydromorphology, especially relating to the simplifying of channels and how this will be mitigated against. This impact upon the hydromorphology should then be used to directly assess the impact upon ecology including fish and their habitat, invertebrates and macrophytes. This could be incorporated into the WFD Assessment and mitigation included where appropriate. Where any stabilisation to banks is required, we would like to see soft engineering considered as a priority, before hard engineering techniques are used.	The site walkover, baseline ecology information provided by the Part B ecologist and desktop based review of online sources provided baseline information for all of the watercourses. The baseline condition of the existing culverts and watercourses has been taken into consideration into the preliminary design of the watercourse crossings. This is detailed in the WFD assessment (Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8)).
Environment Agency	Pg. 58	Section 2.4.11 of the EIA Scoping Report states that nine new culverts are proposed and modification to one existing. The Environment Agency does not support the culverting of watercourses and therefore justification should be provided to demonstrate there is no reasonably practicable alternative.	The design of Part B has progressed since the Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.11) for Part B was undertaken, and there is now only one new culvert proposed and 9 culvert extensions. Three culverts are already of sufficient length in relation to the Part B proposals. Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) outlines the design of the culverts.
Environment Agency	Pg. 58	Any oils, and fuels stored on either compounds should be stored in bunded areas in accordance with the Oil storage regulations. Where possible the storage of oils and fuels should be at least 10m from any watercourses to prevent pollution occurring.	This has been taken into consideration as part of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan and is detailed in Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Environment Agency	59	There are opportunities to reduce the existing flood risk on some of the watercourses and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) to be created. However, this needs to be directed away from land that is in within the floodplain. It is recommended that Highway England engages the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) on this matter.	Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the drainage strategy report and the SuDS included in the design. Consultation with the LLFA has been undertaken regarding local flood risk as detailed in Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES.
Environment Agency	59	The scoping report states that all crossing assessments will include the current climate change allowances and as such, we are satisfied that the crossing will be adequately sized for now and for the future. It should be noted that updated climate change allowances were published on 26 November 2018 and will need to be taken into consideration as part of the DCO application.	Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the hydraulic assessment undertaken for Part B and demonstrates how climate change has been taken into consideration as part of the assessment.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Environment Agency	59	The proposed crossings are all located within Ordinary Watercourses. The hydraulic modelling and/or culvert master assessments should be assessed by the LLFA.	Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the hydraulic assessment undertaken for Part B and the results have been discussed with the LLFA.
Northumberland County Council	83	It would be expected that the EIA or the application generally should cover, at least, the following aspects of the development (details of these are provided below): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flood risk - fluvial and surface water - Drainage 	Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the hydraulic assessment undertaken for the Scheme and Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 8 of this ES details the surface water drainage strategy.
Northumberland County Council	83	There are a number of existing culverts which run under the A1. All of these culverts need to be analysed from a flood risk perspective. Where necessary these culverts need to be replaced, repaired, extended, or newly constructed.	Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details the hydraulic assessment undertaken for Part B and assesses the watercourse crossings.
Northumberland County Council	83	Where overland surface water flow routes have been identified, appropriate mitigation measures will need to be proposed and incorporated into the design.	Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) details where surface water flowpaths have been identified and the mitigation measures proposed.
Northumberland County Council	83	With regards to the disposal of surface water from the highway, as per paragraph 163 of the NPPF When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that: it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. As such we expect to see attenuation provided in the form of SuDS. We ask that the discharge rate is restricted to the equivalent greenfield runoff rate for the same event and that attenuation is provided for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. Information on climate change can be found here – https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances	A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared for Part B, as outlined in Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 8 of this ES details the calculations used to inform the design of the surface water drainage system and that a 20% climate change allowance has been incorporated into the design.
Northumberland County Council	86	The proposed development is within 500m of a number of small water courses (approx. 16). It is stated that all drainage systems shall outfall to watercourses. Given that water quality underpins the ecology of those water courses, including protected species such as water vole and otter, measures to alleviate pollution including those to remove and trap sediment (oversized vegetated balancing ponds and reedbeds) are essential, particularly in the catchments where the WFD classification for ecological or chemical properties of those watercourses are rated as good.	A standalone Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment using the Highways Agency [now Highways England] Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) has been undertaken to support the WFD assessment, as set out in Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). The proposed mitigation measures included within the surface water drainage strategy are deemed to be appropriate and would provide an appropriate level of treatment to the surface water runoff discharged into the watercourses. A WFD assessment has been prepared for Part B, as outlined in Appendix 10.2: Water Framework Directive Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES.
Public Health England	96	When considering a baseline (of existing water quality) and in the assessment and future monitoring of impacts these:	Potential baseline receptors have been identified and are included in Table 10-9 of Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041APP/6.3) of this ES

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should include assessment of potential impacts on human health and not focus solely on ecological impacts - Should identify and consider all routes by which emissions may lead to population exposure (e.g. surface watercourses; recreational waters; sewers; geological routes etc.) - Should assess the potential off-site effects of emissions to groundwater (e.g. on aquifers used for drinking water) and surface water (used for drinking water abstraction) in terms of the potential for population exposure - Should include consideration of potential impacts on recreational users (e.g. from fishing, canoeing etc) alongside assessment of potential exposure via drinking water 	<p>and further consideration of human health impacts are included in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
Geology and Soils			
The Coal Authority	51	<p>The proposed EIA development is located within the defined Development High Risk Area, therefore specific parts of the site have been subject to past coal mining activity and located within an area of surface coal resource.</p> <p>We concur with Section 12.3.7 of the Scoping Report, that the Main Compound areas are not within the Development High Risk Area, however there are certain sections of the Scheme that may have been subject to historic coal mining activity which are likely to require further assessments to be carried out. Section 12.3.16 – 18 of the Scoping Report identifies that it is not possible to rule out the presence of coal workings beneath the site and Section 12.3.2 identifies that ground investigation works are proposed and the additional information obtained will be used to inform the ES.</p>	<p>A Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA) has been completed as requested in the Coal Authority’s consultation response and is included within Appendix 11.6: Coal Mining Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Pertinent information from the CMRA has been included in paragraphs 11.7.26 and 11.7.35 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Impacts associated with ground instability are included in Sections 11.8, 11.9 and 11.10 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
Natural England	74	<p>The EIA will need to consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites. Local Sites are identified by the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or a local forum established for the purposes of identifying and selecting local sites. They are of county importance for wildlife or geodiversity. The Environmental Statement should therefore include an assessment of the likely impacts on the wildlife and geodiversity interests of such sites. The assessment should include proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures. Contact the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or local sites body in this area for further information (see also Biodiversity section of this table).</p>	<p>Impacts relating to statutory and non-statutory geological sites have been scoped out of the assessment as detailed in paragraph 11.4.3 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) .</p> <p>Risk from potential contamination sources to controlled waters including watercourses within 250 m of Part B have been assessed in accordance with CLR11: Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination as set out in Appendix 11.3: Ground Investigation Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and is summarised in paragraphs 11.7.154 to 11.7.157 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
Natural England	76	<p>Impacts from the development should be considered in light of the Government's policy for the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as set out in paragraph 112 of the NPPF. We also recommend that soils should be considered under a more general heading of sustainable use of land and the ecosystem services they provide as a natural resource in line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF. As identified in the NPPF new sites or extensions to new sites for peat extraction should not be granted permission by Local Planning Authorities or proposed in development plans.</p>	<p>An Agricultural Land Classification Survey has been completed as presented in Appendix 11.5: Soils and Agricultural Land Quality, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). Impacts associated with the loss of BMV land are included in Sections 11.8, 11.9 and 11.10 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) .</p> <p>With regard to peat, peat deposits have been excluded from assessments regarding natural resources as detailed in paragraphs 11.7.37, 11.7.116 and 11.7.142 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council	80	Information on the historic land uses which have a risk of contamination in proximity to the defined working area is in the process of being finalised and sent to the consultant. It would also be expected that included within a construction management plan (CMP), or similar, that suitable awareness and protection will be provided to not introduce new contaminants through the development process itself (i.e. avoiding chemical spills, correct fuel/oil storage etc.). Where old asphalt needs to be removed from any parts of the existing carriageways, there should be an awareness that there is a potential for this to contain tar-bound planings.	Details of historical uses located within 250 m of Part B are discussed in paragraphs 11.7.100, 11.7.128 and 11.7.155 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Mitigation measures that are included within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) to prevent contamination during construction are also set out in Section 11.9 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.
Public Health England	96	We would expect the promoter to provide details of any hazardous contamination present on site (including ground gas) as part of the site condition report. Emissions to and from the ground should be considered in terms of the previous history of the site and the potential of the site, once operational, to give rise to issues. Public health impacts associated with ground contamination and/or the migration of material off-site should be assessed and the potential impact on nearby receptors and control and mitigation measures should be outlined.	Risk from potential contamination sources to geology and soils receptors within 250 m of the Scheme have been assessed in accordance with CLR11: Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination as set out in Appendix 11.3: Ground Investigation Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and is summarised in paragraphs 11.7.154 to 11.7.164 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES.
Public Health England	96	<p>Relevant areas outlined in the Government's Good Practice Guide for EIA include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effects associated with ground contamination that may already exist - Effects associated with the potential for polluting substances that are used (during construction / operation) to cause new ground contamination issues on a site, for example introducing / changing the source of contamination - Impacts associated with re-use of soils and waste soils, for example, re-use of site-sourced materials on-site or offsite, disposal of site-sourced materials offsite, importation of materials to the site, etc. 	<p>Risk from potential contamination sources to geology and soils receptors within 250 m of Part B have been assessed in accordance with CLR11: Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination as set out in Appendix 11.3: Ground Investigation Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8) and is summarised in paragraphs 11.7.154 to 11.7.164 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) of this ES.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the potential for pollution to occur during construction and operation from substances used during construction including the re-use of site won and imported soils are included in Sections 11.8, 11.9 and 11.10 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.</p> <p>Mitigation measures that are included within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) to prevent contamination during construction are also set out in Section 11.9 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
Population and Human Health			
Health and Safety Executive	66	It is unlikely that Hazardous Substances Consent will be required for the improvement of a major road so there are unlikely to be any risks to the public from the scheme (see also Material Resources section of this table).	Noted.
Natural England	76	Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways are to be encouraged. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate.	Permanent diversions would be made to existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) where necessary and practicable. The route of new footpaths is noted in Table 12-40 and Table 12-41 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Further details are set out in the Rights of Way and Access plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.5) .

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Natural England	76	The EIA should consider potential impacts on rights of way in the vicinity of the development. We also recommend reference to the relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify PRoW within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.	The baseline data collection has included the use of NCC's Definitive PRoW Map as noted in paragraph 12.4.36 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Right of Way Improvement Plans have also been considered.
Northumberland County Council	84	The potential for PRoW disruption is noted in the report and this should be scoped with the Public Rights of Way team.	Impacts on PRoW within the Study Area are identified and assessed under the topics of walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCHs), journey amenity and community severance, all of which fall under the assessment of Community Effects within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Northumberland County Council	84	We would anticipate the EIA to consider the impacts during the construction phase when sections of the Local Road Network are closed for any significant lengths of time. There would be particular interest where the A1 itself is required to be completely closed and the impacts during this time on the subsequent diversion route especially given local Member and public concern when the A1 was intended to be closed for maintenance earlier in 2018.	The impacts to the local road network during construction is considered within the driver stress assessment of Section 12.10 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Details of and traffic management measures are listed within the CTMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4) .
Northumberland County Council	85	There are potential concerns with the use of the Lionheart depot for works compounds in relation to the impacts of construction traffic on Shilbottle Road and the A1068/Shilbottle Road junction, which is known to experience congestion and is at capacity when committed developments are completed.	The construction traffic impacts associated with the Lionheart depot have been noted in paragraph 12.8.48 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Public Health England	89	We believe the summation of relevant issues into a specific section of the report provides a focus which ensures that public health is given adequate consideration. The section should summarise key information, risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures, conclusions and residual impacts, relating to human health. Compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statements and relevant guidance and standards should also be highlighted.	Impacts on human health as a result of construction and operation of Part B were assessed using the methodology outlined in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and presented in the relevant sections of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES. This includes baseline information, assessment, mitigation, impacts and conclusions. The NPS NN Compliance Table (Application Document Reference: TR010041/AAP/7.2) details how the Scheme is compliant with the NPS NN.
Public Health England	90	Any assessments undertaken to inform the ES should be proportionate to the potential impacts of the proposal, therefore we accept that, in some circumstances particular assessments may not be relevant to an application, or that an assessment may be adequately completed using a qualitative rather than quantitative methodology. In cases where this decision is made the promoters should fully explain and justify their rationale in the submitted documentation.	The methodology and scope for the population and human health assessment is set out in Section 12.4 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Public Health England	90	Our position is that pollutants associated with road traffic, particularly particulate matter and oxides of nitrogen are non-threshold; i.e., an exposed population is likely to be subject to potential harm at any level and that reducing public exposures of non-threshold pollutants (such as particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide) below air quality standards will have potential public health benefits. We support approaches which	The assessment of air pollutants on human health is set out in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and summarised in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		<p>minimise or mitigate public exposure to non-threshold air pollutants, address inequalities (in exposure), maximise co-benefits (such as physical exercise). We encourage their consideration during development design, environmental and health impact assessment, and development consent.</p>	
Public Health England	90	<p>It is noted that the current proposals do not appear to consider possible health impacts of EMF. The documentation states that existing extra-high voltage power cables serving an existing windfarm will be diverted ahead of the scheme commencing. It is unclear if these works fall outside of the scope of the DCO application; we request that the ES clarifies this and if necessary, the proposer should confirm either that the proposed development does not impact any receptors from potential sources of EMF; or ensure that an adequate assessment of the possible impacts is undertaken and included in the ES.</p>	<p>The potential effects of Part B on EMF is covered within paragraphs 4.2.31 to 4.2.33 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES.</p>
Public Health England	90	<p>This section of our scoping response identifies the wider determinants of health and wellbeing we expect the ES to address, to demonstrate whether they are likely to give rise to significant effects. We have focussed our approach on scoping determinants of health and wellbeing under four themes, which have been derived from an analysis of the wider determinants of health mentioned in the National Policy Statements. The four themes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access - Traffic and Transport - Socioeconomic - Land Use <p>We have identified that each of the determinants that require further consideration in the ES; the table also includes the following: evidence demonstrating the link between the determinant of health and related health outcomes some examples of key national policy documents related to this determinant.</p> <p>The final ES should also identify opportunities for ways to enhance beneficial effects as well as avoid or, as a minimum, mitigate adverse effects.</p>	<p>The ES has considered the four themes as noted in paragraph 12.4.2 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041APP/6.3).</p> <p>Design, mitigation and enhancement measures relating to population and health are detailed in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES</p> <p>During operation, health impacts would be mitigated as per the measures set out in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of this ES.</p>
Public Health England	91	<p>A list of vulnerable populations has been provided but it does not reference links to the list of protected characteristics. The impacts on health and wellbeing and health inequalities of the scheme may have effects on vulnerable or disadvantaged populations, including those that fall within the list of protected characteristics. The ES and any Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) should be considered together.</p> <p>The assessments and findings of the ES and any EqIA should be crossed reference, particularly to ensure the comprehensive assessment of potential impacts for health and inequalities and where resulting mitigation measures are mutually supportive.</p>	<p>An EqIA has been undertaken by the Applicant and considers the impacts on vulnerable or disadvantaged populations as outlined. The impacts on health and wellbeing are considered within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p>
Public Health England	91	<p>The accessibility of public transport can be important to prevent social isolation, community severance and allows for effective travel for leisure, education and work. The ES should assess the impact on accessibility and effectiveness of the local public transport system. This should be</p>	<p>Bus stops and bus services operating within the Study Area have been identified. Impacts on accessibility of public transport is assessed as part of the assessment on community severance within Chapter 12: Population and</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		considered both for local communities and access to those beyond the 1km zone where appropriate.	Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Public Health England	91	<p>Active travel forms an important part in helping to promote healthy weight environments and as such it is important that any changes have a positive long term impact where possible. Changes to NMU routes have the potential to impact on usage, create displacement to other routes and potentially lead to increased road traffic collisions. A scheme of this scale and nature can also provide opportunities to enhance the existing infrastructure that supports active travel. The route and design of the scheme may be able to contribute to improved provision for active travel and physical activity.</p> <p>The overall risk to NMU and impact on active travel should be considered on a case-by-case basis, considering the number and type of users and the effect that the temporary traffic management system will have on their journey and safety. Any traffic counts and assessment should also, as far as reasonably practicable, identify informal routes used by NMU or potential routes used due to displacement. The final ES should identify the temporary traffic management system design principles or standards that will be maintained with specific reference to NMU. The scheme should identify opportunities to contribute to improved infrastructure provision for active travel and physical activity.</p>	<p>Details of and traffic management measures are listed within the CTMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4).</p> <p>The effects of Part B on walkers, cyclists and horse-riders (WCH) are provided within Section 12.10 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p>
Public Health England	92	<p>The scoping report list the potential effects on human health (para 13.7.23) but makes no reference to mental health within the impact assessment. Mental wellbeing is fundamental to achieving a healthy, resilient and thriving population. It underpins healthy lifestyles, physical health, educational attainment, employment and productivity, relationships, community safety and cohesion and quality of life.</p> <p>The scheme has identified both temporary and long term impacts, including the demolition of two domestic properties, with the effects on farmers yet to be identified. A scheme of this scale and nature has impacts on the over-arching protective factors, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhancing control - Increasing resilience and community assets - Facilitating participation and promoting inclusion. <p>We believe mental health should be scoped into any assessment with parity between mental and physical health, and any assessment of health impact should include the appreciation of both. A systematic approach to the assessment of the impacts on mental health, including suicide, is required. A recognised methodology supported by PHE is the Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment (MWIA). The assessment should identify vulnerable populations and provide clear mitigation strategies that are adequately linked to any local services or assets.</p>	<p>Assessment of mental health has been included, where appropriate, within the health assessment. However, the scope of this is limited to mental health issues caused by changes to air quality, noise and vibration and road drainage and the water environment.</p>
Public Health England	94	<p>The EIA should give consideration to best practice guidance such as the Government's Good Practice Guide for EIA¹. It is important that the EIA identifies and assesses the potential public health impacts of the activities at, and emissions from, the installation. Assessment should consider the</p>	<p>The assessment of public health impacts are considered throughout the EIA. Assessments including direct assessment of impacts on human health are set out in Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), for example:</p>

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		development, operational, and decommissioning phases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 5: Air Quality - Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration - Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual - Chapter 10: Road Drainage and Water Environment - Chapter 11: Geology and Soils - Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
Public Health England	94	It is not PHE's role to undertake these assessments on behalf of promoters as this would conflict with PHE's role as an impartial and independent body.	Noted. No action required.
Public Health England	94	The list of issues raised by PHE is not exhaustive and the onus is on the promoter to ensure that the relevant public health issues are identified and addressed. PHE's advice and recommendations carry no statutory weight and constitute non-binding guidance.	The health assessment, including the assessment methodology, is detailed within Section 12.4 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). It is noted that PHE's advice and recommendations carry no statutory weight and constitute non-binding.
Public Health England	97	There is evidence that, in some cases, perception of risk may have a greater impact on health than the hazard itself. A 2009 report, jointly published by Liverpool John Moores University and the HPA, examined health risk perception and environmental problems using a number of case studies. As a point to consider, the report suggested: "Estimation of community anxiety and stress should be included as part of every risk or impact assessment of proposed plans that involve a potential environmental hazard. This is true even when the physical health risks may be negligible." PHE supports the inclusion of this information within EIAs as good practice.	Noted.
Public Health England	97 - 102	<p>PHE advice on the health effects of power frequency EMF is available in the following link: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/electromagnetic-fields#low-frequency-electric-and-magnetic-fields</p> <p>There is a potential health impact associated with the EMF around substations, and power lines and cables. The field strength tends to reduce with distance from such equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further information is included within Appendix: PHE Recommendations Regarding the Scoping Document to provide a framework for considering the health impact associated with the EMF produced by the proposed development. This includes direct and indirect effects of the EMF as indicated above. 	The potential effects of Part B on EMF is covered within paragraphs 4.2.31 to 4.2.33 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES.
Public Health England	103	<p>The points below are cross-cutting and should be considered when undertaking a human health risk assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The promoter should consider including Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) numbers alongside chemical names, where referenced in the ES - Where available, the most recent United Kingdom standards for the appropriate media (e.g. air, water, and/or soil) and health-based guideline values should be used when quantifying the risk to human health from chemical pollutants. Where UK standards or 	Noted. The most up to date assessment methods have been employed within the EIA. The emissions for the operational Part B related to traffic and their assessment is set out in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		<p>guideline values are not available, those recommended by the European Union or World Health Organisation can be used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When assessing the human health risk of a chemical emitted from a facility or operation, the background exposure to the chemical from other sources should be taken into account <p>When quantitatively assessing the health risk of genotoxic and carcinogenic chemical pollutants PHE does not favour the use of mathematical models to extrapolate from high dose levels used in animal carcinogenicity studies to well below the observed region of a dose-response relationship. When only animal data are available, we recommend that the 'Margin of Exposure' (MOE) approach is used</p>	
Material Resources			
Environment Agency	58	<p>Surveys should be undertaken to identify the risks present within the Scheme area and detailed method statement will be required to ensure the appropriate control and where possible eradication of any Invasive non-native species (see also 'Biodiversity' section of this table).</p>	<p>For Materials Resources this would be addressed in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3), Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and MMP.</p> <p>Surveys have been undertaken to inform the baseline assessment within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) and Appendix 9.1 Habitats and Designated Sites, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). No invasive species have been identified.</p>
Environment Agency	59	<p>With respect to Table 45: landfill sites in the North East of England of the EIA Scoping Report, it should be noted that two of the sites listed within the table are no longer available as disposal outlets. The Path Head landfill and CLE3/8 sites are non-operational.</p>	<p>The landfill capacity data was based on 2016 figures for the Scoping Report (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.11) for Part B. This has been updated to 2018 for the ES and no longer includes the Path Head Landfill, however the CLE3/8 landfill was included in the 2018 data.</p> <p>Reference has been made within Section 13.7, paragraph 13.7.16, Table 13-11 and Table 13-12 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) to the fact that CLE3/8 landfill is no longer operational. However, this does not affect the overall assessment.</p>
Environment Agency	59	<p>Section 14.3.19 of the EIA Scoping Report states that a proportion of any waste generated will be suitable for recovery at a licenced facility. The public register of licenced facilities is available on GOV.UK and can be used to check the permitted status of a waste facilities. Or a request for information should be sent to northeast-newcastle@environment-agency.gov.uk.</p>	<p>Forecasts for waste recovery (diverted from landfill) gathered from the design stage estimates for Part B, are given in Section 13.8 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). These include licensed waste recovery facilities (where applicable) and their proximity to Part B. The information has been gathered from data provided by the Buildability Advisor and consolidated to show the key waste types.</p>
Environment Agency	59	<p>The Scoping Report fails to make reference to tar bound road plannings that may be generated during the proposed works. Tar bound road plannings must be assessed as part of the DCO submission. In particular, we would welcome consideration to whether there are any tar bound road plannings within the proposed development site. If so, how will it be disposed of? Will it be treated on site? How will it be treated?</p>	<p>The presence of coal tar has not been confirmed or otherwise at the time of writing. Therefore, it has been included as a potential demolition arising in Section 13.8, Table 13-14, Table 13-16 and Table 13-17 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), as a worst-case scenario.</p>
Health and Safety Executive	66	<p>It is unlikely that Hazardous Substances Consent will be required for the improvement of a major road so there are unlikely to be any risks to the public from the scheme (see also Population and Health section of this table).</p>	Noted.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Northumberland County Council	82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please note that “track out” of soils from sites may be an issue if not dealt with appropriately, it is recommended that an areas of hardstanding are formed at an early stage of the development where site workers vehicles and delivery vehicles can enter without tracking materials out onto the access road. 	Proposed mitigation measures that would be included within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) to prevent contamination during construction are listed in Section 11.9 of Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
Public Health England	97	<p>The EIA should demonstrate compliance with the waste hierarchy (e.g. with respect to re-use, recycling or recovery and disposal). For wastes arising from the installation the EIA should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The implications and wider environmental and public health impacts of different waste disposal options - Disposal route(s) and transport method(s) and how potential impacts on public health will be mitigated 	In accordance with DMRB guidance, the impacts of the waste forecast to be generated have been assessed in the context of the impacts on the waste management infrastructure (the receptor with regards to waste) and the legislation, policy and strategy targets influencing waste management. Effects associated with the transportation of materials (carbon emissions, air quality, noise etc) are not covered in the guidance documents. Therefore, an assessment of the impacts and effects of waste disposal and transport on public health is not considered in Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). The impacts and effects of transport emissions on public health has been assessed in Section 12.10 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of this ES.
Assessment of Cumulative Effects			
Natural England	77	<p>The ES should include an impact assessment to identify, describe and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out. The following types of projects should be included in such an assessment, (subject to available information):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing completed projects; - Approved but uncompleted projects; - Ongoing activities; - Plans or projects for which an application has been made and which are under consideration by the consenting authorities; and <p>Plans and projects which are reasonably foreseeable, i.e. projects for which an application has not yet been submitted, but which are likely to progress before completion of the development and for which sufficient information is available to assess the likelihood of cumulative and in-combination effects.</p>	Existing completed projects form the baseline situation and therefore have been considered within all the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3). Section 16.4 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) details the type of developments that have been considered within the cumulative assessment.
Northumberland County Council	85	In respect to the cumulative impacts assessed, there are no applications listed in the Scoping Report and this shall be reviewed as there is notable development in Alnwick. These developments will add traffic to the network and the EIA should consider whether these are significant enough to warrant inclusion in the cumulative effect’s assessment.	As described in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4), NCC were consulted regarding the proposed methodology to the cumulative assessment and long list of ‘other developments. The cumulative assessment methodology was updated based on NCC’s recommendations to include refused applications within the timescale for appeal.
Major Accidents and Disasters			
Health and Safety Executive	66	The scheme boundary does not cross any consultation zones associate with Major Hazard sites or pipelines.	Noted.

Consultee	Page	Consultee Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
Health and Safety Executive	66	HSE's role on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) is summarised in the Advice Note 11 An Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website – Annex G – The Halts and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessment on Page 3.	Noted.
Public Health England	97	The EIA should include consideration of the COMAH Regulations (Control of Major Accident Hazards) and the Major Accident Off-Site Emergency Plan (Management of Waste from Extractive Industries) (England and Wales) Regulations 2009: both in terms of their applicability to the installation itself, and the installation's potential to impact on, or be impacted by, any nearby installations themselves subject to these Regulations.	<p>Appendix 4.3: Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment of this ES provides a description and assessment of the likely significant effects resulting from accidents and disasters applicable to Part B.</p> <p>Section 2.7 sets out the relevant guidance that has been used and referred to and this includes reference to both the COMAH Regulations (Control of Major Accident Hazards) and the Major Accident Off-Site Emergency Plan (Management of Waste from Extractive Industries) (England and Wales) Regulations 2009.</p> <p>Section 5 sets out the baseline conditions which considers features external to Part B that contribute a potential source of hazard to Part B (e.g. COMAH sites) and environmental receptors at risk of significant effect.</p>

Table 1-6 – Part B Comments within the Scoping Opinion on the ES Approach

Scoping Opinion Section	Paragraph	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
1.1 Background	1.1.13	The Inspectorate notes the potential need to carry out an assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations). This document must be co-ordinated with the EIA, to avoid duplication of information between assessments.	An HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.14) screening has been prepared as part of the wider draft DCO. This is referenced within the ES within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
1.2 The Planning Inspectorate's Consultation	1.2.3	The ES submitted by the Applicant should demonstrate consideration of the points raised by the consultation bodies. It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in the ES.	The points raised by the consultation bodies within the Scoping Opinion have been considered within the ES as detailed in Table 1-5 above.
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.1	The ES must include a description of all physical characteristics of the Proposed Development. Where uncertainty exists and flexibility is sought this should explain not only the maximum parameters but also the anticipated limits of deviation, the dimensions, locations and alignments of the various project elements, including points of access and key structures. This information is important to ensure that any potential significant effects associated with the construction and operation stages have been appropriately assessed. The ES should provide figures to support the project description and depict the necessary detail.	<p>Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides a detailed description of the physical characteristics of the Scheme.</p> <p>Section 2.12 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES sets out the Assessment Parameters of the Scheme. The Assessment Parameters for Part B have been assessed within all of the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Figure 2.6: Temporary Construction Works: Part B of this ES presents the temporary construction compounds and topsoil storage locations. Figure 4.2: Boundary Plan: Part B, Volume 6 of this ES shows the permanent and temporary boundaries of Part B (refer to Land Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.2) for definitive permanent and temporary boundaries).</p> <p>The General Arrangement Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.4) shows the Scheme's general arrangement.</p>

Scoping Opinion Section	Paragraph	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.2	The ES should contain a general construction programme so that it is clear how and when the specific works will take place, and how resulting effects on road networks are to be managed. It should provide a description of the land use requirements during both the construction and operational phases. It is also important that the ES clearly identifies and distinguishes areas of land which are required either permanently or on a temporary basis.	Table 2-7 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides the construction programme for Part B. The 'Traffic Management and Temporary Diversions' section within Section 2.8 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides a description of how the road networks would be managed during construction. The 'Temporary and Permanent Land Take' and 'Temporary Land Requirements' sections within Section 2.8 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES details how land would be used during construction and operation. Figure 4.2: Boundary Plan: Part B of this ES shows the permanent and temporary boundaries of Part B.
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.3	The scoping report presents options with regards to number and locations of compounds. The report states that should the two suggested compounds be deemed unsuitable and / or if the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound is not available at the time of construction; a field to the south-east of Charlton Mires could be used as a temporary construction site compound. It is not clear whether the utilisation of the field south-east of Charlton Mires would be as a replacement of the two suggested locations, should one become unavailable or whether it would be used along with one of the suggested compound locations.	As detailed in Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES all three compounds would be used for the construction of the Scheme.
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.4	The Applicant should ensure that the ES provides specific detailed information on diversion of cables and utilities, including plans to identify the diversions, and should ensure that any assessment is consistent with works specified within the DCO.	Section 2.5 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides details on the diversion of cables and utilities. The General Arrangement Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.4) show the location of the diversion of the Extra High Voltage cable.
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.5	The ES should provide full details of the necessary demolition works and it should be clear at what point in the construction programme any demolition activities would occur. Where relevant, the Applicant should ensure that the ES aspect chapters assess the likely significant effects arising from demolition activities.	The 'Demolition' section within Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides detail of the required demolition works and confirms at what point in the construction programme the demolition works would take place. The potential effects associated with the demolition's works have been considered where appropriate within the ES. For example, the demolition works have been considered within Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3): <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration;- Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual;- Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.6	The ES should provide a sufficiently clear and specific textual description of the proposed drainage arrangements, indicating the location of any proposed pipework or balancing ponds by reference to plans.	A description of the proposed drainage design is provided in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES. Further details are provided in Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 8 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.8). The General Arrangement Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.4) are referenced in the drainage section of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES because they show the location of the detention basins.

Scoping Opinion Section	Paragraph	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.7	Should the Applicant decide that lighting is required the ES should assess any impacts associated with lighting, such as light spill, as part of the relevant aspect assessments with evidence as to how this has been taken into account.	No operational lighting is included as part of Part B.
2.3 - Description of the Proposed Development	2.3.8	The ES should contain a full explanation of closures and diversions of roads, footpaths and PRoW, including whether they are temporary or permanent, and associated impacts should be fully assessed. This information should also be depicted on figures in the ES to provide further clarity. The Scoping Report also states that the two existing traffic monitoring units may be replaced in order to meet current standards. Information on any such replacement will also be required in the ES, and figures should again be provided to show the location of any technology to be installed by way of upgrading.	<p>Section 2.5 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES, details the permanent PRoW and footway closures and diversions. The permanent PRoW diversion routes are illustrated on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.5). Section 2.8 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES details the temporary PRoW diversions.</p> <p>The 'Traffic Management and Temporary Diversions' section of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES details the temporary road diversions. Further detail regarding the temporary road diversions is available within the CTMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4). Section 2.5 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES provides detail relating to the traffic monitoring units.</p>
2.3 - Alternatives	2.3.9 & 2.3.10	The EIA Regulations require that the Applicant provide 'A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects'. The Inspectorate acknowledges the Applicant's intention to consider alternatives within the ES. The Inspectorate would expect to see a discrete section in the ES that provides details of the reasonable alternatives studied and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects.	Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives of this ES provides a description of the alternative considered for the Scheme.
2.3 - Flexibility	2.3.11 & 2.3.12	The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine 'Using the 'Rochdale Envelope' which provides details on the recommended approach to follow when incorporating flexibility into a draft DCO (dDCO). The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively different developments. The development parameters will need to be clearly defined in the dDCO and in the accompanying ES. It is a matter for the Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from a large number of undecided parameters. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations.	Section 2.12 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of this ES sets out the Assessment Parameters of Part B. These have been assessed within all the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
2.3 - Flexibility	2.3.13	It should be noted that if the Proposed Development materially changes prior to submission of the DCO application, the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion.	Noted.

Scoping Opinion Section	Paragraph	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
3.1 ES Approach	3.1.2	The ES should be based on the Scoping Opinion in so far as the Proposed Development remains materially the same as the Proposed Development described in the Applicant's Scoping Report.	Noted.
3.1 ES Approach	3.1.3	The Inspectorate is content that the receipt of a Scoping Opinion should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultees to scope such aspects/matters out of the ES, where further evidence has been provided to justify this approach. However, in order to demonstrate that the aspects/matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES should explain the reasoning for scoping them out and justify the approach taken.	Noted.
3.1 ES Approach	3.1.4	Where relevant, the ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent/minimise adverse effects is secured through DCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultees agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.	The delivery or proposed measures would be secured primarily through the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) . The Outline CEMP provides details of the measures required during design, pre-construction / construction and operation of the Scheme. Measures would also be secured through the CTMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4) and the General Arrangement Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.4) .
3.2 Relevant National Policy Statements	3.2.1 & 3.2.2	Sector-specific NPSs are produced by the relevant Government Departments and set out national policy for NSIPs. They provide the framework within which the Examining Authority (ExA) will make their recommendation of NSIPs. The NPSs may include environmental requirements for NSIPs, which applicants should address within their ES. The designated NPS(s) relevant to the Proposed Development is the NPS for National Networks (NPS NN).	The NPS NN Compliance Table (Application Document Reference: TR010041/AAP/7.2) details how the Scheme is compliant with the NPS NN. Environmental topic specific assessment is set out in Section 3: Legislative and Policy Framework , within each of Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
3.3 Scope of Assessment	3.3.1	<p>The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion; - To identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each of the aspect chapters, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects; - To set out the proposed mitigation and/ or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures (e.g. a dDCO requirement); - To describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; and - To identify where details are contained in the HRA report (where relevant), such as descriptions of European sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, are to be found in the ES. 	<p>This appendix sets out the Scoping Opinion comments and how they have been addressed within the ES and associated draft DCO documentation.</p> <p>Table 17-3 within Chapter 17: Summary, Volume 4 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.4) sets out the residual effects in relation to each environmental topic and the cumulative assessment.</p> <p>Table 3-1 of the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) sets out the proposed design, construction and operational and monitoring measures. Measures would be secured via the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3) as set out in Table 3-1 and the CTMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4)</p> <p>Tables 3-1 to 3-7 of the HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.14) sets out European sites, their location and any mitigation requirements.</p>
3.3 Scope of Assessment	3.3.2	The Inspectorate considers that where a DCO application includes works described as 'Associated Development', that could themselves be defined	Noted.

Scoping Opinion Section	Paragraph	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		as an improvement of a highway, the Applicant should ensure that the ES accompanying that application distinguishes between; effects that primarily derive from the integral works which form the proposed (or part of the proposed) NSIP and those that primarily derive from the works described as Associated Development. This could be presented in a suitably compiled summary table. This will have the benefit of giving greater confidence to the Inspectorate that what is proposed is not in fact an additional NSIP defined in accordance with s22 of the PA2008.	
3.3 Scope of Assessment	3.3.3	Some of the text in the Scoping Report, such as in the various tables and boxes, and on the figures in Appendix A, is small scale and difficult to read both on the paper and electronic copies. The Applicant is reminded that the ES should be clear and accessible to readers.	The ES is in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Six: Preparation and submission of applications documents (Ref. 4.1).
3.3 - Baseline Scenario	3.3.4	The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the development as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.	A description of the future baseline is provided within the 'Assessment Methodology' or 'Baseline' section of each of the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
3.3 - Forecasting Methods of Evidence	3.3.5	The ES should contain the timescales upon which the surveys which underpin the technical assessments have been based. For clarity, this information should be provided either in the introductory chapters of the ES (with confirmation that these timescales apply to all chapters), or in each aspect chapter.	The timescales of the surveys are included within each of the relevant Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
3.3 - Forecasting Methods of Evidence	3.3.6	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the assessment, which clearly distinguishes effects that are 'significant' from 'non-significant' effects. Any departure from that methodology should be described in individual aspect assessment chapters.	Section 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES describes the approach taken to the environmental assessments. Section 4.5 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES also details the approach taken to determining significance including which effects are considered significant and which are considered insignificant. Any departure from the assessment methodology detailed within Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of this ES is described within the 'Assessment Methodology' section of the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).
3.3 - Forecasting Methods of Evidence	3.3.7	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	The 'assumptions and limitations' section of the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) details limitations associated with baseline information and the assessment.
3.3 - Residues and Emissions	3.3.8	The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant. This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.	Section 5.8 of Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) details changes in emissions of dust during construction and changes to NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ levels during operation. Section 6.8 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of this ES details the changes in noise and vibration levels during construction and operation.

Scoping Opinion Section	Paragraph	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
			<p>Table 13-15 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES details the material assets that would need to be imported to site during construction. Table 13-16 of Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES sets out the forecast site arisings that can be recovered and diverted from landfill. Table 13-17 provides indicative site arisings that have been identified for disposal to landfill.</p>
3.3 - Residues and Emissions	3.3.9	The ES should describe the anticipated volumes and types of waste to be generated from the demolition of the two residential properties as well as those associated with demolition of roadway (e.g. road planings (potentially coal tar and non-coal tar bearing)).	<p>Table 13-16 within Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) provides the site arisings that could be recovered and diverted from landfill. Site arisings associated with the demolition of the two properties and roadway are included within this table.</p>
3.3 - Mitigation	3.3.10	Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES. The likely efficacy of the mitigation proposed should be explained with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation proposed is secured, with reference to specific DCO requirements or other legally binding agreements.	<p>The required mitigation measures are set out in the ‘Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures’ section of the Technical Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Measures would be secured via the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.3), and CTMP (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/7.4) and the General Arrangement Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/2.4).</p>
3.3 - Risks of Major Accidents and / or Disasters	3.3.11	The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects resulting from accidents and disasters applicable to the Proposed Development. The Applicant should make use of appropriate guidance (e.g. that referenced in the Health and Safety Executives (HSE) Annex to Advice Note 11) to better understand the likelihood of an occurrence and the Proposed Development’s susceptibility to potential major accidents and hazards. The description and assessment should consider the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to a potential accident or disaster and also the Proposed Development’s potential to cause an accident or disaster. The assessment should specifically assess significant effects resulting from the risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment. Any measures that will be employed to prevent and control significant effects should be presented in the ES.	<p>Appendix 4.3: Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment of this ES provides a description and assessment of the likely significant effects resulting from accidents and disasters applicable to Part B.</p> <p>Section 2.7 of Part B sets out the relevant guidance that has been used and referred to. Section 4.5 sets out the assessment of potential major events which considers the vulnerability of the Scheme to a potential accident or disaster and also the Part B’s potential to cause an accident or disaster.</p> <p>Appendix C: Risk Record Screened in Major Events of Appendix 4.3: Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment, Volume 1 of this ES sets out the mitigation measures that would be employed to prevent and control significant effects.</p>
3.3 - Risks of Major Accidents and / or Disasters	3.3.12	Relevant information available and obtained through risk assessments pursuant to European Union legislation such as Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council or Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom or relevant assessments carried out pursuant to national legislation may be used for this purpose provided that the requirements of this Directive are met. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.	<p>Section 2.6 of Appendix 4.3: Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment of this ES sets out the data sources that were used in the preparation of the assessment report.</p>
3.3 - Climate and Climate Change	3.3.13	The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects the Proposed Development has on climate (for example having regard to the nature and magnitude of greenhouse gas	<p>Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3) assesses the potential effects of Part B on the Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) emitted during construction and</p>

Scoping Opinion Section	Paragraph	Planning Inspectorate Comment	How This Has Been Addressed in the ES
		emissions) and the vulnerability of the project to climate change. Where relevant, the ES should describe and assess the adaptive capacity that has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development. This may include, for example, alternative measures such as changes in the use of materials or construction and design techniques that will be more resilient to risks from climate change.	operation and the vulnerability of Part B to the potential impacts of climate change. Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES also identifies where Part B design contains embedded mitigation, such as design optimisation to reflect the carbon reduction hierarchy. In addition, mitigation measures integrated into the design to improve the resilience of Part B to changes in climate are detailed in Table 14-16 within Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of this ES.
3.3 - Transboundary Effects	3.3.15	The Scoping Report concludes that the Proposed Development is not likely to have significant effects on another European Economic Area (EEA) State and proposes that transboundary effects do not need to be considered within the ES. The Inspectorate notes the Applicant's conclusion in the Scoping Report; however, recommends that, for the avoidance of doubt, the ES details and justifies this conclusion.	Appendix 4.4: Regulation 32 Transboundary Screening of this ES presents the transboundary screening for the Scheme.
3.3 - Reference List	3.3.16	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	A reference list is provided at the end of each chapter of this ES, where required.
3.4 Confidential Information	3.4.1	In some circumstances, it will be appropriate for information to be kept confidential. In particular, this may relate to information about the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species such as badgers, rare birds and plants where disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation may result from publication of the information. Where documents are intended to remain confidential the Applicant should provide these as separate paper and electronic documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title and watermarked as such on each page. The information should not be incorporated within other documents that are intended for publication or which the Inspectorate would be required to disclose under the Environmental Information Regulations 2014.	Where required, those species, habitats, results deemed to be of a sensitive nature have been included within in generic and non-descript terms within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of this ES (Application Document Reference: TR010041/APP/6.3), with specific detailed information included within confidential appendices.

REFERENCES

Ref.4.1 – The Planning Inspectorate (2016) Advice note six: Preparation and submission of application document.

© Crown copyright 2020.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

write to the **Information Policy Team, The National Archives,**

Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email

psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/highways

If you have any enquiries about this document A1inNorthumberland@highwaysengland.co.uk or call **0300 470 4580***.

*Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls.

These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ

Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363