



**Application by Highways England for the A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham  
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)  
Issued on 19 November 2020.**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as **Annex C** to the Rule 6 letter of 19 November 2020. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with an alphabetical code and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on general matters is identified as GEN.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [A1inNorthumberland@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:A1inNorthumberland@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'A1 in Northumberland' in the subject line of your email.

**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021.**



**Abbreviations used:**

<b>ARN</b>	Affected Road Network	<b>NCC</b>	Northumberland County Council
<b>Art</b>	Article	<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>AHLV</b>	Area of High Landscape Value	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>NNNPS</b>	National Networks National Policy Statement
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>CEMP</b>	Construction Environmental Management Plan	<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008
<b>DCLG</b>	Department of Communities and Local Government	<b>PRoW</b>	Public Right of Way
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft DCO	<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>DMRB</b>	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges	<b>REAC</b>	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	<b>RIS</b>	Road Investment Strategy
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>SoR</b>	Statement of Reasons
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SPA</b>	Special Protection Area
<b>GCN</b>	Great Crested Newt	<b>TP</b>	Temporary Possession
<b>HRA</b>	Habitats Regulations Assessment	<b>WCH</b>	Walkers, cyclists and horse riders
<b>HEMP</b>	Handover Environmental Management Plan	<b>WSI</b>	Written Scheme of Investigation
<b>IP(s)</b>	Interested Party (Parties)		
<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report		
<b>LWS</b>	Local Wildlife Site		
<b>LEMP</b>	Landscape Environmental Management Plan		



### **The Examination Library**

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010059/TR010059-000838-A1%20Northumberland%20Examination%20Library%20Morpeth%20to%20Ellingham.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

### **Citation of Questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg GEN.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



## Index

<b>GENERAL QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>AIR QUALITY AND EMISSIONS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>BIODIVERSITY AND HABITATS REGULATION ASSESSMENTS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>CARBON EMISSIONS.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>COMPULSORY ACQUISITION/TEMPORARY POSSESSION.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>MATERIAL RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>NOISE AND VIBRATION.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT.....</b>	<b>62</b>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>GENERAL QUESTIONS</b>		
GEN.1.1	Applicant	<p>Responding to paragraph 4.3.1 in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NNNPS) Accordance Table [APP-345], the Applicant asserts that the Scheme has been designed in accordance with the Applicant's 'Roads to Good Design' report which sets out ten principles of good road design.</p> <p>Demonstrate how the Proposed Development has incorporated the 10 principles of good road design.</p> <p>Has the design development taken account of the National Design Guide? If so, demonstrate how; if not, why not?</p> <p>Has the design development taken account of the National Infrastructure Commission Design Principles? If so, demonstrate how; if not, why not?</p> <p>How can the Applicant ensure that the Proposed Development is beautiful?</p>
GEN.1.2	Applicant	<p>'The Road to Good Design' describes the role of Highway England's Strategic Design Panel as overseeing the independent design review of individual Highways England projects.</p> <p>To what extent has the Strategic Design Panel been involved in the design of the Proposed Development and in particular new interchanges / junctions? Is the Panel likely to be involved in reviewing detailed design proposals?</p>
GEN.1.3	Applicant	<p>Under the general heading of Relevant Planning Policy, Chapter 1 of the ES [APP-036] identifies Highways England Guidance and Standards at paragraphs.1.3.21 to 1.3.26.</p> <p>Being the Applicant's own guidance and standards, what weight would the Applicant suggest these documents are given?</p>
GEN.1.4	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.1.10 of the ES [APP-037] refers to the Road Investment Strategy (RIS).</p> <p>Why is there no reference to RIS2 in Chapter 2 of the ES?</p>
GEN.1.5	Applicant	<p>Scheme objectives are set out in paragraph 2.2.1 of the ES [APP-037].</p> <p>How were these objectives determined? Why is there no explicit reference to design quality?</p>
GEN.1.6	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.5.9 of the ES [APP-037] refers to the existing A1 (including the existing bridge over the River Coquet) which would form the new northbound carriageway while a new southbound carriageway (including construction of a new bridge over the River</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Coquet) would be constructed on the eastern side. A new bridge over the River Coquet would be constructed parallel and to the eastern side of the existing bridge as set out in paragraph 2.5.94. The existing bridge would carry A1 northbound traffic and the new bridge would carry A1 southbound traffic.</p> <p>Does this conflict with the dDCO where Work No. 3A involves alteration of the existing carriageway and Work No.3B, to the east of Work No. 3A provides for the creation of a new carriageway?</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to provide plans for both Part A and Part B which show the existing carriageway and the proposed carriageway, ideally distinguished in different colours.</p>
GEN.1.7	Applicant	<p>The de-trunked A1 would be extended northwards between Felmoor Park and the proposed West Moor Junction / Felton Road, by the construction of a proposed link road parallel to the east of Part A according to paragraph 2.5.47 of the ES [APP-037].</p> <p>What is the purpose of the proposed link road?</p>
GEN.1.8	Applicant	<p>A new segregated footway / cycleway would be provided along the length of the eastern side of the proposed link road, between the de-trunked A1 and Felton Road as set out in paragraph 2.5.47 of the ES [APP-037].</p> <p>Is this proposal secured through Work No. 16I? If not, how is it secured? Demonstrate how this footway / cycleway links into other walking / cycling networks.</p>
GEN.1.9	Applicant	<p>In order to construct the new bridge over the River Coquet a temporary haul road would be installed to construct the north pier as described in paragraph 2.5.98 of the ES [APP-037].</p> <p>Has the location of this haul road been determined and is it shown on a plan? Why does it need to be a permanent structure if it is not anticipated to be used for access in the future?</p>
GEN.1.10	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.5.168 of the ES [APP-037] states that some utilities' assets will be diverted, and this may be underground.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain the approach which would be taken when diverting assets underground and have the potential effects from these works been assessed in the ES?</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
GEN.1.11	Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 2.5.174-2.5.180 of the ES [APP-037] describe how the construction of Part A will require the diversion of a National Grid gas transmission pipeline and diversion of a Northern Gas Networks pipeline and a Northern Powergrid overhead electricity line.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide further details regarding how these utilities are anticipated to be moved and clarify where the effects of these diversions have been assessed in the ES?</p>
GEN.1.12	Applicant	<p>According to paragraph 2.5.181 of the ES [APP-037] the lighting assessment [APP is confidential?</p> <p>Please explain the reason for confidentiality.</p>
GEN.1.13	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.5.197 and 2.5.198 of the ES [APP-037] refer to the construction of Part A potentially generating surplus material with landscape and biodiversity mitigation bunds proposed in order to use the excess material and avoid potential effects associated with its transport and disposal off-site. An opportunity for the likely surplus material generated to be used for Part B is also identified.</p> <p>Is the purpose of the proposed landscape and biodiversity bunds to use the excess material or for landscape and biodiversity mitigation?</p>
GEN.1.14	Applicant	<p>Two residential dwellings would need to be demolished to accommodate the proposed Charlton Mires Junction. These properties include East Cottage and Charlton Mires Farm according to paragraph 2.5.181 of the ES [APP-037]. Relevant Representations have been submitted by the owners of these properties [RR-020] [ RR-029].</p> <p>Was an alternative alignment of the A1 considered in order to avoid demolition? If not, why not? If so, why was it rejected?</p> <p>The Applicant is also asked to respond to the comments in the Relevant Representations which relate to these properties.</p>
GEN.1.15	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.8.36 of the ES [APP-037] states that there would be no borrow pits within the boundaries of the Scheme and all imported materials would be sourced from an operational quarry, as locally as possible, where available.</p> <p>Why was it decided not to use borrow pits?</p>
GEN.1.16	Applicant	<p>Tables 3.3 and 3.4 of the ES [APP-038] set out the environmental considerations in the evolution of the scheme design for Part A and Part B. Paragraph 3.4.3 of the ES [APP-038]</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>describes how the development of the design for Part A has been informed by a number of factors and paragraph 3.4.6 adopts a similar approach for Part B.</p> <p>How was design quality addressed for each of the infrastructure elements identified though this exercise?</p>
GEN.1.17	Applicant	<p>Table 3.4 of the ES [APP-038] describes the proposed accommodation overbridge as providing 'safe passage' for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse-riders (WCHs) as well as agricultural movements across the A1.</p> <p>Is such an outcome acceptable or should the objective for WCHs be more ambitious?</p>
GEM.1.18	Applicant	<p>Chapter 16 of the ES [APP-062] (Assessment of Cumulative Effects) assesses both combined and cumulative effects. Table 16.3 shows the criteria for identifying 'other developments' for inclusion in the assessment for cumulative effects. Other developments were identified from the Northumberland County Council website. The short list of sites is presented in Appendix 16.1 [APP-327].</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm if any other proposed sites have been identified since the cut-off point? Has the short list of sites been agreed with Northumberland County Council?</p>
GEN.1.19	Applicant	<p>Tables 17.2 and 17.3 of the ES [APP-063] indicate the monitoring requirements for Part A and Part B respectively. In spite of significant adverse effects having been identified for several residential receptors due to noise and vibration, no noise monitoring measures are proposed in respect of these receptors.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm the location of these properties and explain why no noise monitoring measures are proposed?</p> <p>Details of how the monitoring measures would be secured is not provided for every case where monitoring is proposed.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide clarification where such detail is absent?</p>
GEN.1.20	Applicant	<p>ES Appendix 4.3 [APP-195] (Major Accidents and Disasters Assessment) describes the 'risk' of events occurring, although it does not explain how in this context risk relates to significance.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that the findings of the major accidents and disasters assessment [APP-195] in relation to risk, demonstrate no likely significant effects?</p>



**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
GEN.1.21	Applicant	<p>The application includes an outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which includes a Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC). The application also provides for the preparation of a Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP).</p> <p>Has the Applicant considered the need for a Code of Construction Practice and a Landscape Environmental Management Plan or have the matters which would be covered by such documents been incorporated into the CEMP, REAC and HEMP?</p>
GEN.1.22	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 5.2.5 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] states that an Appraisal Summary Table has been produced for the Scheme which is a summary for decision makers containing key economic, environmental and other information drawn from existing documents such as cost benefit analysis with a summary of the monetised economic, environmental and social benefits of the Scheme provided in Table 29.</p> <p>Where is the evidence for the summary figures contained in Table 29?</p>
GEN.1.23	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 5.3.12 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] states that the Scheme delivers a biodiversity net gain for certain habitats.</p> <p>Should biodiversity net gain take account of all habitats?</p>
GEN.1.24	Applicant	<p>In commenting on the summary of the monetised economic, environmental and social benefits of the Scheme provided in Table 29, paragraphs 5.3.10 to 5.3.24 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] address the environmental and social benefits in operational terms. Have the construction effects been taken into account in this analysis?</p>
GEN.1.25	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 5.2.5 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] states that the monetised user benefits for commuters and other users (for example, leisure) are forecast to be £58.2 million.</p> <p>Where has this been factored into Table 29?</p>
GEN.1.26	Applicant	<p>Table 29 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] provides a figure for Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This is not addressed in the commentary accompanying the table.</p> <p>Please explain how this figure has been derived. Why is the travel time benefit listed three times? Greater clarity is required to explain the figures in Table 29.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
GEN.1.27	Applicant	<p>Table 30 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] concludes that the Scheme has a Benefit Cost Ratio of 0.8.</p> <p>Greater clarity is required to explain the figures in Table 30 and to explain the significance of 0.8.</p>
GEN.1.28	Applicant	<p>Figures 32 and 33 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] purport to show the extent of Policy TRA3 for Part A and Part B.</p> <p>Is Figure 32 correct in showing the A1 north of Alnwick?</p>
GEN.1.29	Applicant NCC	<p>Figure 34 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] is titled 'Inner and Outer Green Belt Boundary Preferred Options Map' sourced from the NCC Morpeth Outer Green Belt Boundary Report, October 2013. It shows existing Green Belt and Proposed Green Belt Extension. Figure 7.10 of the ES [APP-097] shows the existing Green Belt as for Figure 34 and Saved Policy S5 Green Belt Extension. Paragraph 6.4.1 references Policy S5 of the Structure Plan and the emerging NCC Local Plan.</p> <p>What is the status of Structure Plan Policy S5? What is the status of the Green Belt in the emerging NCC Local Plan as described in paragraph 6.4.1? Is the Scheme within the Green Belt? Please clarify.</p>
GEN.1.30	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.5.2 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] describes the benefits of the Scheme as being demonstrated by its inclusion within the RIS and within national, regional and local transport and planning policy.</p> <p>Explain how the inclusion of the Scheme within a policy can be termed a benefit.</p>
GEN.1.31	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.5.4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] sets out the adverse impacts of the Scheme. No mention is made of the impact on Greenhouse Gas Emissions or the loss of ancient woodland.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to review its summary of adverse impacts and the conclusions on the planning balance.</p>
GEN.1.32	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 13.9.2 of the ES [APP-056 and APP-057] describe a process of off-site construction to maximise the use of prefabricated structures and components and encourage a process of assembly rather than construction.</p> <p>Does this approach conflict with the achievement of good quality design?</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
GEN.1.33	Applicant	<p>Table 3.4 of the ES [APP-038] presents Environmental Considerations in the Evolution of the Scheme Design (Part B). In relation to the location of the proposed Charlton Mires junction four different options are described.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to present plans of each of the four options which should also indicate the land interests of M E Beal &amp; Sons [RR-020] and proposals for development on their land.</p>
GEN.1.34	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.8.5 of the ES [APP-037] states that the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound would occupy approximately 40,000 m<sup>2</sup>. In paragraph 2.2.7 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan it is stated that the compound would occupy approximately 50,000m<sup>2</sup>. Please clarify. What is the area of the Order Limits at the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound?</p>
GEN.1.35	Applicant	<p>Table 17-2 of ES Chapter 17: Summary [APP-063] shows that mitigation measures have been proposed for all aspects where significant effects are anticipated. Where significant adverse effects remain after mitigation measures have been employed, it is not apparent whether any additional measures can be introduced to achieve a level of effect which is deemed not significant. For example, if the mitigation measures would not bring noise levels down to a level of effect which is deemed not significant, then could measures such as compensation or enhanced glazing be used.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to justify the significant residual adverse effects shown in the technical chapters of the ES and provide explanation if any further measures can be introduced.</p>
<b>AIR QUALITY AND EMISSIONS</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>
AQ.1.1	Applicant	<p>Table 5.3 of the ES [APP-040] references Highway England's Air Quality Strategy 'Our strategy to improve air quality'.</p> <p>What is the status for the Examination of this Highways England policy document?</p>
AQ.1.2	IPs	<p>Paragraph 5.4.9 of the ES [APP-040] identifies the data sources used for the assessment. Are IPs content with the range of data used?</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
AQ.1.3	IPs	Paragraph 5.4.9 of the ES [APP-040] states that based on the Affected Road Network (ARN), 25 representative human receptors have been selected. These receptors represent worst-case locations with likely relevant human exposure to air pollutants from the ARN. Are IPs content with the identification of these receptors in terms of the number and location?
AQ.1.4	Applicant	Figure 5.2 of the ES [APP-076] Human and Ecological Receptors Assessed, refers in the title to Part A. The plans show both Part A and Part B. Similarly Figure 5.3 [APP-077] Air Quality Monitoring, refers in its title to Part A while the plans show both parts. Please clarify.
		<b>PART B</b>
AQ.1.5	Applicant	Figure 5.1 of the ES [APP-123] ARN refers to Part B in the title, but the plans show both Part A and Part B. Similarly Figure 5.3 [APP-125] Air Quality Monitoring, refers in its title to Part B while the plans show both parts. Please clarify.
<b>BIODIVERSITY AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>
BIO.1.1	Applicant	Paragraph 2.2.3 of the ES [APP-037] states that the Scheme would seek to support the aim of no net loss of biodiversity. Where does this aim derive from?
BIO.1.2	IPs	Paragraph 9.1.4 of the ES [APP-048] explains that the Phase 1 survey for Part A had an extent of 500m while that for Part B was 50m. What implications, if any, arise from these different areas?
BIO.1.3	Applicant	Table 9.2 of the ES [APP-048] highlights the Highways England Biodiversity Action Plan. It is stated that the design, avoidance and mitigation measures detailed within Chapter 9 work towards achieving the action plan outcome targets. Demonstrate whether or not these outcomes have been achieved for the Scheme as a whole.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
BIO.1.4	Applicant IPs	In addressing Policy ENV2 of the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan in Table 9.3 of the ES [APP-048] it is stated that woodland is an irreplaceable habitat and has not been considered in the context of the biodiversity no net loss assessment. Why has ancient woodland been excluded? Explain how biodiversity enhancement, rather than compensation, has been achieved for the Scheme. What is the response of IPs to this approach?
BIO.1.5	NE	Paragraph 9.4.10 of the ES [APP-048] indicates that during consultation, Natural England (NE) confirmed that the location and size of the proposed woodland planting area to address the loss of ancient woodland was acceptable. NE is asked to confirm its position and to explain how it came to its view.
BIO.1.6	Woodland Trust	The Woodland Trust is asked to expand on the comment in paragraph 9.4.20 of the ES [APP-048] which states that it does not support ancient woodland translocation or salvage as this inherently requires the damage of ancient woodland.
BIO.1.7	Applicant IPs	Paragraph 9.4.52 of the ES [APP-048] describes how a biodiversity no net loss calculation has been carried out. How does this relate to the principle of biodiversity net gain? Explain how the principle of biodiversity net gain applies to the Scheme. In responding the Applicant should have regard to Policies QOP1 and ENV2 of the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan in Table 9.3 which seek to achieve net gains for biodiversity rather than no net loss. This should be addressed for the entire Scheme. What is the response of IPs to this approach?
BIO.1.8	IPs	In paragraph 9.5.1 of the ES [APP-048] it is stated that surveys are typically valid for two years unless otherwise specified, and that the validity of surveys greater than two years old, such as breeding birds, to inform the impact assessment has been discussed and agreed with NE. Paragraph 9.7.5 indicates that the Phase 1 habitat survey was undertaken in June 2016. Appendices 9.12 to 9.17 all record surveys from 2017 or earlier. Do IPs consider surveys which are older than 2 years to be still valid?
BIO.1.9	IPs	Are IPs content with the search / study areas identified in paragraph 9.6.2 of the ES [APP-048]?
BIO.1.10	Applicant	Table 9.10 of the ES [APP-048] indicates that breeding bird surveys were undertaken in 2016 while paragraph 9.7.63 states that wintering bird surveys were recorded during

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	NE	<p>2016 /17. Paragraph 9.4.9 indicates that NE confirmed that the surveys for breeding birds were sufficient to inform the impact assessment.</p> <p>Were the surveys repeated? If not, why not?</p> <p>Can NE confirm its position with regard to the breeding bird surveys which are now 4 years old?</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide evidence of agreement with NE regarding the date of all ecological surveys carried out for Part A and Part B of the Proposed Development?</p>
BIO.1.11	Applicant	<p>Table 9.20 of the ES [APP-048] indicates that the total loss of hedgerow would be 23,263m out of a pre-development total of 33,254m.</p> <p>Explain why such a length of hedgerow would need to be removed and explain how much would be permanent and how much temporary.</p>
BIO.1.12	Applicant	<p>In paragraph 9.9.2 of the ES [APP-048] the terms mitigation and compensation are defined.</p> <p>How does enhancement relate to mitigation?</p>
BIO.1.13	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 9.9.6 of the ES [APP-048] indicates that watercourse creation would be a total of approximately 540m while paragraph 9.8.9 indicates that there would be a loss of 750m including 35m of national importance.</p> <p>Explain the basis of the amount of replacement watercourse.</p>
BIO.1.14	Applicant	<p>Table 9.22 of the ES [APP-048] indicates that the total loss of hedgerow of 23,263m would be mitigated through the provision of 32,594m of habitat creation.</p> <p>Why is it proposed to provide so much new hedgerow? What are the ecological implications of such additional provision?</p>
BIO.1.15	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 9.9.7 of the ES [APP-048] describes the Ancient Woodland Strategy which has been developed to address the loss of ancient woodland habitat and impacts to retained woodland as a result of Part A.</p> <p>How would this be secured through the DCO?</p>
BIO.1.16	Applicant	<p>In Table 9.23 - Design and Mitigation Measures and their Delivery Mechanisms of the ES [APP-048], Measure EM041 states that Part A includes approximately 800m of new or reinstated watercourse.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Does this statement conflict with paragraph 9.9.6 or is the additional watercourse in addition to the 540m indicated there, reinstated watercourse?
BIO.1.17	Applicant	<p>In Table 9.23 of the ES [APP-048], Measure EM048 states that barn owl boxes have been installed at locations outside of the Order Limits.</p> <p>As the barn owl boxes have already been installed how can they be considered as mitigation in terms of the EIA?</p>
BIO.1.18	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 9.10.3 of the ES [APP-048] states that Part A would result in the loss of 0.41 ha of woodland within the Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS). It indicates that whilst not designated as ancient woodland, the broadleaved woodland of the LWS supports ancient woodland indicator species. Therefore, for the purposes of the assessment, the LWS woodland was treated as ancient woodland.</p> <p>On that basis explain why the effect was assessed as moderate.</p>
BIO.1.19	Applicant	<p>According to paragraph 9.10.7 of the ES [APP-048] Part A includes hedgerow creation at a ratio of approximately 1.4:1 to that lost and the increase in hedgerow linear length would result in a slight beneficial effect.</p> <p>Explain whether this is mitigation, compensation or enhancement.</p>
BIO.1.20	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 9.10.8 of the ES [APP-048] states that Part A would result in the direct, permanent net loss of approximately 200m of watercourse length, excluding ditches. This includes the loss of approximately 165m of watercourses of local importance and approximately 35m of watercourse of national importance. In relation to direct impacts to watercourses of local importance, Part A would result in a slight adverse effect.</p> <p>What mitigation is proposed to reduce the effect on the watercourse of national importance from very large to slight? Clarify what is meant by "the temporary boundary of Part A".</p>
BIO.1.21	Applicant NE	<p>Paragraphs 9.11.7 and 9.11.8 of the ES [APP-048] state that no post-completion monitoring requirements have been identified, subject to agreement with NE as part of the European Protected Species Licences. Additionally, Appendix A of the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-016] describes the status of negotiations with NE with regard to the European Protected Species Licences which are required.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The Applicant and NE are asked to provide an update on the progress made towards obtaining Letters of No Impediment since the application was submitted.
BIO.1.22	Applicant	Appendix 9.1 of the ES [APP-227] – Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, refers only to Part A on the cover. The report itself addresses both Part A and Part B. The Applicant should clarify the scope.
BIO.1.23	Applicant	Appendix 9.4 of the ES [APP-230] – ‘GCN Environmental eDNA and HSI Survey Report’ recommends that Great Crested Newt (GCN) surveys should be repeated if development is deferred for over 12 months from the date of the initial survey. It records that surveys were conducted between the 18th and 20th of April 2016 and further GCN surveys were undertaken in 2017 and in April to June 2018. Have further surveys been undertaken? If not, why not?
BIO.1.24	Applicant	Appendix 9.7 of the ES [APP-233] – Bat Roost Potential Survey Report 2017 indicates that buildings B4A (North Gate House) which has low bat roost potential was assessed from a distance due to access restrictions. Appendix 9.8 confirms further surveys were carried out in 2017. Have further surveys been undertaken since 2017? If so, what were the results, if not, why not?
BIO.1.25	Applicant NE	Paragraph 2.4 of Appendix 9.10 of the ES (Badger Survey Report) [APP-236] states that surveys were carried out in November and December 2016. It goes on to state that the report reflects the site conditions up to April 2017 and notes that it is considered good practice for wildlife surveys to be repeated should development be deferred for over 12 months from the date of the initial survey. Similarly, paragraph 2.2.7 of the Badger Bait Marking Survey Report [APP-237] records that the survey reflects site conditions up to April 2017 noting that it is considered good practice for wildlife surveys to be repeated should development be deferred for over 12 months from the date of the initial survey. On this basis, should the surveys be considered reliable? Should further surveys be carried out?
BIO.1.26	Applicant NE	Appendix 9.18 of the ES [APP-244] – Otter Monitoring Survey Report was based on surveys undertaken in August / September 2018 but was not published until October 2019. Appendix 9.17 recommends that surveys should be repeated if development is deferred for over 12 months from the initial survey. Similarly, Appendix 9.19 - Terrestrial



**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Invertebrate Survey Report indicates that good practice is to repeat surveys after 12 months. Is there a need for further survey work? If not, why not?
BIO.1.27	Applicant	Appendix 9.20 of the ES [APP-246] – Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment covers Part A while Appendix 9.11 [APP-309] covers the same issue for Part B. Has an assessment been undertaken for the Scheme as a whole? If not, why not?
BIO.1.28	Applicant NE	Appendix 9.21 of the ES [APP-247] – Ancient Woodland Strategy and paragraph 9.10.3 of the ES [APP-048] propose compensation based on a 12:1 ratio in terms of planting to loss. On what basis was it decided to use a ratio of 12:1?
BIO.1.29	IPs	In section 5.2 of Appendix 9.21 of the ES [APP-247] – Ancient Woodland Strategy high level thoughts for the management strategy are presented including for years 11+ management actions every few years. Are IPs content with the scope of the management strategy?
		<b>PART B</b>
BIO.1.30	Applicant NCC	Paragraph 9.4.8 of the ES [APP-049] sets out the organisations consulted in respect of baseline surveys and mitigation proposals. Why were the consultees on Part B not the same as for Part A? Does Northumberland County Council (NCC) wish to respond on these matters?
BIO.1.31	Applicant	In paragraph 9.4.5 of the ES [APP-049] it is stated that an assessment in relation to ecological receptors and impacts arising as a result of air quality is scoped into the assessment. Is there a conflict with the statement in paragraph 9.4.42 that as there are no ecological receptors within the Study Area for impacts as a result of air quality, detailed assessment methodology for air quality impacts on ecological receptors has been omitted from this chapter?
BIO.1.32	Applicant	In Table 9.9 of the ES [APP-049] the references to terrestrial invertebrates specify that the desk study recorded two notable species while the following column refers to three notable species.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Please clarify.
BIO.1.33	Applicant	Table 9.11 of the ES [APP-049] provides details of the mitigation for the loss of Habitats of Principal Importance. Explain the basis of the creation / reinstatement areas / lengths compared to the areas / lengths lost.
BIO.1.34	Applicant	Table 9.23 of the ES [APP-049] - Design and Mitigation Measures and their Delivery Mechanisms for Part B has similarities with Table 9.23 of the ES [APP-048] for Part A. Explain the differences between the tables in terms of format, for example the delivery mechanism and preliminary activities' measure references. Are all measures in both tables included in the REAC / CEMP? If not, why not and how would they be secured?
BIO.1.35	Applicant	Paragraph 9.4.8 of the ES [APP-049] states that Part B includes the reinstatement / creation of compensatory woodland at a quantity significantly greater than that lost (10.14 ha created in comparison to 0.69 ha lost). Explain why the compensatory woodland is so much greater than the area lost.
BIO.1.36	Applicant	Appendix 9.6 of the ES [APP-304] - Breeding and Wintering Birds Report Part B includes Appendix A which cross references to Appendix 9.13 – Breeding Bird Survey Report Part A [APP-239]. Similarly, Appendix B cross references to Appendix 9.14 – Wintering Bird Survey Report Part A [APP-240]. While the titles of Appendix 13 and Appendix 14 indicate that the surveys are limited to Part A the content of both appendices appears to encompass Part B. Clarify the position with respect to surveys for Part B.
BIO.1.37	Applicant IPs	Paragraph 6.2.2 of Appendix 9.11 [APP-309] refers to Highways England (2018) Chief Highways Engineer Memorandum 422/18, Supporting Transparency around our Biodiversity Performance. An assessment in accordance with this memo is included in Appendix C of Appendix 9.11. The Applicant is asked to explain why the approach adopted in its own guidance is more appropriate than other methodologies to assess biodiversity performance. IPs are invited to comment on this methodology.
		<b>HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT (HRA) REPORT</b>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
BIO.1.38	Applicant	<p>Table 2.1 of the HRA Report [APP-342] states that upon completion, two-way traffic along the dualled A1 would be approximately 36,400 AADT (for Part A) and approximately 20,150 AADT (for Part B), plus 3,000 AADT for the de-trunked section of the existing A1 (Part A). The report refers to the Case for the Scheme (Chapter 4) [APP-344] for further details, however the figures provided in Tables 9 and 18 do not appear to match those in Table 2.1.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain this apparent discrepancy?</p>
BIO.1.39	Applicant	<p>Referencing Appendix 5.2 of the ES [APP-199] (Construction Traffic Assessment Part A) and Appendix 5.2 of the ES [APP-270] (Construction Traffic Assessment Part B) the HRA Report [APP-342] Table 2.1 of the HRA Report [APP-342] states that traffic volumes are forecast to increase during construction by between 336 and 401 vehicles per day. The figures provided in these appendices do not appear to match those reported in the HRA Report.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain this discrepancy?</p>
BIO.1.40	Applicant	<p>As set out in Appendix 9.13 of the ES (Breeding Bird Survey Report Part A) [APP-239] and Appendix 9.6 (Breeding and Wintering Birds Survey Report Part B) [APP-303] breeding bird surveys were undertaken in 2016. An updated desk study was undertaken for Part B in 2019 [APP-304]. This states that the 2019 desk study data did not identify any change in what was observed in the Part B 2016 breeding bird survey (paragraph 5.1.1). No updated desk study or field work was undertaken for Part A.</p> <p>Given the age of the survey data can the Applicant comment on the validity of the HRA Report?</p>
BIO.1.41	NE	<p>NE is asked to confirm whether or not it is satisfied with the scope and methodology used to gather baseline data in respect of traffic modelling and air quality for the HRA Report?</p>
BIO.1.42	Applicant	<p>The Addendum Matrix to the Northumberland Marine Special Protection Area (SPA) (footnotes (j),(k) and (l)) [AS-003] states that "there are no other known projects or schemes that would incur impacts to the black-headed gull population of the SPA or with loss of functional habitat (arable or wetland) that, in combination with the Scheme, would constitute a Likely Significant Effect".</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Could the Applicant describe the methodology applied for identifying other projects or schemes that might give rise to impacts on the black-headed gull populations of the Northumberland Marine and Coquet Island SPAs or with loss of functional habitat (arable or wetland) that, in combination with the Scheme, would constitute a Likely Significant Effect?</p>
BIO.1.43	NE	<p>Is NE content with the Applicant's approach to the in-combination assessment?</p>
BIO.1.44	Applicant / NE	<p>NE has stated its support for the HRA conclusions when they were presented as two separate schemes. There is no evidence of similar agreement regarding the conclusions for the scheme as a whole.</p> <p>Can the Applicant and / or NE provide evidence of NE's agreement with the conclusions of the HRA report concerning the project as submitted?</p>
BIO.1.45	Applicant	<p>In the revised HRA Report [AS-005] Screening Table 2-3 states that "diversions would not affect roads or transport links in close proximity to the European site (within 200m)". However, the northbound diversion for Part A includes the A1068 which crosses and runs alongside the River Coquet and the boundary of the Northumberland Marine SPA.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain what effect this will have on the Northumberland Marine SPA?</p>
BIO.1.46	Applicant	<p>The screening matrices in the revised HRA Report [AS-005] state that construction traffic would be confined within the Order Limits, between the Part B Main Scheme Area and Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound and between the Order Limits of Part B and the Main Compound located within the Order Limits of Part A. However, the Construction Traffic Assessments state that construction traffic within the Order Limits are not fixed, with deliveries of aggregates and concrete coming from different directions (Part A [APP-199]; Part B [APP-270]).</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain this discrepancy?</p>
BIO.1.47	NE	<p>The revised HRA Report [AS-005] screens all the sites for impacts from emissions to water from both Part A and Part B of the scheme. For all sites, the report concludes that no impacts are anticipated as a result of pollution events or polluted surface water runoff during construction and operation due to the intervening distance and natural dilution and settlement rates. However, the report also states that the design of Part A incorporates a network of detention basins, featuring filter strips and sediment fall bags, that shall</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>further reduce the likelihood of polluted surface water runoff. It appears that the details regarding the mitigation measures were added to the report in response to advice from NE (Appendix C).</p> <p>Is NE satisfied with the conclusion that water pollution impacts can be screened out on the basis of the intervening distance and natural dilution and settlement rates, without consideration of mitigation?</p>
BIO.1.48	Applicant	<p>Footnote (i) to the screening matrices for Part A and matrices E-2 to E-6 for Part B [AS-005], regarding emissions effects during the decommissioning phase, all refer to best practice measures implemented within the CEMP.</p> <p>Please confirm where in the CEMP the decommissioning phase is addressed?</p>
BIO.1.49	Applicant	<p>The Applicant provided matrices for all sites with the original application [APP-342], but separately for Part A (Appendix B) and Part B (Appendix E). The ExA requested that they provide a single revised matrix for three sites (Northumbria Coast SPA, Northumbria Coast Ramsar, and Northumberland Marine SPA) and these have been provided in an Addendum [AS-003]. The North Northumberland Dunes Special Area of Conservation was also screened for both Parts of the scheme and no combined matrix was requested.</p> <p>Could the Applicant provide a revised screening matrix for the North Northumberland Dunes Special Area of Conservation that combines the assessments of Part A and B?</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to submit the original Planning Inspectorate screening matrices and the amended ones, where applicable, in Microsoft Word format as per Advice Note 10 paragraph 4.30 (<a href="https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Advice-note-10v4.pdf">https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Advice-note-10v4.pdf</a>).</p>
BIO.1.50	Applicant	<p>Screening Table 2-5 [AS-005] for Coquet Island SPA states that no qualifying species were recorded in the survey area. However black-headed gull has been identified as a qualifying feature (as part of the seabird assemblage) and was identified in the survey area (as noted elsewhere in the report).</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify this inconsistency and provide an assessment of the impact to this feature of the SPA?</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
BIO.1.51	Applicant	<p>Matrix 7 (Table E-8) [AS-005] for the River Tweed SAC lists an additional feature which is not mentioned in the original document (Screening Table 3-7) [APP-342]. This feature is listed as "Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculion fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitriche-Batrachion</i> vegetation; Rivers with floating vegetation often dominated by water-crowfoot". The standard data form (JNCC, 2016)<sup>1</sup> for the site also lists "Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (<i>Alno-Padion</i>, <i>Alnion incanae</i>, <i>Salicion albae</i>)" as an Annex I habitat type present on site.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to provide a definitive list of features for the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation and an assessment of the impacts to these features.</p>
<b>CARBON EMISSIONS</b>		
CE.1.1	Applicant	<p>In its Relevant Representation [RR-013] Transport Action Network states that the Scheme will significantly increase carbon emissions and undermine efforts to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2050 (Climate Change Act 2008). The ES states that the scheme will increase emissions by 1,855,000 additional tonnes of carbon due to increased traffic, and 34,750 tonnes due to construction. Transport Action Network states that this is not 'not significant' as the ES claims indicating that the Scheme is a retrograde step in terms of tackling climate change.</p> <p>Please respond.</p>
CE.1.2	Applicant	<p>How might the Government's recent announcement about the phasing out of sales of new petrol and diesel vehicles by 2030 to accelerate the transition to electric vehicles affect the assessment set out in Chapter 14 of the ES [APP-058] [APP-059]?</p>
		<b>PART A</b>
CE.1.3	Applicant	<p>Table 14.3 of the ES [APP-058] refers to the Alnwick District Wide Local Plan. Should this be the Castle Morpeth plan and if so, do the policies need changing?</p>

<sup>1</sup> JNCC, 2016 NATURA 2000 – STANDARD DATA FORM, SITE UK0012691, SITENAME River Tweed. <https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0012691.pdf>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CE.1.4	Applicant	Paragraph 14.4.9 of the ES [APP-058] states that emissions were quantified for each year over a 60-year lifetime of Part A (up to 2083). Explain why the lifecycle period is 60 years.
CE.1.5	Applicant	Paragraph 14.4.16 of the ES [APP-058] notes that the NNNPS sets out that "it is very unlikely that the impact of a road project will, in isolation, affect the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction plan targets" The ES indicates that as such it is unlikely that Part A would constitute a significant portion of the UK carbon budgets. Paragraph 14.10.19 states that this is the case not only for Part A but for the Scheme as a whole. Please explain how this conclusion was reached.
		<b>PART B</b>
CE.1.6	Applicant	Paragraph 14.10.9 of the ES [APP-059] states that the total regional traffic Greenhouse Gas emissions for the operational lifespan of Part B (2023-2082) is 629 ktCO <sub>2</sub> e higher (approximately +9%) than the 'do minimum' scenario. The comparable figure for Part A (paragraph 14.10.9 [APP-058] is 1,836 ktCO <sub>2</sub> e (approximately +28%). Please explain the variation in these figures.
<b>COMPULSORY ACQUISITION/TEMPORARY POSSESSION</b>		
CA.1.1	Applicant	The Applicant is requested to complete the annexed Compulsory Acquisitions Objections Schedule (Annex A) and to make any entries that it believes would be appropriate, and at each successive deadline to make any new entries, or delete any entries that it considers would be appropriate, taking account of the positions expressed in Relevant Representations and Written Representations, and giving reasons for any additions. (It is noted that Annex B of the Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-018] provides a schedule which provides most of this information.)
CA.1.2	Applicant	The Book of Reference (BoR) [APP-020] includes a number of Statutory Undertakers with interests in land. Please provide a progress report on negotiations with each of the Statutory Undertakers listed in the BoR, with an estimate of the timescale for securing agreement from them. Indicate whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		State whether any additional Statutory Undertakers have been identified since the submission of the BoR as an application document.
CA.1.3	Applicant	<p>The former Department for Communities and Local Government published Guidance related to procedures for CA (September 2013) in "Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land". This states that: "Applicants should be able to demonstrate that adequate funding is likely to be available to enable the compulsory acquisition within the statutory period following the order being made, and that the resource implications of a possible acquisition resulting from a blight notice have been taken account of."</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-019] does not identify the CA costs separately from the project costs or explain how a figure for CA costs was arrived at. Please explain the anticipated cost of CA, how this figure was arrived at, and how these costs are going to be met.</p>
CA.1.4	Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 10.6 – 10.12 of the EM [APP-015] indicate how Art 29 of the dDCO provides for the extinguishment of private rights.</p> <p>Could the Applicant explain how this addresses the Guidance published by the former Department for Communities and Local Government in 'Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land' which, in Annex D, paragraph 10 states: "Where it is proposed to create and acquire new rights compulsorily, they should be clearly identified. The Book of Reference should also cross-refer to the relevant articles contained in the development consent order."?</p>
CA.1.5	Applicant	<p>Statutory undertakers: land or rights</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to review Relevant Representations and Written Representations made as the Examination progresses and to prepare, and at each successive deadline update as required, a table identifying and responding to any representations made by Statutory Undertakers with land or rights to which PA2008 s127 applies. Where such representations are identified, the Applicant is requested to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the name of the Statutory Undertaker;</li> <li>b) the nature of their undertaking;</li> <li>c) the land and or rights affected (identified with reference to the most recent versions of the BoR and Land Plans available at that time);</li> </ul>



**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>d) in relation to land, whether and if so, how the tests in PA2008 s127(3)(a) or (b) can be met;</p> <p>e) in relation to rights, whether and if so, how the tests in s127(6)(a) or (b) can be met; and</p> <p>f) in relation to these matters, whether any protective provisions and /or commercial agreement are anticipated, and if so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. whether these are already available to the ExA in draft or final form,</li><li>ii. whether a new document describing them is attached to the response to this question or</li><li>iii. whether further work is required before they can be documented; and</li></ul> <p>g) in relation to a Statutory Undertaker named in an earlier version of the table but in respect of which a settlement has been reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. whether the settlement has resulted in their representation(s) being withdrawn in whole or part; and</li><li>ii. identifying any documents providing evidence of agreement and withdrawal.</li></ul> <p>The table provided in response to this question should be titled CA1.5: PA2008 s127 Statutory Undertakers Land/ Rights and provided with a version number that rolls forward with each deadline.</p>
CA.1.6	Applicant	<p>Statutory undertakers: extinguishment of rights and removal of apparatus etc</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to review its proposals relating to CA or TP of land and/ or rights and to prepare and at each successive deadline update a table identifying if these proposals affect the relevant rights or relevant apparatus of any Statutory Undertakers to which PA2008 s138 applies. If such rights or apparatus are identified, the Applicant is requested to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) the name of the Statutory Undertaker;</li><li>b) the nature of their undertaking;</li><li>c) the relevant rights to be extinguished; and/ or</li><li>d) the relevant apparatus to be removed;</li><li>e) how the test in s138(4) can be met; and</li></ul>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>f) in relation to these matters, whether any protective provisions and/ or commercial agreement are anticipated, and if so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. whether these are already available to the ExA in draft or final form,</li> <li>ii. whether a new document describing them is attached to the response to this question or</li> <li>iii. whether further work is required before they can be documented; and</li> </ul> <p>g) in relation to a statutory undertaker named in an earlier version of the table but in respect of which a settlement has been reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. whether the settlement has resulted in their representation(s) being withdrawn in whole or part; and</li> <li>ii. identifying any documents providing evidence of agreement and withdrawal.</li> </ul> <p>The table should be titled CA.1.6: PA2008 s138 Statutory Undertakers Apparatus etc. and provided with a version number that rolls forward with each deadline.</p>
CA.1.7	Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 of the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-015] state that the Applicant has chosen not to distinguish between 'associated development' within the meaning of section 115(2) PA2008 and works which form part of the NSIP.</p> <p>How does that approach reflect the Guidance on associated development 'Planning Act 2008: associated development applications for major infrastructure projects' (former Department for Communities and Local Government, April 2013)?</p> <p>Explain further the example given of potential overlap between some on-highway and some off-highway diversion of statutory undertakers' equipment and why the 'associated development' aspects of the scheme could not be appropriately categorised as such in the dDCO?</p>
CA.1.8	Applicant	<p>The SoR [APP-018], paragraph 1.2.3, lists the works necessary to deliver the scheme. Which, if any, of these works can be identified as associated development?</p>
CA.1.9	Applicant	<p>The SoR [APP-018], section 3.4 refers to temporary possession powers through Articles 35 and 36.</p> <p>Please provide further details to justify the extent of the land sought to be used temporarily. For each area explain why such a size is required and the justification for the extent of the plots proposed to accommodate them.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.1.10	Applicant	For the avoidance of doubt, what are all the factors that are regarded as constituting evidence of a compelling case in the public interest for the CA powers sought and where, giving specific paragraph references, are these set out in the submitted documentation?
CA.1.11	Applicant	<p>The SoR [APP-018] at section 5.4 states that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the CA.</p> <p>What assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual Affected Persons and their private loss that would result from the exercise of CA powers in each case?</p> <p>Where is it demonstrated within the application that the public benefits of the scheme outweigh any residual adverse effects including private loss suffered by individual land owners and occupiers? Demonstrate how such a conclusion has been reached and how the balancing exercise between public benefit and private loss has been carried out.</p>
CA.1.12	Applicant	<p>In the light of the relevant Guidance related to CA, 'Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land' and in particular paragraph 8:</p> <p>How can the ExA be assured that all reasonable alternatives to CA (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored?</p> <p>Set out in summary form, with document references where appropriate, what assessment/comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests in each case.</p>
CA.1.13	Applicant	<p>Section 6 of the SoR [APP-018] addresses human rights.</p> <p>Where is it demonstrated that interference with human rights in this case would be proportionate and justified?</p> <p>How has the proportionality test been undertaken and explain how this approach has been undertaken in relation to individual plots?</p>
CA.1.14	Applicant	What assurance and evidence can the Applicant provide of the accuracy of the land interests identified as submitted and indicate whether there are likely to be any changes to the land interests, including the identification of further owners/interests or monitoring and update of changes in interests?
CA.1.15	Applicant	Section 5.5 of the SoR [APP-018] states that none of the alternatives or modifications considered would obviate the need for the compulsory acquisition and temporary

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		possession of the Land. The Applicant is asked to provide further detail to substantiate this position.
CA.1.16	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.1.3 of the SoR [APP-018] indicates that land at East Cottage Charlton Mires and Charlton Mires Farmhouse is required in Part B for the construction of the grade-separated junction at Charlton Mires. It states that the Applicant has been in regular discussions with the landowner and a blight application has been received but as at application, compensation discussions remain ongoing.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to confirm the Plot references and ownerships for these properties and to provide an update on discussions.</p>
CA.1.17	Applicant	<p>Annex A of the SoR [APP-018] provides details of the purpose for which CA and temporary possession (TP) powers are sought. It includes, under the heading of permanent acquisition of land a number of plots required for de-trunking works to the existing A1 Trunk Road</p> <p>Why are permanent acquisition rights required for de-trunking works?</p>
CA.1.18	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 4.1.2 of the Funding Statement [APP-019] states that to date two valid blight notices have been served.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to provide details and to update the ExA if any further notices are served.</p>
<b>DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER</b>		
		<p><b>References to the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) in this set of questions refer to Examination Library reference [APP-014] and the reference is not repeated. Similarly, the Examination Library reference for the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-015] is not repeated in this series of questions.</b></p>
DCO.1.1	Applicant	<p>The Applicant is asked to supply subsequent versions of the dDCO in both .pdf and Word formats and in two versions, the first forming the latest consolidated draft and the second showing changes from the previous version in tracked changes, with comments outlining the reason for the change. The consolidated draft version in Word is to be supported by a report validating that version of the dDCO as being in the SI template and with updated revision numbers.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.2	Applicant	The Applicant is asked to ensure that all application or subsequent plans and documents referred to in the dDCO in whatever provision are identified by Drawing or Document and Revision Numbers in subsequent versions of the dDCO. Where revisions are prepared to plans and documents, these should be reflected in the latest version of the dDCO. The Applicant should undertake a final audit of plans and documents referred to in the dDCO prior to submitting its final preferred dDCO to the Examination. Where it is necessary to refer to document numbers the Applicant should use the Examination Library system.
DCO.1.3	Applicant	The Applicant is asked to confirm that Schedule 12 (Documents to be Certified) will be updated in each subsequent version of the dDCO provided during the Examination. This should accompany an update to the Applicant's Document Tracker [AS-002] recording the latest version of each plan and documents.
DCO.1.4	Applicant	Section 3 of the EM describes the Applicant's approach to drafting in respect of associated development. Paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 indicate that the Applicant has chosen not to distinguish between the principal development of the NSIP and associated development within the meaning of s115 of PA2008. This is justified by the Applicant on the basis that "there is no requirement for a development consent order to distinguish between these two categories". The EM also makes reference to the DCLG Guidance on associated development. Schedule 1 of the dDCO describes the authorised development set out in Works Nos. 1-37 with the description of 'further development' following. If no distinction is made between the principal and associated development how can it be demonstrated that the DCLG Guidance has been adhered to? Furthermore, what is the rationale for the identification of further development?
DCO.1.5	Applicant	<i>Contents Page.</i> The Applicant is asked to check the format of the headings used, particularly "Development Consent Order 20[**]" and "Laid before Parliament [***]" which do not appear to be a standard approach.
DCO.1.6	Applicant	<i>Preamble. "An application has been made..."</i> The Applicant is asked to review this sentence. The application was made under section 37 of PA2008; the Order would not be made under section 37. In addition, "sections" should be singular.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.7	Applicant	<p><i>"The application was examined by a single appointed person..."</i></p> <p>The Applicant is asked to draft the Preamble to the next version of the dDCO to confirm that the application has been examined by a panel of two members ("the Panel") appointed by the Secretary of State. The references to the single appointed person in the following two paragraphs should also be removed.</p>
DCO.1.8	Applicant	<p><i>Footnotes.</i></p> <p>A number of early footnotes are very extensive. The Applicant is asked to review the use of footnotes with reference to paragraph 7 of PINS Advice Note 15 and to confirm that the use of footnotes is appropriate.</p>
DCO.1.9	Applicant	<p><i>Art 2 – "the book of reference" means <u>the book of reference</u>... (Our emphasis.)</i></p> <p>Consider changing the underlined phase with "the document of that description". This approach has been used with reference to the interpretation of "environmental statement".</p>
DCO.1.10	Applicant	<p><i>Art 2 – "commence".</i></p> <p>The definition of "commence" only relates to "the carrying out of any material operation" (as defined in s.56(4) PA 2008). The other works listed in the definition, which are described in the EM as "low impact preparatory works" are excluded from the definition. However, these other works are not described as "preparatory works" (for which there is no definition, nor are they all listed in Sch. 1.) It is therefore unclear what authority the Applicant will have to carry out these "preparatory works" as they appear to be excluded from the scope of the DCO (but see comments below on Article 25). Equally, whilst noting that there has been precedent in other DCOs for the SoS to remove definitions of "preliminary works" on the grounds that these were unnecessary / had minimal potential for adverse impacts (see Guidance Note 15 at para 21), the Applicant has not explained why it considers this approach is appropriate in the circumstances of this proposed NSIP. Please clarify.</p>
DCO.1.11	Applicant	<p><i>Art 2 – "engineering drawings and sections" means <u>the drawings and sections listed</u>... (Our emphasis.)</i></p> <p>Consider changing the underlined phase with "the document of that description".</p>
DCO.1.12	Applicant	<p><i>Art 2 – "general arrangement plans" means <u>the drawings listed</u>...</i></p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Consider changing to "means the document of that description listed in Schedule 12 (documents to be certified) and certified as the general arrangement <u>plans</u> by the Secretary of State for the purposes of the Order". (Our emphasis.) This would provide consistency with the interpretation of "engineering drawings and sections".
DCO.1.13	Applicant	<i>Art 2 – "maintain"</i> The definition of "maintain" is not as clear as it could be particularly in relation to the interface with the ES and as drafted does not clearly meet the intent identified in Section 6.4b of the EM. The definition should make it clear that any of the activities classed as maintenance can only be carried out if they do not give rise to any materially new or different environmental effects to those identified in the ES.
DCO.1.14	Applicant	<i>Art 2 – "order land"</i> . Change to "Order land" as this is how the term is presented in the Articles.
DCO.1.15	Applicant	<i>Art 2 – "order limits"</i> . Change to "Order limits" as this is how the term is presented in the Articles.
DCO.1.16	Applicant	<i>Art 2 – "owner"</i> . Insert "(interpretation)" after "section 7".
DCO.1.17	Applicant	<i>Art 2 – "Part B offline works"</i> . The Part B offline works comprise Work Nos. 22a and 22b. The EM describes the Part B offline works as centred on the realignment of the A1 at the new Charlton Mires junction. The Applicant is asked to clarify why these works are described as offline when they appear to be on the same alignment as the existing A1 carriageway. The situation is quite different from the offline works for Part A.
DCO.1.18	Applicant	<i>Art 2 – "rights of way and access plans"</i> . Consider changing to "means the document of that description" for consistency with other terms. The term "Secretary of State" should begin on a new line.
DCO.1.19	Applicant	<i>Art 2 – "statutory undertaker"</i> .

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Insert "(statutory undertakers' land)" after "section 127(8)" for consistency with other terms.
DCO.1.20	Applicant	<i>Art 2 - "street"</i> . Insert "(streets street works and undertakers)" after "section 48" for consistency with other terms.
DCO.1.21	Applicant	<i>Art 2 - "structures engineering drawings and sections" means <u>the drawings and sections listed...</u> (Our emphasis.)</i> Consider changing the underlined phase with "the document of that description".
DCO.1.22	Applicant	<i>Art 2 - "traffic authority"</i> . Insert "section 121A (traffic authorities) of" after "as in" for consistency with other terms.
DCO.1.23	Applicant	<i>Art 2 - "traffic regulation plans"</i> . Consider changing to "means the document of that description" for consistency with other terms.
DCO.1.24	Applicant	<i>Art 2 - "trunk road"</i> . Insert "(general provision as to trunk roads)" after "section 10" and "(certain special roads and other highways to become trunk roads)" after "19(1)" for consistency with other terms.
DCO.1.25	Applicant	<i>Art 2 - "vegetation clearance plans" means <u>the plans listed...</u> (Our emphasis.)</i> Consider changing the underlined phase with "the document of that description".
DCO.1.26	Applicant	<i>Art 2 - "the works plans" means <u>the plans listed...</u> (Our emphasis.)</i> Consider changing the underlined phase with "the document of that description".
DCO.1.27	Applicant	<i>Art 2(7)</i> No justification for this provision is provided in the EM. The Applicant is asked to justify its inclusion.
DCO.1.28	Applicant	<i>Art 6 - Planning Permission</i> Should the penultimate line specify "the carrying out, use or operation of such development"?



**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.29	Applicant	<i>Art 7 – Limits of deviation</i> (b)(iii) The Applicant is asked to provide justification for the proposed Limits of Deviation in respect of the comment above relating to the definition of Part B offline works.
DCO.1.30	Applicant	<i>Art 7 – Limits of deviation</i> (b)(v) The Limit of Deviation is described as 0.5metres upwards or 0.5metres downwards. This appears to be in conflict with the EM which describes the vertical Limits of Deviation for Highlaws and West Moor as being fixed at 0.6metres. The Applicant is asked to clarify and justify this provision.
DCO.1.31	Applicant	<i>Art 7 – Limits of deviation</i> (b)(vii) The vertical Limits of Deviation for the Heckley Fence overbridge works are proposed to be 0.65metres. The EM describes this as being due to site circumstances. The Applicant is asked to provide further clarification about site circumstances.
DCO.1.32	Applicant	<i>Art 7 – Limits of deviation</i> Paragraph 7.12 of the EM indicates that the Limits of Deviation referred to in this article and shown on the application plans have been taken into account in preparation of the ES and the potential impacts of a deviation within the permitted limits have been assessed. Demonstrate how this has been done.
DCO.1.33	Applicant	<i>Art 7 – Limits of deviation</i> Paragraph 7.12 of the EM indicates that Highways England is only permitted to exceed the limits specified in Art 7 if it can demonstrate to the SoS's satisfaction that no materially different environmental effects would arise. Should it refer to "materially new or materially different"?
DCO.1.34	Applicant	<i>Art 7 – Limits of deviation</i> This article does not make provision for the procedure to enable an application to be made to the SoS. The Applicant may wish to consider the provisions within the A19 Downhill Lane Junction Order 2020 in this respect.
DCO.1.35	Applicant	<i>Art 7 – Limits of deviation</i> The ExA is concerned by the tailpiece after Art 7(b)(ix).

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>i) Justify the level of flexibility sought, in particular why and in what circumstances it will be necessary to permit amendment to the maximum limits of lateral and vertical deviation by the SoS at a later date.</p> <p>ii) Explain why it is appropriate to permit amendments to the Limits of Deviation other than by applying to amend the Order in accordance with the provisions of PA2008.</p> <p>iii) Explain what process is in place for the SoS to determine whether exceeding the vertical limits would not give rise to any materially new or materially worse adverse environmental effects.</p>
DCO.1.36	Applicant	<p><i>Art 9 – Consent to transfer benefit of the Order</i></p> <p>This Article is drafted in such a way that it gives the Applicant the power to transfer or grant to these entities for the purposes of carrying out the Works listed in sub-section 4. The EM suggests that the intention is to allow these entities to move their own apparatus where this needs to be diverted for the NSIP. However, the relevant Works (as set out in Sch. 1) are far wider than this.</p> <p>This Article should be modified to limit the transfer/grant for the (limited) purposes set out in the EM and not for the entirety of the relevant Works.</p>
DCO.1.37	Applicant	<p><i>Art 10 -Application of the 1991 Act</i></p> <p>Art 10(4) refers to “article 15 (temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets)”. The title of Art 15 is “Temporary prohibition, restriction and regulation of the use of streets.</p> <p>Please amend.</p>
DCO.1.38	Applicant	<p><i>Art 11 -Power to alter layout etc. of streets</i></p> <p>The EM states that it is unnecessary to list the affected roads as their “location and extent is self-evident from the Works etc. Plans”.</p> <p>The affected roads should either be marked clearly as such on the Plans or listed in a Schedule to the DCO (preferably the latter). This Article also covers “any street having a junction with such a street” but the rationale for this drafting is not explained in the EM. Explain the rationale for this drafting.</p>
DCO.1.39	Applicant	<p><i>Art 11 -Power to alter layout etc. of streets</i></p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Art 11(3) refers to 42 days while Art 11(4) refers to 6 weeks.</p> <p>Is there any reason for switching between days and weeks? Please address in terms of other Articles / Requirements to ensure consistency.</p>
DCO.1.40	Applicant NCC	<p><i>Art 12 -Street works</i></p> <p>Art 12(1) states "The undertaker may, for the purposes of the authorised development, enter upon so much of any of the streets as are within the order limits and may...".</p> <p>Art 12(1)(b) states "tunnel up or bore" Is "up" necessary?</p> <p>Should this article be restricted to specific streets set out in a Schedule? Should it confirm that the power is "without the consent of the street authority"? Should the powers be exercised with the consent of the street authority subject to consultation?</p> <p>What is the view of NCC in respect of this Article?</p>
DCO.1.41	Applicant	<p><i>Art 14 -Classification of roads etc</i></p> <p>The Applicant should explain the rationale for the power in this Article in the EM.</p>
DCO.1.42	Applicant	<p><i>Art 14 -Classification of roads etc / Art 18 Clearways</i></p> <p>Variation of the provisions in these articles is possible under <u>any</u> enactment and arguably this has the effect of disapplying section 153 of PA2008 which provides a procedure for changing a DCO. Justification should be provided in the relevant sections of the EM as to why the provisions are necessary or expedient to give full effect to any other provision of the DCO.</p>
DCO.1.43	Applicant	<p><i>Art 15 – Temporary prohibition, restriction and regulation of the use of streets</i></p> <p>Should this article also apply to public rights of way?</p> <p>The EM indicates that Art 15 confers a power on Highways England where the use of a street has been temporarily stopped up under this article to use it as a temporary working site.</p> <p>EM paragraph 8.23 should mirror the wording of Article 15 i.e. refer to prohibition, regulation and restriction of streets rather than "temporary stopping up".</p>
DCO.1.44	Applicant NCC	<p><i>Art 16 – Permanent stopping up and restriction of use of streets, public rights of way and private means of access</i></p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>In Art 16(2)(b) should there be a reference to "public right of way" after "street" in line 5?</p> <p>In Art 16(3) reference is made to the right of way to be extinguished. Does the term "extinguish" need to be defined, or alternatively should another term be used as extinguish is not otherwise used?</p> <p>NCC - Comment on the provision contained within Art 16 of the draft DCO.</p>
DCO.1.45	NCC	<p><i>Art 17 – Access to works</i></p> <p>Comment on the provision contained within Art 17 of the draft DCO.</p>
DCO.1.46	Applicant	<p><i>Art 18 – Clearways</i></p> <p>Art 18(2)(a)(iii) Should the reference to Schedule 3A (the Electronic Communications Act 2003) be "Schedule 3A (the electronic communications code) to the Communications Act 2003"?</p> <p>Art 18 (2)(c)(iii) Change "persons" to "person's".</p>
DCO.1.47	Applicant IPs	<p><i>Art 22 – Powers in relation to relevant watercourses</i></p> <p>Art 22(4) defines "relevant watercourse" as so much of the River Coquet as the context requires.</p> <p>Is this sufficiently precise? Are IPs content with the powers which are being sought?</p>
DCO.1.48	IPs	<p><i>Art 23 – Discharge of water</i></p> <p>Comment on the provision contained within Art 23 of the draft DCO.</p>
DCO.1.49	Applicant	<p><i>Art 25 – Authority to survey and investigate the land</i></p> <p>The EM describes this article as the means by which, prior to the construction of the scheme, ground investigations and surveying can be undertaken.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to demonstrate how this provision relates to the scope of commencement defined in Art 2.</p>
DCO.1.50	Applicant	<p><i>Art 27 – Compulsory acquisition of land – incorporation of the mineral code.</i></p> <p>For consistency and precision, it is suggested that "acquiring authority" and "undertaker" are emphasised.</p>
DCO.1.51	Applicant	<p><i>Art 28 – Time limit for exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily</i></p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The EM states that this article sets a 5 year time limit on the power of Highways England to take temporary possession of land, although it does not prevent Highways England from remaining in possession of land after that time if it took possession within the 5 year limit.</p> <p>What is the rationale for the power to remain in temporary possession of land after the initial 5-year period has expired?</p>
DCO.1.52	Applicant	<p><i>Art 29 – Compulsory acquisition of rights and restrictive covenants</i></p> <p>Art 29(2) needs to specify that the right should be solely related to the Work No. specified in column 2 of Sch. 6.</p> <p>Art 29(4) references the divided land provision of the 1965 Act.</p> <p>An explanation for such provision is not provided in the EM. The Applicant is requested to do so.</p>
DCO.1.53	Applicant	<p><i>Art 31 – Modification of Part 1 of the 1965 Act</i></p> <p>The EM does not currently provide the rationale for the inclusion of this provision in this DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant should address this further.</p>
DCO.1.54	Applicant	<p><i>Art 32 Application of the 1981 Act</i></p> <p>The EM does not currently provide the rationale for the inclusion of this provision in this DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant should address this further.</p>
DCO.1.55	Applicant	<p><i>Art 33 – Acquisition of subsoil or airspace only</i></p> <p>It would be helpful if the EM could explain the rationale for the CA of airspace particularly with reference to the River Coquet bridges.</p>
DCO.1.56	Applicant	<p><i>Art 35 – Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development</i></p> <p>Art 35(1) References to “that land” in (b) and (c) should specify that this is as referred to in sub-paragraph (a).</p> <p>Art 35(1)(d) refers to “mitigation works”. This phrase does not appear in the definitions, nor is any further explanation given in the EM. The phrase should either be defined or an explanation of the need for these works/this power should be given in the EM.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Art 35(4): the EM should explain the rationale for these powers.
DCO.1.57	Applicant	<i>Art 38 – Apparatus and rights of statutory undertakers in stopped up streets</i> The SoS will be unable to authorise removal or repositioning of apparatus unless satisfied that the extinguishment or removal is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the development to which the order relates in accordance with section 138 of the Planning Act 2008. Justification is needed to show that extinguishment or removal is necessary.
DCO.1.58	Applicant	<i>Art 40 – Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows</i> Art 40(4)(b) The Applicant has identified the hedgerows to be removed in Part 1 of Sch. 9. The EM should explain why the additional general power in Article 40 (4)(b) is required. The EM indicates that the article provides an additional level of specification sought by PINS Advice Note 15. However, this is an alternative, not an addition. The Applicant is asked to provide further justification for this provision.
DCO.1.59	Applicant	<i>Art 42 – Application of landlord and tenant law</i> The EM should explain why this power is required in the context of the Proposed Development.
DCO.1.60	Applicant	<i>Art 43 – Operational land for purposes of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990</i> The title of the article should be amended to “Operational land for purposes of the 1990 Act” for consistency with other articles and because the 1990 Act has already been defined.
DCO.1.61	Applicant	<i>Art 43 – Operational land for purposes of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990</i> While the EM notes that this article follows Art 36 of the Model Provisions, the EM does not explain why this provision is required in this particular situation. Please clarify.
DCO.1.62	Applicant	A number of Articles make provision for “any dispute as to a person’s entitlement to compensation ... or as to the amount of compensation, is to be determined under Part 1 of the 1961 Act”. Part 1 of the 1961 Act only relates to compensation for compulsory acquisition.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The ExA considers that in order for there to be certainty that it would apply in other situations (e.g. the temporary use of land under Articles 35 and 36 of this Order), modification should also be included as with the other compensation provisions in Schedule 7 of the draft DCO [APP-014]. Please respond.
DCO.1.63	Applicant	<i>Sch. 1</i> The Applicant is asked to clarify the reference to s115(2)(b) in the preamble.
DCO.1.64	Applicant	<i>Sch. 1 – Work No. 5a</i> Please explain the rationale for the improvements to the existing road known as West View. In responding the Applicant is asked to have regard to Relevant Representations [RR-018 and RR-018].
DCO.1.65	Applicant	<i>Sch. 1 – Work No. 11c</i> Typo in line 2.
DCO.1.66	Applicant	<i>Sch. 1 – Authorised Development</i> After Work No 37 various works are listed: (a) to (x). Should the introduction to this section confirm that such works would not give rise to any materially new or materially different effects to those assessed in the ES instead of just relating to item (w)? (a) Explain why drainage works are covered subsequent to the list of numbered works and not part of the list. (o) Cocquet should be Coquet in item (o). (u) Explain why site construction compounds are not part of the list of numbered Works?
DCO.1.67	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R1 – Interpretation</i> The definition of European protected species refers to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. The reference should be to the 2017 Regulations and the regulation numbers updated accordingly. The definition of HEMP includes an explanation of its content which is also provided in R4. It would be more appropriate to include the information in R4 and to simply confirm what it is in R1.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.68	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R3 – Detailed Design</i> Should the reference to “materially worse adverse environmental effects” be changed to “materially different environmental effects” as occurs elsewhere in the dDCO?
DCO.1.69	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R4 – Construction and handover environmental management plans</i> <i>R4(2)(c)(vii) Should the reference to “local authority” instead refer to “relevant planning authority” which is defined in Art 2?</i> R4(2)(d)(vii) Should COSHH be described in full? R4(2)(d)(xv) Typo – “Way”.
DCO.1.70	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R5 – Landscaping</i> R5(2) Would it be appropriate to provide a document reference number for the illustrative environmental masterplan (which has two parts) as has been done for example with the REAC and for this to be noted as a certified document in Sch. 12? R(5)(3a): change “bases” to “based”?
DCO.1.71	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R7 – Protected species</i> <i>Should “the relevant parts of the relevant works... Secretary of State” be separated from R7(2)(c) as it appears to apply to parts (a) and (b) too?</i>
DCO.1.72	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R8 – Surface and foul water drainage</i> Should the reference to “materially worse adverse environmental effects” in R8(2) be changed to “materially different environmental effects” as occurs elsewhere in the dDCO?
DCO.1.73	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R9 –Archaeological remains</i> R9 provides for no part of the authorised development to commence until a written scheme for the investigation (WSI) of areas of archaeological interest has been submitted to and approved in writing by the SoS. Should R9 specify that the WSI should be based on the WSI annexed to the ES (Appendix 8.5 WSI for Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation Part A, Appendix 8.6 WSI for Archaeological Strip, Map and Sample Excavation (NG Diversion Works) Part A and Appendix 8.5 Draft Written Scheme for Investigation for Post DCO-Consent Trial Trenching Part B)? If so, should these be identified separately as certified documents?



**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.74	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R10 – Safeguarding of listed milestones</i> The reference to English Heritage should be changed to Historic England. English Heritage is also referred to in the EM.
DCO.1.75	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 R12 – Amendments to approved details</i> The requirement should clarify that the approval in writing should be by the Secretary of State.
DCO.1.76	Applicant	<i>Sch. 2 Part 2 – Further Information</i> Should “business days” be defined in either Art 2 or R1?
DCO.1.77	Applicant Environment Agency Statutory Undertakers	<i>Sch. 10 – Protective Provisions</i> Provide an update as to the acceptability of the Protective Provisions contained in Schedule 9 of the draft DCO
DCO.1.78	Applicant	<i>Sch. 12 Documents to be Certified</i> Should the reference to CEMP be to the outline CEMP?
DCO.1.79	Applicant	The Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-016] states at paragraph 2.1.1(d) that the Scheme has and will be developed on the basis of strong collaboration with key stakeholders, and agreements are expected to be secured at key stages of the Scheme development as necessary. The progress on these items will be reported to the ExA, with a summary of the current situation reported in Section 3 and Appendix A of this Statement.  The Applicant is asked to submit an update of Appendix A at each Examination Deadline as well as an update on the Statements of Common Ground listed in paragraph 3.2.2.
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>
GS.1.1	Applicant	In commenting of the policy objectives of the NNNPS, Table 11.2 of the ES [APP-052] states that Part A involves the on-line widening of the existing A1 carriageway and would not be introducing a wholly new development to the area.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Please confirm that Part A also includes off-line works. What are the implications of off-line working in terms of the policy objectives?
GS.1.2	Applicant	Table 11.3 of the ES [APP-052] refers to the Alnwick District Wide Local Plan. Should this be a reference to the Castle Morpeth Local Plan?
GS.1.3	Applicant	In commenting of the policy objectives of Policy POL1 of the Draft Northumberland Local Plan in Table 11.3 of the ES [APP-052] it is stated that "given that Part A comprises the widening of the existing carriageway there are no suitable alternative sites". The Applicant is asked to confirm that Part A includes off-line work and to consider its response to Policy POL3 in this context.
GS.1.4	Applicant	Table 11.6 of the ES [APP-052] outlines the Geology and Soils Magnitude Impact Criteria for Part A. How were the criteria determined? Has an assessment been undertaken for the entire Scheme? How would the criteria change if the entire Scheme were assessed, for example would the measure of loss of agricultural land need to change?
GS.1.5	Applicant	Paragraph 11.6.2 of the ES [APP-052] describes how Part A was broadly split in to four sub-sections (as illustrated on Figure 11.1: Study Area of the ES [APP-113]. Explain why it was decided to split the study area into sub-sections and how the four were determined. Are the sub-areas distinguished by the broken black line on Figure 11.1 [APP-113]?
GS.1.6	Applicant	In Appendix 11.1 of the ES [APP-261] Preliminary Sources Study Report, reference is made to Appendices A to I but these are not appended. Please provide the missing Appendices.
GS.1.7	Applicant	In Appendix 11.2 Ground Investigation Report of the ES [APP-262] paragraph 3.10 indicates that no additional information has been obtained from the Coal Authority. Does this conflict with Appendix 11.1 [APP-261] where Appendix I is a Coal Authority Report? Why was the Coal Authority not consulted for the Ground Investigation Report?
GS.1.8	Applicant	Appendix 11.4 of the ES [APP-263] is a Coal Mining Risk Assessment. Was the Coal Authority consulted in the preparation of this report? If not, why not?

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
GS.1.9	Applicant	Appendix 11.5 of the ES [APP-2634 is a Geology and Soils DMRB Sensitivity Test. Table 3.1 states that detriment to human health for current and future site users would have a major adverse magnitude leading to a slight adverse effect. Clarify where the magnitude is identified in Chapter 11 [APP-052].
		<b>PART B</b>
GS.1.10	Applicant	Table 11.6 of the ES [APP-053] outlines the Geology and Soils Magnitude Impact Criteria for Part B. How were the criteria determined? Has an assessment been undertaken for the entire Scheme? How would the criteria change if the entire Scheme were assessed, for example would the measure of loss of agricultural land need to change?
GS.1.11	Applicant	Paragraph 11.11.1 of the ES [APP-053] indicates that following reinstatement of the temporary land take, there would be a programme of monitoring of soil conditions to identify if there are soil problems which need to be remediated. The Applicant is asked to confirm the extent of the programme of monitoring and how it would be secured. Is the monitoring included within the outline CEMP? If so, indicate where; if not, why not?
<b>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>
HE.1.1	NCC	Table 8.4 of the ES [APP-046] states that the scope of post determination trial trenching and archaeological mitigation for advanced works was set out in two draft WSIs. These have now been completed and provided (Appendix 8.5 and 8.6) [APP-225 and APP-226]. Is NCC content with the final versions of the WSI?
HE.1.2	Applicant	Paragraph 8.5.5 of the ES [APP-046] states that there is only partial coverage of Part A by the Light Detection and Ranging data. What implications does the absence of comprehensive data have?

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
HE.1.3	Applicant	Reference is made in paragraph 8.7.30 of the ES [APP-046] to six designated heritage assets within the Order Limits comprising Grade II Listed mileposts. It is confirmed in paragraph 8.7.31 that two of the mileposts have not been located. Apart from a walkover survey what efforts have been made to identify what has happened to these mileposts? Has contact been made with the Milestone Society?
HE.1.4	Applicant	Paragraph 8.7.31 of the ES [APP-046] states that as the mileposts are Grade II listed, they are of medium value. As set out in Appendix 4.5 [APP-197] the updated DMRB Guidance indicates that the sensitivity (value) of heritage assets are no longer defined by its level or grade of designation and has to be assessed and justified for each heritage asset. Paragraphs 8.10.29-8.10.30 state that a review of Grade II Listed Buildings likely to be impacted has not identified any grounds for increasing their value from medium to high. How was this review undertaken and what were the findings for heritage assets generally and for the mileposts in particular?
HE.1.5	Applicant NCC Historic England	In paragraph 8.7.34 of the ES [APP-046] it is stated that the assessment identified 64 built heritage assets or designated areas within the Outer Study Area and that 20 built heritage assets have been identified as being potential sensitive receptors. The Applicant is asked to explain how the number of assets was reduced from 64 to 20. NCC / Historic England are asked to comment on the identification of the 20 sensitive receptors.
HE.1.6	Applicant	Historic hedgerows aligning the route of the existing A1 are recognised in paragraph 8.7.60 of the ES as being contemporary with the development of the former turnpike road in the 18 <sup>th</sup> century. Why are historic hedgerows assessed as being of low value?
HE.1.7	Applicant	Appendix D of Appendix 8.1 [APP-221] refers to the Scheme Boundary. Does the Scheme Boundary correspond with the Order Limits?
HE.1.8	Applicant	Appendix 8.4 [APP-224] provides a Gazetteer of Cultural Heritage Assets while Appendix D of Appendix 8.1 [APP-221] is a Historic Environment Gazetteer. The Applicant is asked to explain any differences between the two documents. Why were New Houses Farm and High Highlaws Farm included in the former but not in the latter?

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>Part B</b>
HE.1.9	IPs	Paragraph 8.1.2 of the ES [APP-047] identifies differences in the assessment between the chapters for Part A and Part B. Are IPs content with the different approaches? Are there any significant implications arising from the difference in approach?
HE.1.10	Historic England NCC	Table 8.4 of the ES [APP-047] notes the presence of a Prehistoric burial mound Scheduled Monument within the current Order Limits which was identified by Historic England and NCC as being the main point of concern. Are Historic England and NCC content that here would be no direct physical impacts on Scheduled Monuments?
HE.1.11	NCC	Table 8.4 of the ES [APP-047] notes that a Draft WSI for Historic Building Recording for Charlton Mires was submitted to NCC for comment. Is NCC content with the scope of the WSI?
HE.1.12	Applicant	Paragraph 8.7.3 of the ES [APP-047] states that within the Order Limits and Study Areas of the Part B Main Scheme Area there are seven Scheduled Monuments. Paragraph 4.3.20 of the SoR [APP-018] indicates that there are eight Scheduled Monuments located within 1 km of Part B with two Scheduled Monuments abutting the Order Limits and two located in close proximity to the Order Limits of Part B. Please clarify.
HE.1.13	Applicant	Paragraph 8.7.11 of the ES [APP-047] states that the Stone Cists and Tumulus (HER 5033) was found in the early 1800s. Table 8.11 states that Stone Cists and Tumulus were identified in the late 1800's (HER 5033). Please clarify.
HE.1.14	Applicant	Paragraph 8.7.11 of the ES [APP-047] states that the assessment identified nine designated and four non-designated (i.e. 13 in total) built heritage assets which could be temporarily or permanently impacted by Part B through change in setting during construction and operation. It then states that 15 built heritage assets have been identified as being potential sensitive receptors due to an anticipated change to the setting, before listing 13 of them.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Please clarify.
HE.1.15	Applicant	<p>According to paragraph 8.9.10 of the ES [APP-047] the non-designated milepost North of Shipperton Bridge (HER 16878), which would be removed as a result of Part B, would be subject to a Level 1 Survey in accordance with Historic England’s guidance 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 during construction. On completion of construction, the milestone should be reinstated as close as possible to its original location.</p> <p>In R10 of the draft DCO [APP-014] the Grade II listed milestones include National Heritage Number 168780. Please clarify whether that this refers to the non-designated milepost north of Shipperton Bridge.</p> <p>Should the reference in paragraph 8.9.10 to the Draft WSI be to the Draft WSI for Historic Building Recording (Appendix 8.6) [APP-296]?</p> <p>R10 of the dDCO refers to a written scheme for the protection of Grade II milestones. Should there be a reference in R10 to the need for the written scheme for the protection of Grade II milestones to be substantially in accordance with the Draft WSI for Historic Building Recording (Appendix 8.6) [APP-296]?</p> <p>In light of the comment at the end of paragraph 8.9.11 that any mitigation would be devised in consultation with NCC and the Milestone Society and set out in a method statement (which presumably relates to the milepost in the previous paragraph, not to Charlton Mires Farm) should the Milestone Society also be a consultee under R10?</p>
HE.1.16	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 8.9.10 of the ES [APP-047] states that a programme of historic building recording would be undertaken prior to the demolition of Charlton Mires Farm (WSP002) to ensure it is preserved by record in accordance with Historic England’s guidance and as presented in the Draft WSI for Historic Building Recording (Appendix 8.6) [APP-296].</p> <p>How would the WSI for Historic Building Recording be secured?</p>
HE.1.17	Applicant	<p>A suitable mitigation, and any necessary monitoring, strategy would be devised in consultation with NCC and set out in a WSI and/or a conservation management plan according to paragraph 8.11.1 of the ES [APP-047].</p> <p>How would a conservation management plan be secured through the DCO?</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
HE.1.18	Applicant	Figure 2 of Appendix 8.1 [APP-291] shows the location of non-designated heritage assets. How were WSP Heritage Assets defined and how do these differ from non-designated Historic Environment Records?
HE.1.19	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 8.10.16 of the ES [APP-047] notes that Charlton Mires Farm is a non-designated asset and is of at least mid-19th century date, with the potential for elements dating to the 18th century based on a review of historic mapping. It is judged to be of low value based on the evidence currently available. The construction of the new Charlton Mires Junction would require the demolition of the farm. The magnitude of impact after preservation by record would be permanent moderate adverse with a slight adverse effect (not significant).</p> <p>Please explain further how the demolition of this asset has been assessed as having a slight adverse effect particularly when the temporary and permanent land take and loss of residence and farm buildings from Charlton Mires Farm and the impacts on agricultural land holdings during construction are assessed to be large adverse in Table 17.3 [APP-063].</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>		
LV.1.1	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.3.38 of the ES [APP-037] refers to the former Kyloe Hills and Glendale Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV) and an unnamed former AHLV. These are identified as former designations because they were in the Alnwick District Local Plan which has since been superseded.</p> <p>As former AHLV, what is the status of these areas and how should they be addressed in policy terms?</p>
LV.1.2	Applicant	<p>ES Figures 2.1 [APP-066] and 2.2 [APP-067] show AHLV for Part A and Part B respectively. Is there any reason for the notation in each case being different?</p> <p>What is the status of an Intermediate Area of Landscape Value?</p>
LV.1.3	Applicant	<p>In paragraph 2.5.19 of the ES [APP-037] reference is made to hedgerow mitigation outside of the permanent boundary within third party land while paragraph 2.6.6 states that such hedgerow planting would be expected to be maintained by the relevant landowner.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		How would this be secured through the DCO? Is any hedgerow planting proposed outside of the Order Limits of Part B?
LV.1.4	Applicant Historic England	Table 4.5 of the ES [APP-039] states that Historic England agreed with the viewpoint locations, methodology and receptors for the landscape and visual assessment for Part B. Why did Historic England not confirm their agreement in respect of Part A? What is the Historic England position with regard to the viewpoint locations, methodology and receptors for Part A?
		<b>PART A</b>
LV.1.5	Applicant	Paragraph 7.8.3 of the ES [APP-044] states that 'the local LCAs listed above have been scoped out of the assessment because they are not anticipated to experience significant effects due to the lack of intervisibility created by intervening vegetation, topography and interrelationship with Part A'. To which local LCAs does this comment relate and was this approach agreed with relevant stakeholders?
LV.1.6	Applicant	A number of receptors have been scoped out of the assessment as listed in paragraph 7.8.2 of the ES [APP-044]. Impacts on two National Character Areas have been scoped out and also impacts on four Landscape Character Areas. Can the Applicant provide evidence of agreement with the AONB Officer to scope out impacts from Part A and Part B of the Proposed Development on the AONB? Can the Applicant confirm if they have discussed and agreed the approach on scoping out the NCAs for Parts A and B and the LCAs for Part B with relevant stakeholders and also provide evidence of this?
LV.1.7	Applicant	As summarised in paragraph 7.8.10 of the ES [APP-044], the Arboricultural Report (Appendix 7.5) [APP-220], details the landscape features that would be lost as a result of the construction of Part A comprising: clearance of 28.2 ha of woodland; clearance of 30.2 ha of trees and groups of trees; clearance of 12.5 ha of hedgerow (based on canopy cover) and removal of 187 of the approximate 300 trees that make up the Coronation Avenue. The Applicant is asked to expand on this summary, providing further detail in terms of the number and value of the landscape features to be lost.



**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.1.8	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 7.8.10 of the ES [APP-044] referencing the Arboricultural Report (Appendix 7.5) [APP-220], states that the Scheme would require the removal of 187 of the approximate 300 trees that make up the Coronation Avenue. The Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] shows the location of the proposed Coronation Avenue trees while the Vegetation Removal Plan [APP-096] shows trees lost to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to show on a plan the Coronation Avenue trees to be retained, those to be lost and the proposed Coronation Avenue trees. Explain the reasoning behind the replacement tree strategy.</p>
LV.1.9	Applicant	<p>Section 7.10 of the ES [APP-044] provides an assessment of likely significant effects in respect of landscape and visual matters.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to further demonstrate with reference to each landscape feature, how the effects summarised in paragraph 7.8.10 have been assessed.</p>
LV.1.10	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 7.9.13 of the ES [APP-044] refers to a proposed Woodland Creation Area which would replace removed ancient woodland and provide connectivity to the adjacent and retained ancient woodland. This would appear to be secured through the DCO via the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] through R5(2).</p> <p>Does the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan provide adequate detail about the woodland to be created? IPs are invited to comment.</p>
LV.1.11	Applicant IPs	<p>Paragraph 7.9.14 of the ES [APP-044] describes the development of the landscape mitigation masterplan, and the mitigation principles adopted. It notes that the landscape mitigation design is set out in Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095].</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to explain the process in developing the landscape mitigation masterplan, how the mitigation principles were established and to confirm what those principles are.</p> <p>Are IPs content with the scope of the Masterplan? Is there a need for a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to set the Masterplan in context?</p>
LV.1.12	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 7.9.15 of the ES [APP-044] states that the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan (Figure 7.8) [APP-095] includes the restoration of habitats with reference made to Table 9.22 in Chapter 9: Biodiversity of the ES [APP-048]. Table 9.22 describes the mitigation for the loss of habitats of principal importance by area / length.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Does the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan provide adequate detail about the mitigation? IPs are invited to comment.
LV.1.13	Applicant	<p>Table 7.22 of the ES [APP-044] describes the significant visual effects on occupants of 10 residential properties by Year 15. Paragraph 7.10.34 of the ES states that while these receptors would experience a significant change to their <i>“view or views, considering the location of Part A it is not considered that any of these properties would suffer unduly from negative visual effects such as visual over-dominance, overbearance, or blocking of light, which collectively may affect the overall visual amenity from the residential property.”</i></p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm if any mitigation measures could be employed in these locations to reduce the level of adverse effect on the 10 receptors?</p>
LV.1.14	Applicant	<p>Table 7.25 assesses the design parameters for Part A. Twelve design parameters are discussed and justification is provided for each parameter. Parameter 1 discusses the possibility for additional tree and hedgerow removal.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm where in the dDCO, the replacement hedgerow and tree planting for Parameter 1 is secured?</p>
LV.1.15	Applicant	<p>Throughout Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] reference is made to the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095]. R5(2) of the dDCO [APP-014] refers to the illustrative environmental masterplan.</p> <p>Are these intended to be the same document? If, so should the titles be consistent? If not, explain the differences.</p>
LV.1.16	IPs	IPs are asked whether the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] would adequately address how landscape and ecological features would be protected and managed during construction and reinstatement.
LV.1.17	Applicant / IPs	<p>The Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] includes a key showing different landscape elements and references environmental function, environmental elements and landscape elements. Explain how the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan works alongside the outline CEMP [APP-346].</p> <p>Should explanation of the masterplan proposals be included within the masterplan, a separate LEMP or remain solely within the outline CEMP? IPs are invited to comment.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.1.18	Applicant	The Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] provides for 'Proposed Hedgerow – By Agreement'. Is any proposed hedgerow to be provided outside of the Order Limits? What would be the legal basis of the agreement? What are the implications if agreement cannot be reached? How does this category of mitigation differ from 'Proposed Hedgerow – Essential Mitigation'? If the hedgerows are required to mitigate adverse impacts why is the provision subject to agreement only?
LV.1.19	Applicant	Proposed Individual Trees are provided for in the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095]. What is the strategy for providing individual trees in terms of location and number?
LV.1.20	Applicant	The Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] makes provision for Amenity Grassland and Conservation Grassland. What is the strategy for such provision in terms of location and area?
LV.1.21	Applicant	Explain the purpose of the Proposed Temporary Boundary as shown within the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095]. What form would this take? Does it correspond with the Order Limits?
LV.1.22	Applicant	The source of the references to environmental function, environmental elements and landscape elements in the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] is the DMRB. What impact if any do the changes to the DMRB have in respect of the masterplan?
LV.1.23	Applicant	Figure 7.9 of the ES [APP-096] Vegetation Clearance Plans shows trees lost to the Scheme. How do these unspecified trees relate to Appendix A of the Arboricultural Report (Appendix 7.5) [APP-220] which provides a Survey Schedule?
LV.1.24	Applicant	Paragraphs 3.1.12 – 3.1.15 of the Arboricultural Report (Appendix 7.5) [APP-220] records the response of The Woodland Trust to the Scheme. To what extent did the Applicant attempt to address these concerns?
LV.1.25	Applicant	Table 5.1 of the Arboricultural Report (Appendix 7.5) [APP-220] provides a Potential Impact Summary with Table 7.1 assessing Likely Significant Effects. The total number of

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		trees to be removed for Part A is given as 367. This does not appear to include the individual trees in the wooded areas, linear groups or groups of trees. What is the figure when these are included?
LV.1.26	Applicant	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment presented in Chapter 7 of the ES for Part A [APP-044] and Part B [APP-045] presents an assessment of likely significant effects at summer of the design year 15, after mitigation planting is established. Can the Applicant explain why a winter design year 15 scenario has not been considered, to account for a worst case?
		<b>PART B</b>
LV.1.27	Applicant	Paragraph 7.7.11 of the ES [APP-045] identifies the location of three Areas of Landscape Value, which are designated in local policy comprising the Kyloe Hills and Glendale AHLV designated in the former Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Local Plan, an unnamed AHLV designated in the former Alnwick District Wide Local Plan and an unnamed Intermediate Area of Landscape designated in the former Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Local Plan. The Applicant is asked to confirm the planning status of each of these areas.
LV.1.28	Applicant	Figure 1 of the Arboricultural Report [APP-286] (Arboriculture Constraints Plan) shows 'The Avenue – Historic Tree Lined Road'. Explain the significance of this feature and how it has been assessed.
LV.1.29	Applicant	Paragraph 7.9.5 of the ES [APP-045] refers to a number of specific mitigation measures relating to landscape and/or visual effects being addressed through the Landscape Mitigation Plan (Figure 7.10 [APP-144]). (Paragraph 7.9.6 makes reference to the landscape mitigation masterplan.) Explain why this is not described as a masterplan unlike its Part A equivalent and with reference to the respective keys, explain any difference in approach to landscape mitigation.
LV.1.30	Applicant	Table 7.23 of the ES [APP-045] identifies significant adverse effects at seven residential receptors at Year 15 after mitigation measures have been introduced. There appears to be no explanation as to why mitigation measures will not reduce impacts to these receptors down to a level which is assessed as being not significant.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Can the Applicant explain why it is not possible to mitigate against significant adverse effects at the residential receptors identified in Table 7.23 and shown in Figure 7.3: Viewpoint Location Plan [APP-137] (ie receptors 3,4,5,6,7,8 and 10).
LV.1.31	Applicant	<p>Table 7.28 of the ES [APP-045] assesses the design parameters for Part B. Parameter 3 explains that the realignment of the Northern Powergrid Circuit may require slightly different landscaping treatment within the highway boundary. Visual details are provided in the Landscape Mitigation Plan including Assessment Parameter Plan 3 [APP-148].</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain the differences between the landscape mitigation measures which may be required for the Northern Powergrid Circuit realignment?</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain where the design parameters for Part A and Part B are reflected in the dDCO?</p>
LV.1.32	Applicant	<p>Monitoring arrangements for Part B are set out in Section 7.11 of the ES [APP-045]. Six viewpoints (2,4,6,7,9 and 11) will be revisited at operational years 5, 10 and 15 to assess that the effects on viewpoints are being adequately mitigated by the installed mitigation measures.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm if the viewpoints which will be revisited, include the viewpoints which are representative for those receptors which are identified as experiencing a permanent moderate adverse effect?</p>
LV.1.33	Applicant	<p>In describing monitoring, Section 7.11 of the ES [APP-045] does not describe what arrangements would be put in place if the planting strategy does not achieve the anticipated level of mitigation.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain what triggers would be used to establish whether the planting strategy has achieved the anticipated level of mitigation and the actions that would be taken should the proposed planting strategy be found to not have achieved the anticipated level of mitigation?</p> <p>How is implementation of any such actions secured through the dDCO or other legal mechanism?</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm if the monitoring arrangements for Part A and Part B have been agreed with relevant stakeholders?</p>
LV.1.34	Applicant	Figure 7.11 of the ES [APP-145] Vegetation Clearance Plan does not show the category of tree to be cleared or cross reference this to the Arboricultural Report [APP-286].

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		How do these unspecified trees relate to the Arboricultural Report which provides a Survey Schedule?
LV.1.35	Applicant	Paragraph 3.2.4 of the Arboricultural Report [APP-286] states that a consultation response was not received from the Forestry Commission. Has the Applicant sought comments on the Arboricultural Report from the Forestry Commission since the submission of the application? If not, why not?
LV.1.36	Woodland Trust	The Woodland Trust does not appear to have been consulted on the Arboricultural Report [APP-286]. Does the Woodland trust have any comments on the Arboricultural Report?
LV.1.37	Applicant	Table 7.1 of the Arboricultural Report [APP-286] - Likely significant Effects – Trees, Groups, Hedges, Linear Groups, Shrubs and Wooded Areas appears to adopt a different approach to that adopted in Table 7.1 of Part A [APP-220]. For example, the former uses the terms partially impacted, directly impacted and protection require/not impacted whereas the latter uses the terms partial removal, remove and retain. Explain why different approaches have been adopted and produce a composite which enables the likely significant effects to be considered across the Scheme as a whole. How many trees would be lost under the Part B proposals?
LV.1.38	Applicant	Figure 2 of the Arboricultural Report [APP-286] is a Tree Protection Plan for Part B. The equivalent plan for Part A is provided as Figure B4 [APP-220]. Explain why different approaches have been adopted and produce a composite which enables tree protection measures to be considered across the Scheme as a whole.
<b>MATERIAL RESOURCES</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>
MR.1.1	Applicant	Table 13.2 of the ES [APP-056] sets out National Planning Policy Relevant to Material Resources. It includes the Highways England Sustainable Development Strategy. As the Applicant's own advice, what weight should be given to this document during the Examination?
MR.1.2	Applicant	Table 13.16 of the ES [APP-056] states that suitable earthworks cut would be reused and retained where possible and placed in landscape bunds within the Order Limits. In

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		particular, these would be reused on site in landscape bunds (specifically within proposed bunds 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 & 13). Please direct the ExA to where these proposed bunds are shown on a plan.
		<b>PART B</b>
MR.1.3	Applicant	Section 13.5 of the ES [APP-057] does not refer to the presence of Ash Dieback disease in the location of Part B in spite of Part A [APP-057] noting that the disease may adversely impact the reuse of site-won earthworks. Please clarify whether Ash Dieback disease would be a consideration in relation to Part B.
MR.1.4	Applicant	Table 13.15 of the ES [APP-057] shows Material Assets Imported to site during the Construction Phase. In respect of asphalt the amount for Part B is 120,000 tonnes while that for Part A (Table 13.15) [APP-056] is 60,702 tonnes. Similarly, for concrete the respective figure for Part A are 8,450 tonnes and Part B 23,420 tonnes. Please explain the reasons for such wide variations between the two Parts.
MR.1.5	Applicant	Table 13.16 of the ES [APP-057] shows Forecast Site Arisings that can be Recovered and Hence Diverted from Landfill. For topsoil the amount for Part B is 11,840 tonnes while the comparable figure for Part A [APP-056] is 160,000 tonnes. Please explain the reasons for such wide variations between the two Parts.
MR.1.6	Applicant	Table 13.17 of the ES [APP-057] shows Forecast Site Arisings that have been Identified for Disposal to Landfill. For Part B the earthworks and topsoil cut figure is 2,715 tonnes while for Part A [APP-056] the unsuitable earthworks cut figure is 315,000 tonnes. What does the difference in terminology indicate and why are the figures so widely different?
MR.1.7	Applicant	Paragraph 13.10.16 of the ES [APP-057] states that the sensitivity test has identified that Part B would achieve 99% material recovery / recycling. In comparison Part A (paragraph 13.10.16) [APP-065] estimates a 61% recovery would be achieved. Please explain the difference in recovery rates between the two Parts.
<b>NOISE AND VIBRATION</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
NV.1.1	Applicant	<p>Section 6.7 of the ES [APP-042] provides an overview of the baseline conditions for Part A. Noise sensitive receptors are presented in Table 6.20, Noise Important Areas are identified in Table 6.21 and Designated areas and Footpaths are presented in Table 6.22.</p> <p>The measurement locations for the noise surveys and the extent of the survey area are presented in Figure 6.1 [APP-079]. Table 6.18 presents the baseline noise survey results for long term unattended monitoring. Table 6.19 presents baseline noise survey results for short-term attended measurements.</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify why the long-term monitoring shown in Table 6.18 was only undertaken for a single 24-hour period?</p>
NV.1.2	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 9.9.19 of the ES [APP-042] states that Part A gives rise to significant adverse noise effects at three receptors. Paragraph 9.9.23 indicates that 3m high noise barriers were tested in these locations but did not reach the 3decibel threshold for meaningful benefit to the residents of those properties. Therefore, it is proposed to install 4m noise barriers at these locations.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain what the decibel reduction benefit of a 4m high noise barrier would be compared to the 3m high barrier?</p>
NV.1.3	Applicant	<p>Table 6.35 of ES [APP-042] explains the level of significance experienced at all of the receptors which were included in the noise assessment. Significant adverse residual effects are identified at Group 7 (two receptors) and Group 8 (1 receptor). The ES does not appear to explore any other possible mitigation measures.</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify what alternative mitigation measures have been explored with regard to reducing noise levels at the three receptors located in Group 7 and Group 8?</p>
NV.1.4	Applicant	<p>Part A and Part B contain a commitment to monitor impacts from noise and vibration during construction [APP-042 and APP-043]. No monitoring arrangements are intended for the operational phase.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain why monitoring will not be undertaken, given that there are significant adverse impacts which have been identified at three residential properties in Part A?</p>
		<b>PART B</b>
		There are no additional questions relating to Noise and Vibration for Part B at this point.



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>
PHH.1.1	Public Health England	Paragraph 4.2.31 of the ES [APP-039] states that Public Health England recommended the consideration of Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) in the ES. As set out in paragraph 4.2.39, based on the initial assessment the proposals would be compliant with EMF exposure guidelines and the issue has therefore been scoped out of further assessment. Is Public Health England content with this outcome?
PHH.1.2	Applicant	Paragraph 12.1.4(e) of the ES [APP-054] states that Part A considers employment by industry baseline data for 2011, whereas Part B also considers data for 2017 / 2018, because the assessments were completed at different times. However, it is considered that there would be no material difference if 2017 / 2018 data was used for Part A. Explain how this conclusion has been drawn.
PHH.1.3	Applicant	ES paragraphs 12.4.49 [APP-054] and 12.4.44 [APP-055] state that the number of jobs generated is based on an evaluation of total construction cost against average gross output per construction worker. It is not stated what the average gross output per construction worker is, nor the source of this metric.  The Applicant is requested to provide this information.
PHH.1.	Applicant	Paragraphs 12.4.64 [APP-054] and 12.4.60 [APP-055] of the ES refer to "human health receptors" (including residential premises / homes, care homes, hospitals, schools, places of worship, sensitive commercial premises, neighbourhoods and communities within the area) but these are unspecified.  The Applicant is requested to confirm precisely what assets are considered human health receptors.
PHH.1.2	Applicant	Table 12.4 of the ES [APP-054] confirms that the NCC PRoW Officer was consulted and agreed with the proposed methodology to assess the potential effects on PRoW as a result of Part A.  What is the response of NCC to the effect of the Proposed Development on PRoW? Are appropriate alternatives proposed where closures / diversions are required?

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
PHH.1.	Applicant	Tables 12.5 and 12.6 of the ES (Part A [APP-054] and Part B [APP-055]) present thresholds used to assign levels of stress for single and dual carriageway roads respectively. These are meant to replicate those in the DMRB guidance. However, the average journey speed in Table 12.6 differs from that in the DMRB: Table 2 in the DMRB has three categories (Under 60, 60-80, and Over 80 km/hr) while in Table 12.6 these are lower (Under 50, 50-70, and Over 70 km/hr). Can the Applicant explain this discrepancy?
PHH.1.2	Applicant	Paragraph 12.6.12 of the ES [APP-054] states that the study area for the assessment of agricultural land holdings is restricted to the Order Limits, whereas other physical assets have been assessed with a study area of the Order Limits plus 500m. The Applicant is requested to explain why this is a suitable area to capture all agricultural land holdings that might be affected in terms of access, water supply and drainage?
PHH.1.3	Applicant	Paragraph 12.6.13 of the ES [APP-054] states that the assessment of impacts on the economy and employment during construction focuses on the county of Northumberland. This is because it is assumed that much of the construction workforce would be drawn from the regional labour market. Clarify the extent of the regional labour market. Is this Northumberland or further afield?
PHH.1.4	Applicant	It is stated in paragraph 12.7.35 of the ES [APP-054] the PRoW in the Study Area do not form a coherent network. In addressing changes which needed to be made to the PRoW network as a result of the Proposed Development were any opportunities identified to make the network more coherent? Would NCC wish to comment on the opportunities for a more coherent PRoW network?
PHH.1.5	Applicant	The Applicant is asked to provide a plan showing all PRoWs and any other walker, cyclist and horse rider (WCH) routes in a wider context and the effect of the Proposed Development on these networks.
PHH.1.6	NCC	Is NCC content that the 2016 survey data provides a realistic representation of how the local footways and PRoW are being used by WCH?
PHH.1.7	Applicant	Table 12.24 of the ES [APP-054] presents a Summary of WCH Movements within the Study Area in 2016. Paragraph 12.7.43 states that existing WCH movements were carried

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>out between July and September 2016, over seven days (three Thursdays, and two weekends).</p> <p>Do the results in Table 12.24 provide totals for the seven days? Over what time period each day was data recorded?</p>
PHH.1.8	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.9.16 of the ES [APP-054] states that any temporary diversionary works or closure of WCH routes (as identified in Table 12- 37) would be undertaken following consultation with affected individuals, groups, and NCC.</p> <p>To what effect would the consultation be meaningful if a decision on the closure / diversion of a route had already been taken through the DCO?</p>
PHH.1.9	Applicant	<p>ES paragraphs 12.10.57 [APP-054] and 12.10.37 [APP-055] state that the sensitivity of local economic receptors is medium. It is not clear what exactly is meant by 'economic receptors' and there is no justification for attributing them a 'medium' sensitivity.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to clarify this matter.</p>
PHH.1.10	Applicant	<p>Chapter 12 of the ES [APP-054] and the supporting Figures contain some inconsistencies between properties comprising the baseline for 'residential and commercial properties'.</p> <p>For Part A, the Applicant is requested to ensure that residential properties in Tables 12.25 and 12.26 [APP-054] are consistent with Figure 7.6 [APP-109], and that commercial properties in Tables 12-27 and 12-28 [APP-054] are consistent with Figure 12.2 [APP-178].</p>
PHH.1.11	Applicant	<p>Wansbeck Food Bank is located within the Part A study area, north of Northgate Hospital, however it is not listed amongst the community facilities (ES paragraph 12.7.59) [APP-054].</p> <p>Has the Applicant considered the impacts of the scheme on Wansbeck Food Bank?</p>
PHH.1.12	Applicant	<p>ES paragraphs 12.9.24/ 12.9.28 [APP-054]/[APP-055] regarding economy and employment outline some measures to increase the potential for the workforce and supply chain to be sourced locally. The effectiveness of this mitigation does not appear to have been considered in the assessment and it is not stated how these measures are to be implemented and secured.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to clarify this.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
PHH.1.13	Applicant	<p>In the analysis of Driver Stress in Appendix 12.2 of the ES (Part A [APP-320] and Part B [APP-321]), it is not clear which thresholds (those in Table 12.5 or 12.6) are used to assign the levels of stress. Some of the classifications of driver stress do not accord with the methodology set out in these tables. For example, 'Link ID 1985-40011' in the '2038 Do Something' scenario is classified as 'Low' for both AM and PM but applying the criteria this should be 'Moderate'.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to confirm which thresholds are being applied to which road link.</p>
PHH.1.14	Applicant	<p>Section 12.10 of the ES [APP-054] [APP-055] provides an assessment of likely significant effects, a number of which are significant adverse effects. No further mitigation has been proposed.</p> <p>For those matters for which a significant residual effect has been established, can the Applicant explain whether any further mitigation measures have been explored or are available to reduce the significance of effect?</p>
		<p><b>PART B</b></p>
PHH.1.15	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.3.37 of the ES [APP-037] states that the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound would not impact on commercial development locally because it is likely that the temporary use would be complete before the land is used for commercial development. What is the basis of this assertion?</p>
PHH.1.16	Applicant	<p>Table 12.42 of the ES [APP-055] provides a Summary of Potential Effects on Access to Private Properties during Construction without Mitigation. Why does the table not make reference to East Cottage and Charlton Mires Farm when both are proposed to be demolished?</p>
PHH.1.17	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.10.18 of the ES [APP-054] states that "during construction of Part B East Cottage and Charlton Mires Farm are required to be demolished to enable Charlton Mires Junction to be constructed. The sensitivity of these assets is high as they are receptors with limited capacity to absorb change. The magnitude of impact is considered to be major. Overall, there would be a direct, permanent effect of large significance (considered to be significant), but compensation would be provided to landowners."</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Notwithstanding that the effect would not change, why was the sensitivity recorded as 'high' rather than 'very high'?
PHH.1.18	Applicant	<p>Chapter 12 of the ES [APP-054] and the supporting Figures contain some inconsistencies between properties comprising the baseline for 'residential and commercial properties'. For Part B, the Applicant is requested to ensure that residential properties identified in Tables 12.25 and 12.26 [APP-055] are consistent with Figure 7.6 [APP-093], and that commercial properties identified in Tables 12.26 and 12.27 [APP-055] are consistent with Figure 12.3 [APP-181], to accurately present the residential and commercial properties identified in the study area. Additionally, for Part B, residential and commercial properties which fall within the study area of the Lionheart Enterprise Compound and the Main Compound should be systematically listed in tables and consistently presented on accompanying figures.</p>
PHH.1.19	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.7.101 of the ES [APP-055] states that there are several allocations designated under the Alnwick Local Development Framework 2007 for industrial and employment land within the Lionheart Enterprise Park which fall within the Study Area. It states that "the majority of this land has now been developed and is under use as part of the Enterprise Park" [APP-055]. It is not stated precisely how much land is undeveloped. The Applicant is requested to provide on the quantity and nature of the undeveloped land.</p>
PHH.1.20	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.10.2 of the ES [APP-055] states that there will be an overall increase in the level of driver stress experienced during construction and that mitigation would limit these effects where possible, but it does not assign this effect a level of significance. The Applicant is requested to confirm the significance of this effect.</p>
PHH.1.21	Applicant	<p>There is land allocated under the Alnwick Local Development Framework 2007 for industrial and employment land within the Lionheart Enterprise Compound that will be affected by the development. The Applicant is requested to explain how effects on this land from the construction compound have been assessed or provide an assessment of these effects based on the relevant criteria.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT</b>		
TT.1.1	Applicant	<p>In paragraph 2.5.59 of the ES [APP-037] reference is made to footways being provided over the Highlaws Junction, with paragraph 2.5.62 stating that footways would be provided over the Fenrother Junction and paragraph 2.5.64 stating that footways would be provided over the West Moor Junction</p> <p>What provision is made for other non-motorised users at these junctions?</p>
TT.1.2	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 4.1.10 of the ES [APP-039] states that a sensitivity analysis was carried out, in order to test whether the predicted traffic levels would materially affect assessments for the revised opening year and design year. The result of this sensitivity analysis was that there would be increases in vehicle movements (up to 4%) in the opening year (2024), and a decrease in predicted vehicle movements (up to 3%) in the design year (2039).</p> <p>Explain why there was a decrease in predicted vehicle movements in the design year.</p>
TT.1.3	Applicant	<p>In paragraph 3.7.4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] it is stated that in 2038 in a 'without Part A' scenario, the model forecasts show that it would take users around 10½ minutes to travel along the route in both directions. By 2051 this is predicted to increase to 12 minutes travelling northbound and 11½ minutes travelling southbound. Paragraph 3.7.5 explains the changes with Part A in place while paragraphs 3.7.6 and 3.7.7 present the position for Part B.</p> <p>Do the figures for travel times only take account of Part A compared with Part A improvements or do they consider the entire Scheme improvements? The same question applies to Part B. Please clarify and provide comparable figures for without improvements and with improvements for the entire.</p>
TT.1.4	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 4.4.1 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] states that the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) flows for the A1 between Morpeth and Felton are around 10,000 vehicles a day in each direction of which approximately 11% are identified as HGVs. It is noted that the percentage of HGVs is significantly higher than the average figure for rural A roads of around 6% as reported by DfT.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.5 states that AADT flows for Part B are around 5,000 vehicles a day in each direction of which approximately 15% are identified as HGVs.</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		How do these figures compare with other parts of the Strategic Road Network for example other parts of the A1 and the A6 in the North West?
TT.1.5	Applicant	Table 7 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] provides thresholds of proximity and scale of development into the uncertainty log. How were these thresholds determined? Were the authorities consulted?
TT.1.6	Applicant	In paragraph 4.7.3 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] it is stated that a decrease in predicted vehicle movements (up to 3%) in the design year (2038) is expected. What is the basis for a decrease in vehicle movements particularly when there is a predicted increase in vehicle movements (up to 4%) in the opening year (2024)?
TT.1.7	Applicant	Table 9 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] provides Annual Average Daily Traffic Forecasts. Within this context, the Applicant is asked to provide an overview of the Scheme construction vehicle numbers which would use the A1. This should address all construction compounds but with particular reference to the use of the main compound at West Moor junction for the construction of Part B.
TT.1.8	Applicant	Paragraphs 4.82 and 4.83 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] address journey times and reliability for 2013 and 2051. As with ExQ1 TT.1.3 the Applicant is asked to address this for Part B and for the entire Scheme.
TT.1.9	Applicant	In Tables 20 and 21 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] no figures are presented for the Intermediate Peak. Why not?
TT.1.10	Applicant	Paragraph 4.9.29 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] states that the wider impacts for the Scheme have been calculated using WSP's Wider Impacts in Transport Appraisal (WITA) tool. The spreadsheet tool emulates the methodology set out in WebTAG A2.1. Why was the WITA used instead of WebTAG A2.1?
TT.1.11	Applicant	Table 22 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] shows the Wider Impact Benefits over the 60 year appraisal period.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Explain why / how the impacts for the full appraisal period are so much greater than those achieved in 2051.
TT.1.12	Applicant	<p>It is stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] that the average collision rate between 2012 and 2016 is 169 collisions per billion vehicle miles. The national average rate for all A Roads is 466 collisions per billion vehicle miles and for rural A Roads, this value drops to 270 collisions per billion vehicle miles. This analysis shows that along the Scheme, the average collision rate is lower than the national average between 2012 and 2016.</p> <p>Average collision rates are below the national average rate which indicates that the proposed improvements are not primarily to address accident rates. The Applicant is asked to comment including with reference to Table 25.</p>
TT.1.13	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 4.10.25 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] states that overall, there are forecast to be accident savings along the Scheme links compared to the without Scheme scenario. Accident benefits are also forecast on parallel routes to the Scheme including the A1068, A697, A696 and A68. These benefits are a result of reductions in traffic on these roads as traffic switches to using the A1 on completion of the Scheme. Paragraph 4.10.6 confirms that there would be a general increase in traffic flows being drawn onto the A1 as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>To what extent would the growth in traffic on completion of the Scheme be as a result of redistribution from other roads? Should this be seen as a benefit or disbenefit of the Scheme?</p>
TT.1.14	NCC	<p>Paragraph 4.11.16 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] states that surveys have been undertaken to establish which pathways and junctions were commonly used by WCH (walkers, cyclists and horse-riders) users.</p> <p>Does NCC wish to comment on the location and / or outputs of these surveys?</p>
TT.1.15	Applicant IPs	<p>According to paragraph 4.11.21 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] there would be a number of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) that would be directly affected by the Scheme and would be permanently closed or diverted during operation. It indicates that the PRoWs that will be closed as a result of the Scheme are not frequently used with less than five users observed at each site over the six survey days. Additionally, paragraph 5.3.12</p>



**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>states that the inclusion of grade-separated junctions and changes to PRow would improve connectivity and safety, and therefore benefit users.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to confirm the details of the surveys which were undertaken which led to the proposed closures and permanent diversions. How would the inclusion of grade-separated junctions and changes to PRow benefit users when it is proposed to permanently close or divert a number of PRows? Following the publication of the Applicant's response to this question at Deadline (D)1, IPs are invited to comment on this response by D2.</p>
TT.1.16	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 4.11.24 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] notes that although there are closures of PRows as a result of the Scheme, with increased walking times in some cases, these closures are not expected to have a substantial impact due to the low usage of the PRows. Improvements to facilities for WCHs through the inclusion of footways crossing the A1 will provide benefits to WCHs. Overall, the Scheme is considered to have a slight beneficial to moderate adverse impact on WCHs.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to substantiate this conclusion and to comment on the effects of these proposed changes on the wider WCH network. Following the publication of the Applicant's response to this question at Deadline (D)1, IPs are invited to comment on this response by D2.</p>
TT.1.17	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 1 of Appendix C of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] refers to the proposed A1 Alnwick to Ellingham dualling scheme. The title provided above paragraph 1 refers to A1 'Morpeth to Felton' and 'Alnwick to Ellingham' Dualling.</p> <p>Please clarify the area to which Appendix C refers.</p>
TT.1.18	NCC	<p>Is NCC, as Highway Authority content with the scope of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-347]? Does section 5.10 of the CTMP provide adequate guidance at this stage to guide the scope of the PRow Management Plan to be secured through R4?</p>
TT.1.19	Applicant	<p>The CTMP [APP-347] sets out in section 2.3 estimates of the amounts of different materials needed for construction.</p> <p>In general terms, how do these amounts convert to vehicle movements?</p>

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
TT.1.20	Applicant	<p>In their Relevant Representations, Amble Town Council [RR-002] and Tom Lloyd [RR-015] question why access to Causey Park Bridge is being reduced in favour of Fenrother junction.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to provide evidence for this proposed change. NCC are also asked to comment as the highway authority.</p>
TT.1.21	Applicant	<p>In their Relevant Representation NCC [RR-001] raise concerns about the proposed Charlton Mires junction in terms of capacity, public transport provision and the speed limit.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to respond.</p>
TT.1.22	Applicant	<p>In their Relevant Representation NCC [RR-001] seek further information in respect of whether peak hour flows have been assessed in the ES and whether discrete junction modelling has been undertaken.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to respond.</p>
TT.1.23	Applicant	<p>NCC [RR-001] as local highway authority is seeking clarification in respect of the extent of highway adoption in relation to the de-trunked A1 and the new local highway network outwith the carriageway and footway areas shown in the submitted plans. In addition, a number of other Relevant Representations raise the issue of highway adoption / responsibilities.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to clarify this matter.</p>
<b>WATER ENVIRONMENT</b>		
		Questions in relation to the Water Environment will be asked in ExQ2.

**ExQ1: 19 November 2020****Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021****ANNEX A**

A1 in Northumberland – Morpeth to Ellingham:

List of all objections to the grant of Compulsory acquisition OR TEMPORARY POSSESSION powers (ExQ1: Question CA1.2)

<b>Obj No.<sup>i</sup></b>	<b>Name/ Organisation</b>	<b>IP/AP Ref No<sup>ii</sup></b>	<b>RR Ref No<sup>iii</sup></b>	<b>WR Ref No<sup>iv</sup></b>	<b>Other Doc Ref No<sup>v</sup></b>	<b>Interest<sup>vi</sup></b>	<b>Permanent / Temporary<sup>vii</sup></b>	<b>Plot(s)</b>	<b>CA?<sup>viii</sup></b>	<b>Status of objection</b>

i Obj No = objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence.

ii Reference number assigned to each Interested Party (IP) and Affected Person (AP)

iii Reference number assigned to each Relevant Representation (RR) in the Examination library

iv Reference number assigned to each Written Representation (WR) in the Examination library

v Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination library

vi This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:

- Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of Order land;
- Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the Order, but who “would or might” be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the Order being implemented, or Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the Order has been implemented;
- Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the Order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the Order.

vii This column indicates whether the applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land/ rights

viii CA = compulsory acquisition. The answer is ‘yes’ if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and National Grid are seeking compulsory acquisition of land/ rights.