

## Questions posed to the IP's from the ExA

**AQ.1.2 - 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?**

### IP Comment

1. As my property lies within 8 metres of the road expansion the potential increase in air pollution is naturally a major concern. As such I have raised a number of queries on this topic with the Applicant the most recent being in May 2020 but have yet to receive a response. I am hopeful that a scheduled meeting with the Applicant will help answer the queries.
2. I have a number of concerns with the currency of the data sources. I understand that the majority of the data was captured in 2015 and the subsequent results extrapolated before the current plans were formulated. A significant number of changes have been made to the plans since then which have a direct impact on air pollution.
3. Although it may be standard industry practice but I am struggling to understand how an accurate forecast can be derived from data recorded 10 years ahead of actual implementation. This concern is further exacerbated when you consider the range of different factors which have an impact upon air quality.
4. In deriving an air quality forecast I understand that there are a large range of unknown variables which require assumptions to be made. Given the dependency on such variables I was expecting a wider range of potential results to cover different scenarios. For example, what is the impact on air quality in the event that there is an accident and traffic is stationary for some time.
5. As the latest plans include the placing of a layby close to the property, I was hoping to see some specific data on the impact of stationary vehicles running idle in a layby. Similarly, there is no data source which identifies the additional impact of an operational depot being placed close to the property.
6. Given the age of the data sources I was expecting to see a schedule for further surveys to be carried out to update and validate the results. As it stands, I understand that there is no intention to carry out any further surveys on air pollution.
7. In reading the results I did not pick up on any detail which showed the impact of different weather conditions on air pollution.
8. Unfortunately, there was a Coroner's Inquest investigating the sad death of Ella Kissi-Debrah on 16<sup>th</sup> December. The outcome of the inquest concluded that air pollution was the direct cause of death. Are there any lessons learnt from that landmark case that should be considered in this review on air quality?

**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?**

**IP Comment**

1. In looking at the list of receptors and the respective grid references it would appear that one of the receptors was placed within my property. Whilst if correct this would have been reassuring but we are not aware of any receptor being placed there. Can the Applicant please confirm actual position of the receptor and when the study took place for this particular receptor? Similarly, how accurate are the other receptor grid references listed?
2. As my property lies within 8 metres of the road expansion the potential increase in air pollution is naturally a major concern. As such I have raised a number of queries on this topic with the Applicant the most recent being in May 2020 but have yet to receive a response. I am hopeful that a scheduled meeting with the Applicant will help answer the queries.

**BIO 1.2 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?**

**IP Comment**

1. I do not feel that I have sufficient understanding of the technical topic here to make a comment.

**BIO.1.4 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?**

**IP Comment**

1. I do not feel that I have sufficient understanding of the technical topic here to make a comment.

**BIO.1.8 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?**

**IP Comment**

1. Given the dynamic nature of the environment I am struggling to understand how a short snapshot survey taken over 2 years ago can provide a full indication of the potential impact.

2. This position is exacerbated further with surveys scheduled for 2020 being cancelled due to Covid constraints.

**BIO.1.8 Are IPs content with the search / study areas identified in paragraph 9.6.2 of the ES [APP048]?**

**IP Comment**

1. The paragraph highlights the intention to survey protected species over a 2k distance which is measured from the centre line of the road. If this is measured as 1k on either side of the carriageway then I believe that this would be woefully inadequate when you consider the breadth of the works intended in some places including my own property. If it is 2k on both sides of the centre line then this is better but an additional allowance should be made where the required works extend beyond the carriageway.

**BIO.1.29 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?**

**IP Comment**

1. I do not feel that I have sufficient understanding of the technical topic here to make a comment.

**BIO.1.37 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.**

**IP Comment**

1. I do not feel that I have sufficient understanding of the technical topic here to make a comment.

**DCO.1.47 Art 22 – Powers in relation to relevant watercourses Art 22(4) defines “relevant watercourse” as so much of the River Coquet as the context requires. Is this sufficiently precise? Are IPs content with the powers which are being sought?**

**IP Comment**

1. If my interpretation is correct then this would appear to be quite draconian with minimal protection offered to the property owner.

**DCO.1.478 Art 23 – Discharge of water. Comment on the provision contained within Art 23 of the draft DCO .**

**IP Comment**

1. If my interpretation is correct then this would appear to be quite draconian with minimal protection offered to the property owner. Given the scale of change planned for my property there is a possibility that I will be subjected to the implementation of these powers. Naturally I am concerned that I will be required to incur further detriment without any recourse.

**HE.1.9 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?**

**IP Comment**

1. I do not feel that I have sufficient understanding of the technical topic here to make a comment.

**LV.1.11 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]. 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. 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?**

**IP Comment**

1. Whilst it is positive to see the detail of the landscape mitigation principles, I am struggling to see this approach reflected in the actual plans detailed in APP-095.
2. As I have a number of outstanding queries relating to the Masterplan, I would welcome further detail and context provided by a landscape and ecological management plan.
3. As the current plans involve major detrimental changes to the landscape that I currently enjoy I have raised a number of concerns and queries with the Applicant on this topic in May 2020 which remain outstanding. I am hopeful that a scheduled meeting with the Applicant will help answer the queries.

**LV.1.16 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.**

**IP Comment**

1. Unfortunately, the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan shown in APP-095 is a major source of frustration and disappointment as I believe that it falls well short of what should be achieved to address landscape and ecological features.
2. In considering my property, as an example, the plans involve major changes to the to a picturesque landscape on all sides of the property. The current outlook from my property which includes mature woodlands and a pleasant tree lined avenue is to be replaced with 7 lanes of tarmac including a layby and access roads. The Landscape Masterplan offers very little mitigation to offset the detriment to visual effect. The sense of frustration is further exacerbated when the impact on the landscape visual is categorised as being slight.
3. As the plans involve major detrimental changes to the landscape that I currently enjoy I have raised a number of concerns and queries with the Applicant on this topic in May 2020 which remain outstanding. I am hopeful that a scheduled meeting with the Applicant will help answer the queries.

**LV.1.17 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]. 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.**

**IP Comment**

1. As the plans involve major detrimental changes to the landscape that I currently enjoy I have raised a number of concerns and queries with the Applicant on this topic in May 2020 which remain outstanding. As some of my queries relate to the use of keys in the plans, I would welcome any additional information to help my understanding.

**TT.1.15 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 ExQ1: 19 November 2020 Responses due by Deadline 1: 12 January 2021 Page 65 of 67 ExQ1 Question to: Question: states that the inclusion of grade-separated junctions and changes to PRoW would improve connectivity and safety, and therefore benefit users. 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 gradeseparated 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.**

**IP Comment**

1. As this is a topic has a direct upon myself, I look forward to reviewing the publication of the Applicant's response.