

# **A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham**

**Scheme Number: TR010059**

## **Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations**

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010  
Rule 8(1)(c)

Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

**The A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to  
Ellingham**

Development Consent Order 20[xx]

---

**Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations**

---

<b>Regulation Reference:</b>	APFP Regulation Rule 8(1)(c)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010059
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010059/6.7
<b>Author:</b>	A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham Project Team, Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 0	January 2021	Deadline 1

---

# CONTENTS

---

<b>1</b>	<b>APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO RELEVANT REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>LOCAL AUTHORITIES</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>PARISH COUNCILS</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>OTHER STATUTORY CONSULTTEES</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>NON-STATUTORY ORGANISATIONS</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>1.6</b>	<b>MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND BUSINESSES</b>	<b>45</b>

---

## ***TABLES***

Table 1-1 - Northumberland County Council – RR-001	2
Table 1-2 - Amble Parish Council – RR-002	24
Table 1-3 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation – RR-003	25
Table 1-4 - Environment Agency – RR-004	26
Table 1-5 - Historic England – RR-005	26
Table 1-6 - Public Health England – RR-006	27
Table 1-7 - National Grid Gas PLC – RR-007	28
Table 1-8 - Natural England – RR-008	29
Table 1-9 - Northern Gas Networks – RR-009	32
Table 1-10 - BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Royal Mail – RR-010	33
Table 1-11 - Northumberland Estates – RR-011	34
Table 1-12 - RWE Renewables UK – RR-012	40
Table 1-13 - Transport Action Network – RR-013	42
Table 1-14 - The Woodland Trust – RR-014	44
Table 1-15 - Tom Lloyd – RR-015	45

---

Table 1-16 - Andrew Kirkman – RR-016	45
Table 1-17 - Gareth Moor – RR-017 and Colin Moor – RR-018	46
Table 1-18 - Dr Mark Green – RR-019	49
Table 1-19 - M E Beal and Sons – RR-020	49
Table 1-20 - Max Squires – RR-021	52
Table 1-21 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Robert John Fenwick Thorp - RR-022	53
Table 1-22 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Matthew Thomas Gray - RR-023	56
Table 1-23 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Paul Gray trading as D G Gray & Son - RR-024	58
Table 1-24 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Ann Riley - RR-025	60
Table 1-25 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of C J Bosanquet Children's Trust - RR-026, Rock Farms Ltd – RR-041 and Rock Settled Estate RR-042	62
Table 1-26 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Craig McLaren - RR-027	66
Table 1-27 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Dallas Allen - RR-028	69
Table 1-28 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Felicity Hester - RR-029	72
Table 1-29 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of House of Haggerston Ltd trading as Carnabys - RR-030	74
Table 1-30 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of J E G Grahamslaw & Sons - RR-031	75
Table 1-31 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of James Douglas - RR-032	78
Table 1-32 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of James Robson - RR-033	83
Table 1-33 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Jill Mary Gray - RR-034	86
Table 1-34 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Mick Holland - RR-035	88
Table 1-35 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Mr and Mrs A Kelly – RR-036	92
Table 1-36 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Neil and Elizabeth Elder - RR-037	93
Table 1-37 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Paul Dawson – RR-038	95
Table 1-38 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Robert John Fenwick Thorp and Nina Mickleborough – RR-039	96
Table 1-39 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Robin Tuer – RR-040	98
Table 1-40 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Shaun Robinson – RR-043	100
Table 1-41 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of William David Purvis – RR-044	106
Table 1-42 - Mark Hawes on behalf of residents of Northgate Farm – RR-045	109

---

Table 1-43 - Robert Thompson – RR-046	115
Table 1-44 - Scott Clarehugh – RR-047	118

# **1 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO RELEVANT REPRESENTATIONS**

---

## **1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT**

- 1.1.1. This document relates to an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) made on 7 July 2020 by Highways England (the 'Applicant') to the Secretary of State for Transport via the Planning Inspectorate (the 'Inspectorate') under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (the '2008 Act'). If made, the DCO would grant consent for the A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham (the 'Scheme').
- 1.1.2. The Scheme comprises two sections known as Part A: Morpeth to Felton (Part A) and Part B: Alnwick to Ellingham (Part B), a detailed description of which can be found in Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-037].
- 1.1.3. The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's response to the Relevant Representations (RR) from the interested parties.

## 1.2 LOCAL AUTHORITIES

**Table 1-1 - Northumberland County Council – RR-001**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.1	Northumberland County Council recognises the benefits of this project. There has been a long ambition and campaign to dual the A1 north of Morpeth and the Council is supportive in principle of the proposal. Support is contained within the Local Transport Plan and other policies and documents. The scheme is considered to be broadly in accordance with the Council' adopted and emerging policy.	
1.1.2	However, the local impacts and their cumulative impacts caused by the scheme should nevertheless be considered and adequately addressed by the applicant. The dualling of the A1 presents a major opportunity in the county and the scheme should not miss opportunities to improve the environment and accessibility in this part of the county. The nature of the scheme and the location of the proposal means that the scheme should be sensitive to its impact on both the environment and the communities through which it passes and serves.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant considers that all aspects of the environment and community have been assessed robustly, as reported within the Environmental Statement (ES), for both Part A and Part B [APP-035 to APP-336]. The Applicant considers that the likely significant cumulative effects as a result of the Scheme have been robustly assessed and the findings are presented in Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects Part A [APP-060], Chapter 15: Assessment of Combined Effects Part B [APP-061] and in relation to the Scheme as a whole presented in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects [APP-062].</li> <li>2. The development and design of the Scheme has inherently considered the environment and surrounding communities, wherever possible seeking to minimise the potential effects upon them.</li> <li>3. Furthermore, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has considered reasonable opportunities to improve the environment and accessibility through the Scheme, for example through the various mitigation measures proposed to reduce the effects of the Scheme. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-346] sets out the proposed commitments for construction and operation of the Scheme, for each of the technical environmental topics as well as a commitment to develop a strategy of biodiversity enhancements based on the opportunities set out in Chapter 9: Biodiversity for Part A [APP- 048] and Part B APP-049].</li> <li>4. The Scheme objectives, as presented in Section 2.2 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037], all relate to overall improved accessibility with the Scheme.</li> <li>5. Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054] indicates that Part A of the Scheme would benefit vehicle travellers along the A1 with a reduction in congestion. It would also improve overall accessibility for users of the network of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) through better connectivity and safer grade separated crossings at the overbridges at Fenrother Junction and Causey Park. Although there would be diversions and additional journey lengths along some PRoW, Part A would not sever walking, cycling and horse riders from community facilities and crossing over the A1 would be safer. A number of bus stops (northbound and southbound) would be removed for Part A, but the Scheme includes retention, relocation and formalisation of existing bus stop provision to ensure continued access to public transport. Furthermore, access to properties would either be maintained or made safer.</li> <li>6. Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] also indicates that Part B of the Scheme would benefit vehicle travellers along the A1 with a reduction in congestion, and access to properties would either be maintained or made safer. Although there would be diversions and additional journey lengths along some PRoW, Part B would not sever walking, cycling and horse riders from community facilities and crossing over the A1 would be safer. The completion of the Heckley Fence Accommodation Overbridge and the Charlton Mires Junction would provide grade separated provision for crossing the A1. Three existing bus stops would be extinguished as part of the Scheme, but two new stops are proposed along the B6341 (offline from the A1 for safety reasons) to replace these, and ensure continued access to public transport. It was recognised in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-055], Section 12.10 that usage of these services (as reported by the service</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>provider) is low. Temporary bus stops would be provided during construction of Part A and B. The exact location of these temporary locations would be finalised prior to construction in discussions with the service provider and NCC as the Highway Authority.</p> <p>7. Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] describes the forecast benefits of the Scheme, including travel time and journey time reliability benefits. Appendix C of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] details the forecast wider impacts of the Scheme.</p>
1.1.3	<p>The areas where the Council has significant concerns and where the issues remain unresolved have been outlined below, these matters will be further expanded in future representations submitted separately if they remain appropriate at that time.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant cannot respond to matters of which notice is not given. The specific points raised in the Relevant Representation are addressed below.</p>
1.1.4	<p>Many of the comments are made as a result of Officers from the Council not being given sight of documents prior to submission by the applicant and therefore this has been the first opportunity to raise any issues or concerns over the scheme. Many of these comments could have been avoided if more effective engagement by the applicant had taken place with the Council prior to submission.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant considers that effective consultation and engagement has been undertaken on the application as presented in the Consultation Report [APP-021]. This has also been acknowledged by Northumberland County Council (NCC) in their Adequacy of Consultation letter sent to the Planning Inspectorate dated 17 July 2020 [AoC-004].</li> <li>2. Table 3 (Engagement undertaken with the local authority, key stakeholders and land interests) of the Consultation Report [APP-021] sets out the engagement undertaken, outside of the advertised statutory consultation periods, with prescribed and statutory bodies, including NCC.</li> <li>3. This engagement has included throughout the development of the Scheme regular Working Group meetings between NCC and the Applicant.</li> <li>4. The Working Group meetings informed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Statement of Community Consultation methodology</li> <li>ii. Technical input for tie-in to local road network, including maintenance boundaries;</li> <li>iii. Technical input for widening West View to adoption standard;</li> <li>iv. Technical input for environmental assessments;</li> <li>v. Details of abnormal loads route and winter maintenance;</li> <li>vi. Details of existing refuse collection;</li> <li>vii. River Coquet second road bridge and retention of existing public right of ways;</li> <li>viii. Provision for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians on de-trunked carriageway;</li> <li>ix. Private means of access for replacement of existing direct accesses on the A1;</li> <li>x. Handover requirements for the de-trunked carriageway;</li> <li>xi. Construction diversion routes; and xii. Proposed construction compound sites.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. In addition to the regular Working Group meetings, there have additionally been several focused meetings with NCC regarding public rights of way and adoption of access routes associated with the Scheme.</li> <li>6. This consistent engagement has enabled NCC to have sight of design developments and to engage on matters arising from environmental studies, as well as commentary based on the early statutory consultation documents such as the Statement of Community Consultation (Appendix F of the Consultation Report [APP-022]) and Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (Appendix L of the Consultation Report [APP-026]). Due to the evolving nature of both the design and combination of the original proposed separate Development Consent Orders (DCOs) for Part A and Part B (which did not materially change the methodology and conclusions of the Environmental Statement (ES) previously discussed), the timeframe for submissions did not also allow for sharing of the combined application documents prior to the submission date of 7 July 2020. However, these documents were made available to NCC as a Statutory Consultee via the Section 56 process whereby NCC were informed of the availability of all submission documents from 14 September 2020. Further, the documents submitted with the application were revised versions of documents previously shared with NCC in respect of the component parts of the application.</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
Highways Issues		
1.1.5 a)	<p>Pedestrian and cyclist access along the length of the Morpeth to Felton section (Part A) with particular reference to pedestrian and cyclist connectivity between Morpeth and Felton via the de-trunked A1 and the new and existing pedestrian and pedestrian/cyclist connectivity. The proposals as they currently stand do not take full advantage of the potential to provide a connection along this corridor. Particular areas of concern include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>a) The lack of detail in relation to cross sectional changes to the de-trunked A1 to provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists along the full extent of this section including revision to the existing cross section reducing carriageway width to provide footways and cycleways as discussed in pre-application working group meetings with the applicant;</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The de-trunked A1 is the subject of ongoing discussions with NCC as part of development of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</li> <li>2. The Scheme is designed as a dual carriageway and, given the continued existence of the former A1, which is predicted to be much more lightly trafficked after detrunking, there will not be a need for additional cycling provision.</li> <li>3. The existing footway along the A1 from the A697 junction to Hebron Road is to be retained together with the existing footway along the A1 to be de-trunked from Tritlington School to Causey Park Road. A new shared footway is proposed for the new link road connecting the de-trunked A1 with Felton Road at West Moor grade separated junction. A programme of measures to promote the provision of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on the de-trunked A1 is outside the remit of the Scheme and is not the responsibility of the Applicant as the body responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of the strategic road network. The provision of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on the local road network are matters that fall within the responsibility of local highway and transport authorities as opposed to the operator of the strategic road network. Nonetheless, the Applicant welcomes the efforts of NCC in this regard.</li> <li>4. Subject to funding availability and any proposals meeting set criteria, such as being able to demonstrate it is an activity deemed beyond business as usual that is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme, there may be opportunities to make use of Designated Funds. Designated Funds is a series of the ring-fenced funds provided by Government to address a range of issues over and above the traditional focus of road investment and may be available to deliver additional enhancements, for example, cycling provision to enhance safety, connectivity and integration. The Applicant will liaise with NCC to identify possible enhancements for which Designated Funds can be applied for. There may also be other funding opportunities that NCC can explore such as through the Department for Transport Transforming Cities Fund.</li> </ol>
1.1.5 b)	The footway/cycleway connection around the A697 junction;	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing footway along the eastern edge of the A1, at the southern end of Part A which continues south towards the A192, is proposed to be retained by the scheme. This DCO application does not include a commitment to delivering a footway/cycleway connection around the A697 junction. This is because there are no recorded safety issues with the current arrangements and the Scheme proposals will not change the A697 configuration. Therefore, a footway/cycleway connection is not necessary to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
1.1.5 c)	The lack of connectivity between new footways at the Fenrother and Causey Park junctions themselves and the existing/proposed footways along the detrunked A1;	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] show footways over structures as a 'future proofing' measure. There is no existing footway infrastructure to tie-in to at Fenrother and Causey Park structures other than diverted Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) as shown on the Plans. The footway on the A1 to be de-trunked is not in close proximity to Fenrother junction or Causey Park overbridge to tie-in. Crucially, the structures are designed such that, should future access be required, the structures will not restrict this.</li> </ol>
1.1.5 d)	The lack of new provision of pedestrian footway on the de-trunked A1 where an existing footway does not exist; and	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This DCO application does not include new provision of pedestrian footway on the de-trunked A1 as there is not a footway there at present and it is not necessary to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. In addition, there are no pedestrian footways on adjacent NCC side roads.</li> </ol>
1.1.5 e)	Providing safe termination of new footways at the grade separated junctions away from potential points of conflict with vehicles.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Rights of Way and Access Plan [APP-009] show that the new footways will terminate away from the grade separated junctions to minimise potential points of conflict with vehicles.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.6	Private accesses, access rights and public rights of way connectivity at the southern end of the scheme tying into the existing network within the former Northgate Hospital site on West View will need to be resolved as the development of the Northgate hospital is not yet complete and a further planning permission for the redevelopment of the hospital and further residential development has not yet been implemented.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant notes the planned agreement between NCC and the developer of the Northgate Hospital site for modification to West View in future years. The Scheme will tie into a road that accesses the development which has already been constructed and the DCO application therefore accommodates further residential development of Northgate Hospital.</li> </ol>
1.1.7	The proposed new side road to be provided north of the Charlton Mires Junction on the east side of the widened A1 is not in line with the pre-application discussions which took place where it was requested that this road be provided as a 2-way 6.1m wide road and not a single track road with passing places due to the level of existing development this access road will serve as well as the future development plans at Charlton Hall (one of which is subject to a Highways England holding directive due to the impacts on the existing A1 junction).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed East Linkhall Access Road will be a two-lane carriageway. The Order limits allow for the required carriageway width suitable for adoption by NCC.</li> <li>The design is to be developed during detailed design to consider the future development plans at Charlton Hall and will be undertaken through ongoing liaison with NCC.</li> </ol>
1.1.8	The Local Highway Authority does not agree with the proposed 20mph speed limits to be imposed on the new side roads leading from the Charlton Mires Junction (both sides of the A1 widening) and the Rock South Farm access roads. Further discussions are required in relation to determining an appropriate speed limit to apply to these side roads that are self-enforcing and appropriate to the design of the routes.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has designed the new side road leading from the Charlton Mires Junction in line with NCC's Residential Roads and Footpaths in Northumberland design guidance which advised a 20mph speed limit for this type of road. However, the Applicant acknowledges that rather than imposing lower speed limits on the long straight or large radii bends, agreed traffic calming features could be incorporated as part of detailed design.</li> <li>The Applicant has had further discussion with NCC to determine that the national speed limit is appropriate and any traffic calming features. This will be set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</li> </ol>
1.1.9	Public Transport provision for the section of A1 north of the Charlton Mires Junction is required for those dwellings/developments that have severed bus connectivity as a result of the widening, including Charlton Hall.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant does not propose to remove connectivity to existing bus stops on the A1 north of the new Charlton Mires junction as part of the Scheme. The features raised by NCC have been confirmed by the bus provider as markers that denote the boundary between fare zones, and are not bus stops. Therefore bus connectivity has not been severed by the Scheme. This issue is recorded as item 16 in Table 3-2 of the NCC Statement of Common Ground.</li> </ol>
1.1.10	Further information is requested in respect to whether peak hour flows have been assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment and whether any discrete junction modelling has been undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed junction designs can operate within their operational capacity and that any potential queues from them do not interact with either the Local Highway Network or Strategic Highway Network. This would need to undertake in conjunction with any cross sectional changes on the de-trunked section of the former A1 reflecting the comments earlier in this response.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peak hour flows have been used within the following assessments within the ES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air quality assessment: Chapter 5, Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Chapter 5, Air Quality, Part B [APP-041] – Dispersion modelling undertaken based on Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) 24 traffic data split into AM, PM, inter-peak and off-peak periods of the day. Traffic data generated from macro-simulation traffic modelling (SATURN) which includes detailed Scheme and junction designs.</li> <li>Climate assessment: Chapter 14, Climate Part A [APP-058] and Chapter 14, Climate Part B [APP-059] - AADT 24 data, which includes peak flows, has been used for the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) traffic assessment.</li> <li>Population and Human Health assessment: Chapter 12, Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054] and Chapter 12, Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] - Peak traffic flows (AM and PM) have been used for driver stress calculations (in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 9, Vehicle Travellers guidance).</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>2. Section 4.9 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] details the junction modelling which has been undertaken for the proposed junctions on the A1. The modelling concludes that all junctions assessed are forecast to operate well within capacity and with minimal queuing (no more than one vehicle on average) in all time periods on either the Local Highway Network and Strategic Road Network. Detailed junction modelling has not been undertaken for the de-trunked sections of the A1, as the significant forecast reduction in flows will lead to reduced delays compared with the without Scheme scenario.</p> <p>3. As noted in the responses to RR 1.1.5a and 1.1.5b above, the Scheme does not include a commitment to delivering changes to the cross section of the de-trunked A1 to provide facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and therefore no detailed junction modelling of such potential changes has been undertaken at this stage.</p>
1.1.11	<p>The Local Highway Authority seeks clarification in respect to the extents of highway adoption in relation to the de-trunked A1 and the new local highway network out with the carriageway and footway areas shown in the submitted plans. It would be anticipated that the verge areas, especially those which forms embankments and/or cuttings that either support the highway or the surrounding land would be adopted as highway. The extents of the responsibilities for the soft estate/landscaping also need to be defined noting it is the position of NCC that detention basins and SuDS ponds associated with the scheme would remain the responsibility of Highways England and not form part of the Local Highway Network.</p>	<p>1. The extents of highway adoption and permanent boundaries for Highways England and NCC are described below:</p> <p>2. The trunk road and associated junctions, slip roads and their soft estate will remain with the Applicant. Private Means of Access will stay with the appropriate landowner. The Applicant proposes for the following list of roads to be adopted by the local authority:</p> <p>Part A</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. West View;</li> <li>2. Realigned section of High Highlaws Road approaching Highlaws Junction (2/A in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>3. De-trunked A1, from Priests Bridge (PA 3/5 in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] to the new West Moor roundabout, including the realignments related to Fenrother Lane (East) (4/B and 4/C in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]) and the new link road (8/B in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>4. Bywell Road (8/A in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>5. Realigned section of West Moor Road approaching West Moor Junction (9/A in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> </ol> <p>Part B</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rock South Farm Access Road (from PA 14/2 to PA 15/5 in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]). West Linkhall Access Road (from PA 15/3 to PA 16/1 in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>2. East Linkhall Access Road (from PA 15/4 to PA 16/4 in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>3. Local Authority roads to be handed back to landowner:</li> <li>4. Rock South Farm Road (from 13/C to PA 14/2 to in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>5. Critical infrastructure relating to the new trunk road and its supporting earthworks and soft estate will remain under the maintenance of the Applicant. Other earthworks supporting local access roads and management of its soft estate will form part of the handover to the local highway authority.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>6. Further principles defining the embankments and cuttings have been discussed between the Applicant and NCC and are set out in the accompanying Appendix TT3. Initial proposals are for these to be in line with the carriageway maintenance boundaries (as shown in appendix TT3), formal arrangements for this will be determined at the Detailed Design stage, along with the exact point where the adoption changes within the local and connector road junctions.</p> <p>7. Detention basins associated with servicing the trunk road will be the responsibility of the Applicant. There are two basins DB17a and DB17b which service Bywell Road and the new de-trunked link road respectively. These roads are to be adopted by the Local Highway Authority, while the basins would be maintained by the Local Authority.</p> <p>8. All of the above is secured by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014].</p>
1.1.12	There are no details in respect to the replacement and updated road signage associated with the sections of roads that will become part of the Local Highway Network along with any other areas that will require amended signage resultant from the proposals. Whilst the DCO provides powers to amend signage, we would wish to enter into a discussion with the applicant to develop and subsequently implement a signage strategy for the scheme with the agreed scheme either submitted to the Examination or as a condition of the DCO.	<p>1. The signage strategy to be implemented on completion of the works is not normally provided in relation to a scheme of this nature at this point.</p> <p>2. The Applicant's dDCO [APP-014] includes powers to replace and update verge signage as part of the Scheme. Strategic positioning of new road verge signs has been accounted for within the Order Limits for the Scheme.</p> <p>3. Access road signing and temporary diversion signing are referenced in the Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347].</p> <p>4. The Applicant will work with NCC during the detailed design stage to agree a Signing Strategy. Refer to the Outline CEMP [APP346] (reference S-PH3).</p>
<b>Public Rights of Way</b>		
1.1.13	The Highways Authority is satisfied that Highways England has properly considered the impact of the project on the public rights of way network in Northumberland. It has carefully balanced the need to provide an improved trunk road for motor users while ensuring that the adjacent and adjoining public rights of way network is not disproportionately affected by the scheme. This has been achieved by proposing the diversion of existing public rights of way onto new alignments, the creation of new rights of way and limiting the number of public rights of way that are proposed for extinguishment and for which no replacement has been provided.	<p>1. Noted</p>
1.1.14	It is noted, however that the Environmental Statement only assesses rights of way between Morpeth and the River Coquet at Felton. No assessment is provided for the scheme to the north at Ellingham.	<p>1. The ES assesses rights of way within the entirety of the Scheme, including Part B of the Scheme (Alnwick to Ellingham). This is set out within Chapters 5 to 15 [APP-040 to APP-061]. No assessment has been undertaken in relation to the A1 north of Ellingham, as this section of the route is not included within the Scheme and is not affected by it.</p>
1.1.15	The Highways Authority has identified a number of errors within the DCO in respect of the Public Rights of Way and it is expected that these can be corrected during the course of the application, however, the Authority may wish to raise these issues later in the process if they remain unresolved.	<p>1. The input of NCC as local highway authority is welcomed and should any errors come to light these will be amended. A review and feedback exercise are ongoing with NCC to address points raised in correspondence received 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020. Liaison calls were held in Dec-20 and planned for Jan-21. Any amendments made to the application documents will be submitted to the Examining Authority, where required.</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.16	There are a number of rights of way proposed to be stopped up which are not affected by the proposal. The Local Authority object to these closures unless they are temporary closures to enable the development work.	<p>1. The following list of PRoW were listed in error in Schedule 3 of the dDCO [APP-014] as to be stopped up. They are not shown as affected on the RoW &amp; Access Plans [APP-009]. Schedule 3 of the dDCO will be updated for submission following the NCC liaison meeting mentioned above in Jan-21.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRoW 423/008 running north/south, east of Causey Park Bridge</li> <li>• PRoW 129/023 running from public right of way 129/014 and B1430</li> <li>• PRoW 129/012 running from public right of way 129/023</li> <li>• PRoW 129/005 running from Rock Midstead and Rock South Farm</li> <li>• PRoW 110/019 running from B6341 proposed A1 alignment</li> <li>• PRoW 110/010 running from the B6341 and proposed public right of way 129/021</li> <li>• PRoW 112/008 running from Westlink Hall</li> <li>• PRoW 112/037 running from A1 at North Charlton and Bridleway 218/024 Charlton Burn</li> <li>• Bridleway 218/024 running from public right of way 112/037 to north of Brownieside</li> <li>• PRoW 112/007 running from Bridleway 218/024 and Bridleway 126/026</li> <li>• PRoW 129/006 running east from Rock South Farm</li> </ul> <p>2. Only PRoW proposed to be stopped up have been correctly assessed as being impacted/severed by the Scheme. Please refer to TT.1.15 of the Applicant's Response to the First Written Questions for additional information on this assessment.</p>
Landscape and Visual Effects		
1.1.17	The applicant has not aligned the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) methodologies and combined into a single assessment covering the two sections which is unhelpful given that the scheme is now a single application.	<p>1. As stated at paragraph 16.4.22 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects of the ES [APP-062] of this ES, the remote nature of the two study areas meant that a proportionate approach was taken to the assessment of landscape and visual effects, and differences in the approach to the assessment of each Part do not alter the findings of the assessment. This is confirmed in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects of the ES [APP-062], paragraphs 16.4.18 – 16.4.22, for consideration of the landscape and visual assessment for the Scheme.</p> <p>2. Part A and Part B were originally proposed to be the subject of separate applications for DCOs, and therefore the assessment of Part A and Part B were originally prepared separately to reflect this. The differences in the approaches are acknowledged and described in paragraph 7.1.6 in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part A [APP-044], and paragraph 7.1.6 in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045]. These differences are focused around the agreed scope (in consultation with NCC - refer to Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part A [APP-044] and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045]) of the assessments set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part A [APP-044], and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045], including the selection of receptors, viewpoints, night time assessment, the study area and approach to the assessment of footpaths.</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.18	<p>The landscape assessment has not been carried out in accordance with current guidance contained within LA107 and therefore current best practice with respect to considering effects on Residential Visual Amenity (LI TGN 02/19) and landscape sensitivity ('An Approach to Landscape Sensitivity' Natural England, June 2019) have not been referenced or applied. This has meant that the focus of the assessment has retained a focus on private amenity rather than public visual amenity. The assessment fails to consider the public visual amenity of communities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of landscape effects has been undertaken in accordance with then-current best practice as set out in IAN 135/10. Following the issue of updated guidance, a sensitivity test has been undertaken, which demonstrates that the original assessments appropriately predict landscape impacts. It is of course the case, that IAN 135/10, the predecessor to LA107 had been valid beforehand and that NCC will have been familiar with the methodology meaning that it will have suffered no prejudice as a result.</li> <li>2. New guidance in the form of LA 107 was issued and effective in Revision 0, September 2019. Production of the assessment for DCO application the Applicant had already been completed. The Applicant therefore undertook a sensitivity test of the assessment against the new guidance in LA107, as set out in paragraph 7.10.60 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part A [APP-044], and paragraph 7.10.28 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045]. This concluded that adopting the LA107 methodology would not change the overall findings of the assessment. In line with DMRB GG101 Rev 0 (in particular, paragraphs 1.3 and 1.4), Highways England's approach to the adoption of new guidance is to rely upon existing assessments where they have reached a stage such that additional significant costs would be incurred should the new guidance be adopted. For the Scheme, assessments were substantially complete, and should the new guidance have been adopted significant costs would have been incurred. Nevertheless, and out of an abundance of caution, the Applicant undertook sensitivity tests to demonstrate that the conclusions of the original assessments remained valid.</li> <li>3. A Residential Visual Amenity Assessment was not identified as being necessary within the Scoping Report Part A [APP-338], Scoping Report Part B [APP-339] or required within the Scoping Opinion Part A [APP-340] and Scoping Opinion Part B [APP-341] received from the Planning Inspectorate. NCC's representation in response to scoping in relation to residential assessment confirmed agreement on a set of viewpoints to be used for the assessment of visual effects, but the Applicant has gone further and provided an assessment of individual or groups of residential receptors identified as being subject to effects as a result of the Scheme. Scoping Opinion Part A [APP-340] did request that the Applicant agree the residential and non-residential receptors to assess, which was undertaken at the outset of the assessment as agreed viewpoints (including with NCC), and this is evidenced in Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Part B [APP-045].</li> <li>4. The guidance 'An Approach to Landscape Sensitivity', Natural England, June 2019, is not appropriate for the assessment, the focus being on a spatial planning approach to the issue of sensitivity, rather than a specific site or development such as the Scheme, for which, the application of specific guidance in Interim Advice Note (IAN) 135/10 (as superseded by LA107) and Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Revision 3 (GLVIA 3) is appropriate. The adoption of the guidance is not mandated in the current LA107 guidance. IAN 135/10 was the previous guidance provided within the DMRB for the landscape and visual assessment of highways schemes. GLVIA 3 is the guidance produced by the Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment for the landscape and visual impact assessment of development, which provides broader guidance for highway and non-highway developments.</li> <li>5. Viewpoints as agreed with NCC, and as described in Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], include viewpoints representative of public visual amenity, available from publicly available locations, the purpose of which was to assess the effects in accordance with best practice.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>6. In addition, and to ensure that the effects on the residents of the scattered nature of the dwellings within the study area were appropriately assessed, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has included an assessment of those properties with a view of the Scheme. Therefore, the effects on public visual amenity has formed an integral part of the assessments as set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part A [APP-044], and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045].</p>
1.1.19	<p>The impacts on Fenrother, Causey Park, Causey Park Bridge and West Moor as places and communities are not considered and this has implications for the mitigation design. Viewpoints in the LVIA should reflect these impacts. In particular the viewpoint at Fenrother, where the chosen viewpoint does not include the proposed junction, at Causey Park Bridge, where no viewpoint is provided to illustrate the effect on the community and Rock, where no viewpoint assessing the impact on the Conservation Area is provided.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not correct that the LVIA impacts on the communities of Fenrother, Causey Park, Causey Park Bridge and West Moor as a result of the Scheme have not been assessed. The viewpoints agreed with NCC as described in Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045] are associated with publicly accessible locations, and are representative of local residents, rights of way and local roads, all of which make up a community. Figure 7.6: Visual Effects Drawings Residential Properties Part A [APP-093], and Appendix 7.2: Viewpoints Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-217] sets out the receptors associated with the communities identified by NCC in paragraph 19.</li> <li>2. Those specifically identified by NCC include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fenrother – Viewpoint 36</li> <li>• Causey Park - Viewpoint 29, 31, 32</li> <li>• West Moor – Viewpoint 27</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. With respect to Causey Park Bridge, as part of the viewpoints previously agreed with NCC there is no viewpoint associated with the Causey Park Bridge locality. However, the assessment does identify within Appendix 7.3: Residential Visual Effects [APP-218] the effects on individual receptors (ref 56 – 64 and the Oak Inn – as identified on Figure 7.6: Visual Effects Drawings Residential Properties Part A [APP-093]) that make up the community of Causey Park Bridge, which is sufficient to determine the significance of effect.</li> <li>4. With reference to the Rock Conservation Area, Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045] evidences the agreement on the viewpoints with NCC and Historic England, the latter deferred the agreement of viewpoints to NCC. This provides that the assessment of Rock Conservation Area was scoped out of the assessment, following a site visit in the summer of 2018, during which a viewpoint that afforded a view of the Scheme could not be identified. The viewpoints for the assessment were agreed in an email from NCC (12/9/18), refer to Appendix 4.2 Environmental Consultation [APP-194].</li> </ol>
1.1.20	<p>The landscape susceptibility judgements are not explained – the text focuses on quality and value.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment was undertaken in accordance with IAN 135/10, and sensitivity has been determined using descriptions set out in Annex 2 Table 1 Visual Sensitivity and Typical Descriptors. As set out at 1.1.18, above, the Applicant carried out a sensitivity test which concluded that adopting the LA107 methodology would not change the overall findings of the assessment. Further, susceptibility for the landscape character areas is identified, alongside quality and value, in Table 7-15 - Local Landscape Character Area, in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-1 – Appendix 7.3: Landscape Effects Schedule Part B [APP-288].</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.21	<p>The Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) provided are based on “bare earth” terrain models and are of limited value in identifying where views of the proposals may realistically be possible. LA107 requires that “the ZTV identified for linear infrastructure projects, such as roads, shall be constructed for a sequence of points along the road with heights of structures (i.e. bridges and gantries) and vehicles along with existing screening features built into it to better demonstrate visibility of all aspects”. The ZTVs should therefore include the screening effects of existing above ground features (eg woodland, buildings, settlements etc).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The preparation of the ZTV (referred to as the ZVI in IAN 135/10) has been used as a tool to determine the outer limits of the study area. In the absence of available roadside information to build into the model, the ZTV has supported site-based surveys, in line with the up-to-date guidance in paragraph 3.35.1 LA107 which sets out:</li> <li>2. “Mapping existing screening features identified (i.e. tree lines, woodland, industrial/large buildings, etc.) in the ZTV to assist the visibility analysis is difficult to achieve accurately, therefore field surveys should be used to judge their effects.”</li> <li>3. This identifies that mapping the existing screening features is difficult to achieve accurately. Therefore, in line with the LA107 guidance, and the methodology set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, the ZTV and establishment of the study area, and location of viewpoints has been supported by field surveys, some of which have been undertaken alongside representatives of NCC as set out Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and have along with discussions with NCC informed the assessment of the landscape character and visual effects of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
1.1.22	<p>The landscape mitigation plans do not form part of the application drawings, raising a concern that they do not form part of the scheme to be delivered. There is also a lack of certainty over hedgerow removal during the construction stage and areas of hedgerow marked as being retained may have to be removed to construct sections of the highway. Although they might be replaced, the impact of the road would be starker in the medium term until they matured.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Landscape proposals for the Scheme are illustrated in Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144]) which form part of the DCO application and are referred to in the relevant ES chapters. In addition, mitigation proposals are set out within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346], refer to Table 3-1, S-L1 – S-L4. The Applicant therefore considers that the landscape mitigation plans do form part of the DCO application, and as such, is committed to their delivery, as identified in S-L2, Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme within the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>2. The landscape and visual assessment is based on the clearance of vegetation, including woodland, individual trees and hedgerows, as set out in Figure 7.9: Vegetation Clearance Plans Part A [APP-096] and Figure 7.11: Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145]. Should any additional vegetation be identified as requiring removal at the detailed design stage this will be subject to replacement on a like for like basis refer to S-L2 of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme within the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. In addition, an appropriate evaluation of change exercise would be undertaken by the Applicant, to determine if its removal would lead to a potentially significant effect. As has previously been identified, the Landscape design as set out in Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144]), including any additional vegetation clearance and replacement will be approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with NCC as per Requirement 5, Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014].</li> </ol>
1.1.23	<p>The replacement Coronation Avenue is a token gesture, consisting of trees spaced roughly every 100m. This avenue plays an important role in retaining a rural, well vegetated character through this section of the route and the LVIA is quite clear about the local importance of the Avenue as a landscape feature and the sparse nature of the replacement compared to what is removed is not explained or justified in the application.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In paragraph 7.8.10 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] it is acknowledged that 187 no. of the 300 no. trees that form the Coronation Avenue would be removed by the Scheme. Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] identifies the indicative location of the replacement trees, at regular intervals along the extent of the A1 where the presence of trees planted as part of the Coronation Avenue currently exist, totalling 38no. As has been identified above, the Landscape design as set out in Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] including any replacement vegetation and trees to restore the Coronation Avenue will be approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with NCC as per Requirement 5, Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014]. The Applicant has prepared a draft strategy for the replacement of trees along the Coronation Avenue, identifying the final number and spacings of the replacement trees that would be planted to restore the landscape feature, refer to Appendix LV.2 submitted at Deadline 1 in response</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		to ExA Written Question LV.1.8, having been discussed and agreed with NCC via email January 2021.
1.1.24	There is a lack of certainty and commitment in the landscape proposals, some of the bunds are described as 'desirable mitigation' and it is unclear as to whether they will be delivered or not. A number of the proposed hedgerows are marked as being 'by agreement' and the replacement avenue is described as 'currently proposed' and 'as appropriate and if required' suggesting that these elements are not a committed aspect of the proposals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Landscape proposals as illustrated in Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144]) do form part of the DCO application, and are referred to in the relevant ES chapters. In addition, mitigation proposals area set out within the Outline CEMP [APP-346], refer to Table 3-1, S-L1 – S-L4. Therefore, the landscape mitigation plans form part of the DCO application, and as such are required.</li> <li>2. As set out in paragraph 7.5.1 points q and r of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] and on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095], only those measures that are within the Order Limits and that form the essential mitigation strategy are committed to and have been incorporated into the assessment. Those hedgerows identified as 'Proposed hedgerows – by agreement', would require agreement with the adjacent landowner as they are outside of the permanent highway boundary for both planting and future management, as indicated on the Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095]. As these cannot be committed to at this stage, these hedgerows have not been included within the assessment of landscape and visual effects as set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the ES [APP-044].</li> <li>3. Other desirable measures (for example, proposed bunds that, depending on the amount of surplus material, might not otherwise be required) have been assessed within Table 7-25 - Consideration of Assessment Parameters in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044], specifically parameter 4 and 5, which address the profile of embankment slopes and non-essential bunds to dispose of material respectively. The conclusions of the assessment as set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] are not significantly altered as a result of any or all of these parameters being adopted.</li> <li>4. By including the locations of hedgerows and tree planting on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] the Applicant is committed to delivering the measures required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
1.1.25	Mitigation for visual effects at Causey Park Bridge appear to be inadequate given the proposals include no vegetative screening for a 4.2m high embankment with a noise fence on top openly seen at a distance of 100-150m from the street and homes. The red line boundary includes an area where planting could have been included to provide some screening.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The planting strategy associated with Causey Park Bridge does include an element of vegetative screening in the form of a hedge and groups of hedgerow trees that would replicate the existing vegetation to the west of Causey Park Bridge, reflecting the existing characteristics and interrupting views towards the Scheme. In establishing the landscape proposals as set out on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] the Applicant considered that provision of more extensive blocks of planting (trees and shrubs) or long linear belts of woodland, as suggested by NCC, would not be appropriate, as this would substantially change the characteristics and setting to the settlement. These are typically absent within the immediate area, and substantially increasing tree cover would change the open nature of the landscape to the west of Causey Park Bridge. The embankment and specifically the proposed noise barrier would be within the line of sight from receptors within Causey Park Bridge and are anticipated to screen traffic movements. However, despite this, it is anticipated that the effects on the receptors with west facing elevations would be significant during construction and in winter Yr 1, and would remain significant in the summer Yr 15.</li> <li>2. The negative visual effects arising on receptors forming the Causey Park Bridge community could be mitigated further through the adoption of further planting. However, taking the negative effects on landscape character that would arise as a result of the combination of the Scheme and the changes to the open characteristics of the landscape as a result of more extensive blocks of planting (trees and shrubs) or long linear belts of woodland, the proposed mitigation strategy, outlined in Figure 7.8:</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] is the most appropriate option in terms of landscape character.
1.1.26	It is considered that the impact of the proposed West Moor junction would have more than a negligible or neutral effect of the character of the area identified in the LVIA.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views to the south from properties at West Moor would be comparable to the existing outlook, with the A1, albeit widened, screened by hedgerows and hedgerow trees, that would stretch out into the distance. The proposed West Moor Junction has a robust planting strategy associated with it, comprising hedgerow and woodland planting to the outer edge of the West Moor junction as identified on Sheet 15 of 19, Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] tying into existing woodland to the west of the junction. This view is supported by the preparation of a photomontage, refer to Viewpoint 27, Figure 7.11: Photomontages Part A 2 of 2 [APP-099], which demonstrates that, whilst the proposed junction, overbridge and traffic would be visible immediately following construction, planting associated with the junction, would in Year 15, largely screen the junction, with only a short section of the overbridge itself being visible crossing the A1, in views to the north east.</li> </ol>
1.1.27	The LVIA does not adequately assess the effects on landscape character. A full assessment of the effects on the landscape character should be provided and in turn should inform landscape mitigation. No assessment on the effects on Areas of High Landscape Value (AHLV) or Areas of Intermediate Landscape Value (AILV) have been provided in the LVIA.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not correct that the LVIA does not adequately assess the effects on landscape character. In line with the agreed methodology and guidance (135/10 and GLVIA 3), the assessment of the Scheme has been undertaken to determine the effects of the Scheme on the whole of the character area, identifying as appropriate, where specific impacts and effects have arisen. The assessment has subsequently informed the development of the mitigation proposals, for example. The assessment has subsequently informed the development of the mitigation proposals, for example the impact of the removal of trees forming the Coronation Avenue and subsequent replacement, or replacement of woodland within the Woodland Creation Area to offset the removal of woodland within the River Coquet valley.</li> <li>In relation to Part A, the LVIA (refer to Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044]) considers, where appropriate, the effects both on National Character Areas and Local Character Areas, defined by the Northumberland Landscape Character Assessment, Land Use Consultants, (August 2010) and informed by the Alnwick Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (adopted May 2010). However, some of the boundaries have been revised at a local level for this assessment, following the findings of the site walkover carried out in April and June 2018 respectively, by chartered landscape architects. These are the identified in Table 7-15 - Local Landscape Character Area, in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the ES [APP-044] as LCA. These are the identification of 38b (1) Hub of Recreational Activity, that comprises the area around Eshott airfield, and 35b (2) Northgate, an area north of Morpeth that has undergone housing development.</li> <li>Table 7-2 - National Planning Policy Relevant to Landscape and Visual, in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] identifies that Areas of High Landscape Value (AHLV) have been taken into consideration when judging the sensitivity of the Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) affected by Part A.</li> <li>AHLV that are potentially impacted, are aligned with LCA 35a Coquet Valley and 38b Longhorsley, the landscape sensitivity of these LCAs recognising the quality and value placed on these landscapes within the identified sensitivity, and this reflects the criteria for landscape sensitivity in Table 7-6 - Landscape Sensitivity of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044], which defines locally designated landscapes being of a minimum moderate sensitivity.</li> <li>In relation to Part B, AHLV that are potentially impacted, are aligned with LCA 8c Charlton Ridge and 3c Rock, the landscape sensitivity of these LCAs recognise the quality and value placed on these landscapes within the identified sensitivity, and this reflects the criteria for landscape sensitivity in Table 7-6 - Landscape Sensitivity of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045]. Locally designated landscapes being of a minimum moderate sensitivity as set out in Table 7-6 – Landscape</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>Sensitivity of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045]. It should be noted that 3c Rock LCA is considered to have a high sensitivity as it is located within the Northumberland AONB.</p> <p>6. The Applicant therefore considers that the assessment of landscape effects as outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] is sufficiently detailed and robust. As detailed above, this assessment of effects has informed the development of the mitigation proposals for the Scheme.</p>
1.1.28	The potential for night-time effects on the landscape is recognised but no assessment has been made in the LVIA.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has considered night-time effects on the landscape and an assessment has been made within the LVIA.</li> <li>2. In relation to Part A, a night time assessment has been undertaken as agreed with NCC in Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044], and has comprised a written description of the night time effects, in line with the approach agreed with NCC, refer to email 30/4/18 in Environmental Statement - Appendix 4.2 Environmental Consultation 1 of 2 [APP-193]. The effects on landscape character concluded that there would be a neutral effect, and are described in in paragraph 7.10.23 in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044], with the written description of visual effects outlined in paragraphs 7.10.49 – 7.10.57 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044], the conclusion being that there would be no significant effects during Year 1 or Design Year 15.</li> <li>3. In relation to Part B, consideration of the potential night time effects is set out in paragraph 7.4.43 in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045]. The conclusion was that during construction the majority of works would be undertaken in daylight hours, but that some temporary lighting may be required at specific locations to facilitate some night time working, but this would be unlikely to result in a significant effect.</li> <li>4. As set out in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] a night time assessment was scoped out, as no operational lighting along the A1 corridor is proposed and Part B is considered as an online improvement scheme, therefore the impact of traffic headlights would not substantially increase the effect on the currently unlit existing A1 corridor and therefore Part B is not anticipated to give rise to significant landscape or visual night time effects.</li> <li>5. The different approach to the night time assessment for Parts A and B, reflects the nature of the two separate Parts. Part A comprises an upgrade of an existing road corridor and new offline sections within a rural and largely unlit landscape. In contrast Part B is an upgrade to an existing road corridor (albeit with an unlit junction) within which awareness of car headlights is an existing feature.</li> </ol>
1.1.29	There is a lack of certainty in the consideration of footpath closures with viewpoints being given assessments – how long footpaths are to be closed for during construction for example.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has described the visual effects likely to arise on footpaths – as outlined in Appendix 7.4: Public Rights of Way Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-219], and Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287]. Within paragraph 7.5.1 and item d, of both Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] there is the assumption that “<i>where a permanent diversion is to be provided, it is assumed that this would be undertaken early in the construction period in order to maintain public use</i>” the assessment having been undertaken on this basis.</li> <li>2. Temporary diversions of PRoW are not proposed and have not been identified on the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]. Therefore, the effects on temporary diversions during the construction phase have not been assessed.</li> </ol>
1.1.30	There is an ecological bias to the landscape design, both in narrative and in the resultant design. No information has been provided regarding species selection or management or	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The landscape design is not biased towards ecological mitigation but has sought to reflect the relationship between the different aspects of the assessment. The Applicant has developed the landscape and visual mitigation proposals, set out in Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	consideration of this in terms of mitigation of landscape and visual effects.	<p>A [APP-095] and Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], to address where appropriate, the landscape and visual effects identified during the assessment. These proposals have been developed alongside the project ecologists, as there is a relationship between the landscape, visual and ecological effects arising as a result of the Scheme, and the provision of mitigation measures provided for landscape character or visual effects mitigation must also serve to provide sufficient replacement habitat.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Applicant has, within Section 7.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures, of both Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045], stated how embedded mitigation and specific mitigation measures to address landscape and visual effects should be incorporated into the detailed design.</li> <li>3. Issues of species selection would be addressed at the detailed design stage based on this requirement but would reflect the species found locally and would comprise native species, this is identified in:</li> <li>4. Part A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 7.9.14, item c, native tree and shrub species would be in keeping with local landscape character</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Part B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 7.9.4, item c, the incorporation of species rich hedgerows</li> <li>• Paragraph 7.9.13, items b and f, the incorporation of native species in keeping with the local landscape character.</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. Depending upon the species selected and the final design of the measures to deliver mitigation, the management of the mitigation features would be included within a landscape scheme to be approved by the SoS following consultation with NCC, as part of Schedule 2, Requirement 5 of the draft DCO. These measures are secured within the items S-L1 – S-L5, S-L9 of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. Mitigation measures would be monitored during the establishment period to ensure their delivery through items S-L11 – S-L13 of the same document.</li> <li>7. In addition, the Outline CEMP [APP-346], prepared and updated through the design and delivery phases would be subsequently converted to a Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP) to secure the long-term establishment of the mitigation measures required by the Scheme. Mitigation measures would be monitored during the establishment period to ensure their delivery through items S-L11 – S-L13 of the same document.</li> </ol>
1.1.31	The impact of the developments on the amenity and the quality of the user experience of the public rights of way network and local roads (where an assumption has been made that users are travelling by car and not walkers, cyclists or horse riders who may place greater value on the wider views) has not been adequately addressed in the application. This aspect should be a separate theme within the ES in order to address the impact on both the tourism industry and the local communities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Health Part A [APP-054], Section 12.8 and Chapter 12: Population and Health Part B [APP-055], Section 12.8 provided assessment of the effects of the Scheme on Communities.</li> <li>2. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Parts 8 and 9, for both vehicle travellers (for Part A only, as this was scoped out for Part B as it was predicted that during operation views from Part B would be similar to current views from the A1 due to the nature of Part B which primarily includes online widening to the east of the existing A1 carriageway) (under Views from the Road) and for walkers, cyclists and horse riders (under Journey Amenity).</li> <li>3. Impact on the tourism industry specifically is not required under DMRB Volume 11 guidance and was not scoped into the Population and Human Health assessment. (Parts 6, 8 or 9) However, an</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		assessment of impacts on private and commercial properties (including to their access) has been undertaken within Chapter 12: Population and Health Part A [APP-054], Section 12.8 and Chapter 12: Population and Health Part B [APP-055], Section 12.8.
Cultural Heritage		
1.1.32	Due to the nature of the assessment process values are assigned to heritage assets such that impacts that might otherwise be considered significant are considered not significant within the terms of the EIA process. Thus, for example, the demolition of a non-designated heritage asset may be considered not significant in EIA terms although the loss is total.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment adheres to DMRB, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2. Accordingly, the effects assessed as moderate significance or above are deemed significant. Care is always required in Cultural Heritage Assessment because of the use of the term "significance", which relates both to the importance of an asset and the scale of an impact in terms of EIA.</li> <li>2. The proposed assessment methodology for Cultural Heritage was presented in the Scoping Report Part A [APP-338], Scoping Report Part B [APP-339] and is set out in detail in Section 8.4 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Part A) [APP-468] and Section 8.4 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Part B) [APP-479]. NCC's representations in response to scoping did not comment on the proposed methodology and the approach to the assessment.</li> <li>3. In the ES, the potential impacts are presented in Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Part A) [APP-046] and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Part B) [APP-047] and the assessment of likely significant effects after the implementation of design and mitigation measures is provided in Section 8.10 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Part A) [APP-046] and Section 8.10 of Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Part B) [APP-047]. The purpose of the design and mitigation measures is to reduce and remove, where possible, the magnitude of impacts and effects. The assessment of likely significant effects reported includes those which in EIA terms are deemed to be not significant (i.e. slight adverse).</li> <li>4. Taking the non-designated heritage asset example cited, the assessment established that, based on the currently available evidence, the asset is of low value (i.e. locally important). The impact on the asset would be major adverse, due to its complete loss. Based on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology, this would result in moderate adverse effect before mitigation (as reported in the Appendix 8.1 Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment Part B Section 5 [APP-291]). However, with the use of mitigation through the preservation by record of the heritage asset, the impacts in this instance are reduced to moderate adverse, with a slight adverse effect (not significant).</li> </ol>
1.1.33	For Part A (except for milepost reference 1153544 which is to be relocated) the impacts will be indirect to setting. New over junction structures will have a degree of impact on heritage assets. It is accepted that most of these impacts will be in the construction phase and that in operation the mitigation measures proposed would prove effective.	
1.1.34	For Part B there would be a wider range of effects. Direct impacts to designated heritage assets would again be limited to the relocation of mileposts. One unlisted Page   7 milepost, a NDHA, would also be relocated. The greatest direct impact would be to Charlton Mires Farm, also a NDHA, which would be demolished. This would be a major adverse impact but after mitigation by recording would be a slightly adverse effect (and therefore not significant in EIA terms).	
1.1.35	Indirect setting impacts would be experienced by West Lodge House, a NDHA and gatehouse to the Charlton Hall estate in that	

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	the road would move closer to it. The grade II listed Patterson's Cottage would be similarly impacted by roadway widening. However, the most significant indirect setting impact would be to the grade II listed Dovecote at Heckley Fence (NHL 1371059) due to the construction of an overbridge. Here the proposal would result in a permanent moderate adverse effect.	
1.1.36	In terms of mitigation, measures that ensure the appropriate recording of the buildings to be demolished at Charlton Mires should be included in the CEMP.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item B-CH4 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] outlines the required mitigation for buildings at Charlton Mires prior to demolition through a Historic Building Recording.</li> <li>2. In addition, Appendix 8.6: Draft Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Historic Building Recording Part B [APP-295] accompanies the application and was reviewed by NCC prior to submission. Section 2.5 of Appendix 8.6: Draft Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Historic Building Recording Part B [APP-295] includes the requirement for the archaeological contractor undertaking the Historic Building Recording to provide a detailed method statement (paragraphs 2.5.1 to 2.5.4) which would be reviewed and approved by NCC prior to the works commencing.</li> </ol>
1.1.37	The applicant is urged that all mileposts (whether designated or otherwise) to be subject to a method statement to cover their recording in situ, temporary safe storage for the duration of the works and subsequent relocation within the completed scheme.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has established that there are six designated mileposts in the Part A Order limits, although two have been determined to be missing (NHL 1370646 Milepost at NGR NZ 19029485 (Causey Park) and NHL 1371021 (Milepost Approximately 55 Metres South West Of Thurston (sic) New Houses Farmhouse)). There is one non-designated milepost in the Part B Order limits. The assessment has determined that one designated milepost on Part A (NHL 115344 Milepost at NGR NZ 18468998 (Highlaws Junction) and the non-designated milepost on Part B (HER 16878 (Milepost north of Shipperton Bridge)) would be directly impacted. The remainder of the designated mileposts are located on the existing section of the A1 (Part A) which would be de-trunked and therefore the effects as a result of the Scheme operation would be neutral.</li> <li>2. Item S-CH6 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] states the requirements and approach to protecting designated heritage assets from accidental damage during the construction phase of the Scheme, including milestones, and includes the requirement for these to be developed in the CEMP.</li> <li>3. Item A-CH2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] outlines the approach to recording, protecting and relocating one Grade II Listed Milepost on Part A which would be directly impacted by the Scheme. Item B-CH3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] outlines the approach to recording, protecting and relocating of one non-designated on Part B which would be directly impacted by the Scheme.</li> <li>4. The Main Contractor will be responsible for providing detailed method statements to NCC which outline how the mileposts will be appropriately recorded in-situ prior to works commencing. The Main Contractor is also responsible for preparing and providing a detailed method statement which outlines how the mileposts will be removed from their current location, protected and transported, together with the storage location, before construction commences. The method statement should also include proposed locations for the replacement, timescales for replacement and a second phase of recording. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been updated and submitted at Deadline 1.</li> </ol>
1.1.38	The County Archaeologist has identified a number of amendments or points for clarification which are required in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan which are detailed below:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has updated the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and it was submitted at Deadline 1. Responses to each of NCC's comments are provided below, along with an explanation of how these are reflected in the updated Outline CEMP, where appropriate.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.39	Section 2 - Scheme roles and responsibilities - Scheme Archaeologist - The production of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) will also be needed for mitigation work, where required, not just evaluation.	1. The description of the Scheme Archaeologist (main contractor) role and responsibilities in Section 2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been revised to include the preparation of a programme of archaeological mitigation, where required, in addition to the evaluation.
1.1.40	Archaeologist (main contractor) – point b, the evaluation will establish the appropriate mitigation. This may be excavation, strip, map and record or watching brief dependant on the extent and significance of archaeological remains, this needs to be amended to reflect the range of potential mitigation.	1. The description of the Archaeologist (main contractor) role and responsibilities in Section 2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been revised to include reference to appropriate mitigation (such as strip, map and record and watching brief) in point b.
1.1.41	Reference S-CH3 it is useful to identify at this stage that mitigation work may not just happen during the construction phase but may be required prior to construction work commencing if excavation or strip map and record are required. Further work, as recommended by the results of the trial trench evaluation, will be determined in consultation with NCC and implemented by the main contractor during construction.	1. The Action column in Reference S-CH3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been revised to include pre-construction archaeological mitigation.
1.1.42	Reference B-CH4 relates to Charlton Mires but has a reference to consultation with NCC and the Milestone Society, this text should be in references B-CH3 and A-CH2 Table 5-1 - Monitoring to be carried out during construction - clarification is required about which archaeologist is responsible for monitoring impacts on cultural heritage.	<p>1. The Action column in Reference B-CH4 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been revised to remove reference to Milestone Society. The Action column in Reference B-CH3 and A-CH2 has been amended to include consultation with the Milestone Society.</p> <p>2. Table 5-1 Monitoring to be Carried out During Construction (CEMP [APP-346]) has been amended to clarify that it is the Scheme Archaeologist and the Environmental Manager who are the responsible persons to monitor the impacts on cultural heritage.</p>
Biodiversity/Ecology		
1.1.43	The key issue is the loss of 0.68ha of ancient woodland, of which 0.27ha is within the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI and 0.41ha in the Coquet River Felton Park LWS. A new area of 8.16ha of ancient woodland (agreed with Natural England) will be established adjacent to the lost woodland on the south west bank of the River Coquet, under a 50 year management plan. Whilst fine detail of that woodland creation is required (soil analysis of receptor site, translocation details of soils and young trees) the overall plan is welcomed.	1. The Applicant acknowledges that NCC welcomes the overall plan for translocation in relation to woodland creation and can confirm that the finer details of the Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247] will be refined at detailed design.
Air Quality		
1.1.44	The applicant has not submitted any detailed or geographically specific information on the risks or mitigation from “dust” generated by construction / demolition works. No apparent distinction has been made between dust and particulates in relation to construction and demolition works. Whilst it is generally accepted that the greatest dust impacts will be within 100 metres of a source and this includes both large (>30µm) and small dust particles, there does not appear to be a risk assessment of dust and particulate impacts to local receptors. The principle source of dust/particulates will be from	1. The Applicant confirms that the assessment of construction dust included within Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041]. The assessment of construction dust has been undertaken in line with guidance set out in DMRB, Volume 11, Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques, Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality. The guidance assumes that all dust generating activities, including demolition and earthworks, may occur anywhere within the Scheme boundary, and that impacts may occur within a 200m corridor of the works. Therefore, the guidance does not require the submission of detailed or geographically specific information on the risks or mitigation from “dust” generated by construction or demolition works. This is because the methodology prescribed by the guidance encompasses all dust generating activities on a Scheme-wide basis. Figure 5.4: Construction Receptors [APP-078] shows all potentially affected human receptors.

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	earthworks and the most impacted will be within 100m, without mitigation.	2. Section 5.9 of Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Section 5.9 of Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] set out the mitigation measures to be applied during the construction process. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As per paragraph 5.10.1 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] a, with the application of these mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated.
1.1.45	There are eight receptors within 100 metres of the carriageway on Part A of the scheme, seven are these are at Fairmoor and there are thirteen receptors within 100 metres of the carriageway on Part B of the scheme, one of these is to be demolished to accommodate the scheme.	1. Chapter 5 Air Quality Part A [App-040] and Part B [APP-041] have, on a precautionary basis, considered the construction and operational impacts on all receptors within 200m of potential works associated with the Scheme, and therefore accounts for the receptors within 100m.
1.1.46	The applicant has submitted an outline construction environmental management plan (CEMP) which very briefly addresses dust from the construction / demolition phase. This does not constitute a dust management plan document which a contractor or sub-contractor could work from on a daily basis.	1. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] sets out general mitigation measures, including records of dust-generating incidents, auditing, and visual inspections, as appropriate for an outline CEMP. Reference S-A1 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been updated to explicitly state that a Dust Management Plan will be produced by the Main Contractor, and has been submitted at Deadline 1.
1.1.47	It is recommended that the applicant commits to a dust management plan (which could include a dust audit programme) which identifies the main sources and locations of dust and particulates generation and methods to mitigate. This could be in an outline format which is refined and finalised by the main contractor.	1. A Dust Management Plan will be produced prior to construction commencing and reference S-A1 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been updated to reflect this commitment and submitted at Deadline 1.
<b>Noise and Vibration</b>		
1.1.48	Operational noise levels have also been modelled for Part B of the dualling scheme where the impacts have been determined. Many receptors are predicted to experience an immediate improvement in the noise environment associated with improved flows of road traffic and the associated noise in the 2023 (Opening Year) and 2038 (Design Year). This has to be set against a predicted negligible deterioration in noise (+0.1 to +2.9 dB LA10 increase) in a Do-Minimum scenario (no dualling).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NCC's conclusions are correct. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331] and Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the operation of the Scheme.</li> <li>2. Table 6-35 and Table 6-36, Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Tables 1-12 and 1-13 of Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331] show that there are a number of properties which are predicted to experience a decrease in operational road traffic noise due to the Scheme.</li> </ol>
1.1.49	However, unlike Part B of the scheme, there does not appear to be the inclusion of a Do-Minimum noise prediction for Part A of the scheme. Therefore, it is impossible to draw any conclusions of the relative impact of a Do-Something (Opening Year) against a Do-Minimum (without dualling) scenario. For consistency and appropriate interpretation of the impacts of the scheme, the applicant should produce and submit a Do-Minimum (without dualling) prediction of operational road traffic on Part A of the scheme.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A figure comparing the operational road traffic predictions for the Do-minimum (without dualling) scenarios in the opening and future years on Part A of the Scheme is not necessary and further explanation is provided below.</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms that Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration, Part A [APP-042] does not include a figure presenting noise change contours for the Do-Minimum opening year (2023) (without the Scheme) against the Do-Minimum design year (2038) (without the Scheme) as the magnitude of noise level changes are predominantly of negligible increase. Section 6.7 Baseline Conditions Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] includes an assessment of the future baseline by comparing the predicted noise levels at each receptor within the Part A Study Area in the Do-Minimum design year with those in the Do-Minimum opening year. Table 6-24 – Noise Sensitive Receptors, Long-term Noise Changes without Part A from Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] presents the noise level changes in the long-term without the Scheme and shows that the majority of receptors are predicted to experience a negligible increase in noise level.</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.50	For vibration, areas of earthworks and piling (principally for bridge construction) have been identified and the receptors within these areas. For Part A there are no receptors within a SOAEL area for vibration from piling and only one in Part B. Both parts of the scheme would see receptors impacted above SOAEL by earthworks	1. The Applicant can confirm the conclusion reached by NCC in relation to Part A and Part B is correct.
1.1.51	The applicant has submitted an outline construction environmental management plan (CEMP) which addresses noise and vibration from the construction/demolition phase. Understandably this is embryonic at this stage given that specific plant is unknown at this stage. However, generic modelling has been carried out using "standard" noise levels from a likely composition of plant along the routes and within compounds.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms within the Outline CEMP [APP-346], noise and vibration is specifically addressed within Table 3-1, Ref S-N1, S-N2, S-N3, S-N4, S-N5, A-N1, A-N2, A-N3, A-N4, A-N5, A-N6 and B-N1.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.4 Assessment Methodology of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] and Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], presented the methodology adopted for the construction noise and vibration assessments. The assessments rely on reasonable assumptions for construction information. Construction noise and vibration predictions have been undertaken for a number of key construction activities that are likely to be undertaken along the length of the Scheme and/or at compound locations.</li> </ol>
1.1.52	The applicant has stated that "The main contractor will develop and submit a noise and vibration management plan (NVMP) including method statements and any monitoring and reporting protocols that demonstrate to the Applicant that no significant impact will result from their construction works"	1. Within the Outline CEMP [APP-346], Table 3-1, Ref. S-N2, there is a commitment for the Main Contractor to produce and submit a noise and vibration management plan (NVMP).
1.1.53	Additionally, the applicant has submitted a statement on "statutory nuisance" as required with Regulation 5(2)(f) of the Infrastructure Planning (Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. This statement concludes that the proposed scheme will not give rise to "statutory nuisance" as defined in S79 of The Environmental Protection Act 1990 with mitigation measures in place.	1. Within the Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343], Section 6 Conclusion, it is stated that "With mitigation in place, none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the EPA 1990 are predicted to arise during construction and operation of the Scheme."
1.1.54	The submitted documents makes reference to consents under Section 61 of The Control of Pollution Act 1974, but it is not entirely clear whether there is an intention to apply to Northumberland County Council for any such consents	1. Within the Outline CEMP [APP-346], Table 3-1, Ref. S-G9 and S-N2 there is a commitment for the Main Contractor to produce and submit an application under Section 61 of Part III of the 1974 Act to NCC Environmental Health Department prior to commencement of construction.
<b>Land Contamination</b>		
1.1.55	A number of historic land uses have been identified by the applicant in a series of plans showing their locations along the routes of Part A and B of the sections to be dualled. No assessment of risk from contamination has been presented and it would be normal not to require on for such a development as it does not introduce any sensitive receptors to contamination (should it exist).	
1.1.56	There is a potential risk of ground instability from historic coal mining in the area of Causey Park, this would be a matter for the applicant to address and may require a licence from the Coal Authority should stabilisation works be required where entry in coal seams or historic coal workings is needed.	1. A Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA) has been completed for Part A and forms part of the application at Appendix 11.4 of the ES [APP-264]. It identifies the areas of Part A which lie within Coal Authority Development High Risk Areas (DHRA) and specifically assesses the risks associated with potential shallow coal workings at Causey Park and the DHRA shown along a section of the River Coquet valley. The CMRA concludes that there remains a risk of shallow workings in the vicinity of the route at Causey Park and that there is negligible risk associated with the DHRA shown along the

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		River Coquet valley. The requirement for a Coal Authority permit when working within development high risk areas is recognised within the Coal Mining Risk Assessment [APP-264]. Any stabilisation works such as grouting would be required to be completed under a Coal Authority permit. Further intrusive works at detailed design stage are required to inform the requirement for and obtain sufficient information to design stabilisation requirements in high risk development areas. The requirement for further intrusive ground investigation works is set out at reference S-GS12 in the Outline CEMP [APP-346].
1.1.57	It is likely that any risks from contamination or ground instability are more likely to be Health and Safety at Work issue for the contractors	1. The Applicant confirms that Chapter 11: Geology and Soils Part A [APP-052] and Chapter 11: Geology and Soils Part B [APP-053] states that the Outline CEMP [APP-346] details the requirements for Risk Assessment Method Statement (RAMS) to ensure that mitigation measures such as the use of temporary shoring are incorporated to mitigate risk associated with potential ground instability and potential risks associated with groundworkers being exposed to potential contamination sources, by the use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE).
<b>Flood Risk and Drainage</b>		
1.1.58	The authority has no concerns over the principle of surface water disposal proposed. However, there is a lack of information at present which means that the proposed basins may not be adequately sized, and the flooding may occur within the new highway network and/or increase downstream as a result. Both of which are unacceptable.	1. The Applicant has set out the preliminary design of the drainage for the Scheme within the Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES. Highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1-year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). The runoff from the developed areas will be controlled at the detention features to ensure that the runoff rate to existing watercourses is no greater than the current Greenfield Runoff Rates.
1.1.59	A plan which clearly shows the different surface water catchments on the scheme is required. This plan will also need to compare the areas to the greenfield runoff rate and allowable discharge rates.	1. The Applicant has not produced plans showing this detail. This was discussed with NCC, and the Applicant has provided plans at Appendix B of Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix B of Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] which show the different surface water catchments by identifying the highway drainage networks that connect to each of the detention features and subsequent outfalls to watercourses. This was agreed on a telephone call on 9 <sup>th</sup> December 2020 and was confirmed in an email to NCC which was issued on 22 <sup>nd</sup> December 2020. This has been included in the SoCG. The allowable discharge rates which have been derived from the surface water catchment size and the greenfield runoff rates are in Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix B of Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314].
1.1.60	From the information provided it appears that surface water discharging from the respective attenuation features will not be set to one rate. Will a complex control feature be used instead? If so, details of this feature, for each catchment and attenuation feature will need to be provided. What rates will each feature be set to, and how does this compare with the greenfield runoff rate?	1. Complex control features will be required at each of the attenuation features. The flow rates for each catchment and attenuation feature are tabulated within the reports in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 in Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Section 4.3 in Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES. The flow rates are based on the greenfield runoff rates that have been calculated with the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems, Chapter 6 (ICP SuDS) method which is suitable for catchment areas below 50 ha as per this Scheme. The flow control rates for the greenfield runoff based on Qbar (4.5l/s/ha), (1 yr, the 30 yr and the 100yr) have been modelled as flow depth relationships.
1.1.61	All of the respective drainage strategy layout drawings just state "Flow Control Chamber" - no associated details are stated as to the allowable rate(s) for each chamber.	1. Details of the flow control device or chamber will be developed by the Main Contractor during detailed design. It will be designed to meet the performance requirements set out in Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES. Surface water flow from the detention basins will be managed and surface water run off rates

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		will be restricted to the existing greenfield run off values. These measures will be secured via requirement 8 of the dDCO.
1.1.62	As is stated within the ES (chapters 6.6 and 6.7), the surface water scheme is to adhere to the DEFRA Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. Notably standard S4 Volume Control "Where reasonably practicable, for greenfield development, the runoff volume from the development to any highway drain, sewer or surface water body in the 1 in 100 year, 6 hour rainfall event should never exceed the greenfield runoff volume for the same event". As the proposals are to discharge surface water at different rates akin to the greenfield rate (1 in 1, 1 in 100), information is required to show that runoff volumes to standard S4 have been met.	1. The existing ground conditions and their unsuitability for infiltration means that it is not reasonably practicable to comply with S4 with this Scheme. As a result, the Applicant has considered S6 which gives guidance when S4 cannot be complied with. (S6 Where it is not reasonably practicable to constrain the volume of runoff to any drain, sewer or surface water body in accordance with S4 or S5 above, the runoff volume must be discharged at a rate that does not adversely affect flood risk.) NCC has confirmed, during a telephone call on 7 <sup>th</sup> January 2021 that this approach is satisfactory, a follow-up email has recorded this which was issued on 11 <sup>th</sup> January 2021. This has been included in the SoCG. The existing drainage catchments are being maintained and the rates of discharge are being controlled so that flood risk is not adversely affected. The 1 in 100 yr greenfield runoff rate (Q100) is the maximum discharge rate, the flow control will ensure this and also allow lesser discharges in the events with lesser return periods. The flow control rates for the greenfield runoff based on Qbar (4.5l/s/ha), (1 yr, the 30 yr and the 100yr), for each of the subcatchments are tabulated in Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES. The storage volumes, for each detention feature, identified in the reports are for the 1 in 100yr, 6 hour rainfall events.
1.1.63	To ensure that the features are adequately sized, associated calculations need to be submitted which accompany the surface water drainage scheme.	1. The calculations are included in the DCO application as Hydraulic Models in Appendix A of Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix A of Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES.
1.1.64	In addition to the above, drawings (including cross-sectional) of all the attenuation features and swales need to be submitted. These drawings need to denote the maximum water level in a 1 in 100 year plus climate change event (+20%).	1. The ponds have been designed with 1 in 3 side slopes and a minimum freeboard of 300mm and that the storage features have been sized to accommodate the 1 in 100 yr event plus 20% climate change. The storage base levels of the detention basins are at the Proposed Detention Basin Outlet Invert Levels shown within Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-315] of the ES.  2. The Applicant will undertake the detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design in discharging Requirement 3 of the dDCO [APP-014]. The Applicant confirms that this will include the detailed design and specification of the attenuation features and swales including maximum water levels. The Applicant will also consult with NCC on matters related to its function in connection with surface and foul drainage, to discharge Requirement 8 of the dDCO.
1.1.65	On drawing HE551459-WSP-HDG-M2F-DR-CD-0011 Rev P05 "Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 6 of 13" attention is drawn to the proposed swale which will intercept waste from the road crossing. Where will water from the swale go? If it connects to the surface water scheme for the A1, are these areas included within the calculations? In addition to appears that the swale is proposed over an existing pond (northern side).	1. Currently the runoff from the carriageway of the minor road drains over-the-edge to the adjacent land, this will continue to be the case to the north and with the kerb and gully drainage to the south.  2. The swales are proposed to drain the road and embankments, and are to be connected to the local watercourse rather than the surface water network for the A1. The existing pond is a recent feature (post 2009) and is associated with the construction of the private off-road driving track rather than a land drainage requirement. There is a connection from the pond to a ditch to the east and that is where the runoff will discharge.
Development Consent Order		
1.1.66	As drafted at present there are a number of areas that need amendment in light of the above concerns. Due to the issues raised in this response, the contents of the Development Control Order	1. The Applicant will continue to work with NCC throughout the examination process. Until more specific comments in relation to the draft DCO are received, the Applicant is unable to provide any detailed response.

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	cannot be agreed with at this stage due to the need for amendments to take into account the points of clarification above.	
1.1.67	<p>It is considered that there is general ambiguity to the proposed for roads planned to be adopted by the Local Highway Authority with the various cross references in Schedules 1 and 4 not cross referencing to each other and/or to the drawings submitted.</p> <p>It is considered that the key in the Rights of Way and Access Plan indicating "De-trunked A1" should be strengthened to read "New/improved highway – De-trunked A1" to cover the full requirements as set out above. Further discussions are therefore requested to resolve this issue and a schedule of issue can be issued from our review.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would be preferable for the referenced roads in Schedule 4 Part 1 to include the relevant Local Road classification number.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amendments to road references in Schedule 4 are under discussion with NCC and, if amendments are required, will be included in a further iteration of the dDCO.</li> <li>2. The Applicant proposes for the following list of roads to be adopted by the local authority is as follows: Part A: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. West View;</li> <li>2. Realigned section of High Highlaws Road approaching Highlaws Junction (2/A in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>3. De-trunked A1, from Priests Bridge (PA 3/5 in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009], and connecting to the new West Moor roundabout,; including the realignments related to Fenrother Lane (East) (4/B and 4/C in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]) and the new link road (8/B in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]);</li> <li>4. Bywell Road (8/A in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> <li>5. Realigned section of West Moor Road approaching West Moor Junction (9/A in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Part B: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rock South Farm Access Road West Linkhall Access Road</li> <li>2. East Linkhall Access Road</li> <li>3. Local Authority roads to be handed back to landowner:</li> <li>4. Rock South Farm Road</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. The reference title for the de-trunked A1 in the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] is not proposed to be amended, for the reasons set out above. Local Road classification numbers will be agreed with NCC during the detailed design process and resolved as part of the signing strategy. The Applicant will work with NCC during the detailed design stage to agree a Signing Strategy. The Outline CEMP [APP346] (reference S-PH3) confirms that the Applicant will consult NCC in devising its signing strategy and that this will feed into the scheme sign design.</li> </ol>
1.1.68	It would appear that there is a section of road missing from Schedule 4 Part 1 in relation to the "new link road from West Moor Junction roundabout to Brockenfield Bridge" on the Old A1 under Work Section 16L.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amendments to the Schedules are included in a further iteration of the draft DCO [APP-014] submitted at Deadline 2 after discussion with NCC.</li> </ol>
1.1.69	The Council will seek to engage with the applicant in relation to the concerns outlined above in order to try and minimise the harm caused by the projects and address the issues raised where possible.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant welcomes discussions with NCC in relation to the concerns it has raised.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.1.70	The Council will continue to seek and advocate for s106 agreements to secure appropriate mitigation and/or compensation in relation to the identified impacts of the proposals.	1. There is no requirement for section 106 agreements to secure appropriate mitigation and/or compensation in relation to the identified impacts of the Scheme. Mitigation measures identified, through the EIA process, to minimise the impact of the Scheme are secured by the Requirements of the draft DCO [APP-014]. NCC as the local planning authority will be consulted on the Requirements, as appropriate, prior to the Applicant seeking approval from the Secretary of State for Transport. As all mitigation is within the Order limits (as shown in the General Arrangement Plans [APP-008]), there are no proposed elements that would require additional legal agreement outwith the draft DCO [APP-014] once consent is granted.

### 1.3 PARISH COUNCILS

Table 1-2 - Amble Parish Council – RR-002

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.2.1	It has been noted that Highways England have now merged the Morpeth-Felton proposals with the Alnwick-Ellingham proposals into one Development Consent Order. However, the issues outlined in the Councils first objection do not appear to have been addressed and therefore Members would like the following objection lodged.	
1.2.2	"Please consider where virtually all southbound traffic from not just Amble but also Warkworth, Hadston, Broomhill, Hauxley, Acklington and Widdrington gets access to the A1. It is presently Causey Bridge, the busiest junction between Morpeth and Felton, where the right turn lane often fills completely with traffic waiting to return, regularly threatening to block all A1 northbound traffic.	1. Drivers approaching the existing A1 from Amble and the other settlements listed who wish to continue their journey southwards may use the Fenrother junction via the de-trunked section of the existing A1. However, it is noted that there are a choice of other routes and A1 junction access points which drivers may choose depending upon their specific origin and destination, the purpose of their journey and prevailing traffic conditions. Paragraph 1.2.7 of this response provides the justification for why Fenrother Junction was chosen in preference to a junction at Causey Bridge.
1.2.3	This same junction is being ignored by the proposed new A1, in favour of one at Fenrother, requiring Amble commuters to use 2 miles of old A1 before getting access to the new dual carriageway. The ONLY community that benefits from the junction at Fenrother is the tiny hamlet of Tritlington, whose commuters can still get southbound access via Cockle Park at Highlaws junction.	1. Drivers approaching the Scheme from Amble and other settlements have a choice of routes and junctions where they may join the new A1 including Fenrother and West Moor. The distance between Causey Park Junction to West Moor Junction is around 4km, whereas the distance from Causey Park Junction to Fenrother Junction is around 3km. The additional time associated with the increased journey distance to join the A1 will be offset by the forecast overall journey time savings detailed in section 4.8 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344]. The Applicant therefore does not accept that Tritlington is the only settlement that benefits from the junction at Fenrother. 2. The justification for the new junction being provided at Fenrother instead of Causey Park is set out at paragraph 1.2.7 of this response. The additional time associated with the increased journey distance to join the A1 from Amble and the other settlements listed will be offset by the forecast overall journey time savings detailed in section 4.8 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344].
1.2.4	Amble commuters already frustratingly have to give way at both Chevington junctions to less trafficked roads, and the proposed arrangement will just add a third example, more gear changes/pollution and probably no time saved - an appalling return for the millions being spent.	1. The Applicant has undertaken traffic modelling of the Scheme and this is described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344]. The Scheme is forecast to significantly reduce traffic flows on the de-trunked sections of the A1, including in the section passing the Causey Bridge junction. In the opening year without the Scheme in place, model flows at this location are forecast to be between 800 and 1000 pcu in each direction during both the morning and evening peak periods. With the Scheme in place, forecast flows reduce to between 20 and 140 pcu in each direction. On the Widdrington Road approach to the A1 Causey Bridge junction, model flows are forecast to be less

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>than 3 vehicles per minute in each direction in the opening year without the Scheme in place. With the Scheme in place, forecast flows reduce or stay at around the same levels.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. These significant forecast reductions in traffic on the de-trunked A1 would reduce delays for the relatively small number of vehicles joining the A1 from Widdrington Road at this point and minimise the risk of right turning vehicles blocking northbound traffic.</li> <li>3. The Scheme results in no significant air quality effect as a result of changes to traffic activity. This is set out in further detail in Appendix 16.4 Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330].</li> </ol>
1.2.5	Part of the reason for the A1 upgrade is to improve road safety on a stretch of road which has a record of serious and fatal accidents. By making all traffic to the coastal strip use the old A1 there will continue to be serious accidents.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 4.10 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] forecasts an overall reduction of 414 accidents over the 60-year appraisal period as a result of the Scheme. The associated saving in accidents is forecast to reduce the number of casualties by 708, including 17 fatalities.</li> </ol>
1.2.6	When this part of the old road is "de-trunked" it is likely the road will not be a priority for gritting and general maintenance thereby increasing risk.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Winter and general maintenance of the de-trunked section of the A1 will become the responsibility of Northumberland County Council and subject to the required maintenance interventions for that standard of road. Northumberland County Council is already responsible for the maintenance of the local road network which connects with the A1. In addition, the forecast traffic volume using this de-trunked section of the A1 will reduce by circa 90% compared to existing, as noted in the response to 1.2.4 above. For these reasons' overall safety risk on this de-trunked section will not increase.</li> </ol>
1.2.7	Much of the area now relies on tourist trade and amenities where good access is vital to success. The town of Amble and its near neighbours have high local unemployment rates, and a good southbound road access would be a major factor in attracting desperately needed employers to this area. A simple relocation of the proposed Fenrother junction 2 miles north at Causey Bridge would dramatically improve all these journey times at minimal cost difference. <i>Alternatively, if the Fenrother junction cannot be relocated the plan shows there is to be a new bridge over the A1 near Causey Bridge, this could be upgraded and slip roads to the A1 added to serve the coastal towns and villages"</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Junction provision on the strategic road network aims to achieve the optimum balance between often competing factors such as traffic flows, connectivity, environment, safety and cost. One of the key identified problems and issues with the current layout is the large number of at grade junctions and private accesses, many of which are designed to inadequate standards. Therefore the Scheme must rationalise the number of junctions in order to meet its stated objectives, This has led to the junction provision at West Moor and Fenrother with an overbridge at Causey Park.</li> <li>2. Connectivity from the A1 to Amble and its near neighbours will be facilitated by the West Moor Junction or the Fenrother Junction. The additional time associated with the increased 3km journey distance to join the A1 from Amble and its near neighbours will be offset by the forecast overall journey time savings detailed in section 4.8 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344]. Re-locating the Fenrother junction to Causey Park would therefore not dramatically improve journey times particularly for the longer journeys undertaken by tourists. The location of the Fenrother junction was chosen in preference to Causey Park based on the traffic model forecasts which show more vehicles per hour using the junction. In addition, the Fenrother junction provides improved east-west connectivity across the A1. and the existing local road network is more suitable to deal with the forecast traffic movements generated by the new junction.</li> <li>3. Results of operational assessments set out in Tables 12-17 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] clearly demonstrate that the proposed junctions can easily accommodate the forecast traffic flows</li> <li>4. A junction at Causey Park in addition to the junctions at West Moor and Fenrother cannot be justified. It would militate against the objectives of the scheme which is to rationalise the number of junctions along this stretch of the A1.</li> </ol>

## 1.4 OTHER STATUTORY CONSULTEES

Table 1-3 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation – RR-003

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.3.1	I can confirm the MOD has no safeguarding concerns with this proposal. However, we request details of any future designs for lighting columns which may be proposed for the two bridges (Heckley Fence Overbridge and Charlton Mires Junction) in order to perform the necessary safeguarding assessments. These areas pass through the 15.2m Statutory Technical Safeguarding Zone associated with RRH Brizlee Wood.	1. The Applicant can confirm that lighting was scoped out of the assessment as set out in Appendix 2.1 Lighting Assessment [APP-187]. There will be no lighting columns on any of the bridges forming part of the Scheme, including the two overbridges in Part B at Heckley Fence and Charlton Mires.

Table 1-4 - Environment Agency – RR-004

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.4.1	We have reviewed the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, Environmental Statement (ES) and supporting documents and have a number of concerns regarding the proposed development and matters within our remit. We therefore make representations in relation to the following areas: 1) Net loss of biodiversity 2) Habitats of Principle Importance 3) Otter and water voles 4) Detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) 5) Fish 6) Geomorphology Assessment 7) Discharge of Treated Water and Outfall Construction 8) Water Framework Directive Assessment 9) Surface Water Drainage 10) Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment (DNWQA) 11) Flood Risk Assessment 12) Groundwater 13) Historic Landfill Sites Attachment	1. See Appendix 1 for response to RR-004.

Table 1-5 - Historic England – RR-005

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.5.1	The scheme will run in very close proximity to a number of scheduled monuments, including: North Charlton medieval village and open field system • Camp at West Linkhall. We have had pre-application with Highways England on this project and in principle support the scheme. However, there note some issues which do not appear to be fully addressed within the DCO documents: the need for absolute clarity that the DCO boundary abuts these scheduled monuments and does not take in any land within them. 1) Nationally important designated archaeology: North Charlton medieval village and open field system Scheduled Monument The remains of the medieval township of North Charlton and its associated field system survive in good condition on both sides of the modern A1. The earthworks of the houses, farms and fields survive both as visible earthworks and as buried archaeological	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Order Limits abuts the boundaries of the scheduled monuments North Charlton medieval village and open field system and Camp at West Linkhall. No land within the scheduled monuments is within the Order Limits. Plans are provided to confirm that no land within the Scheduled Monuments is within the Order Limits (see Appendix B).</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms Item B-CH1 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP [APP-746] outlines the requirement and approach to protecting the Scheduled Monuments. As a minimum, the extent of the Scheduled Monuments are to be clearly marked out during the construction works and all access prohibited.</li> <li>3. Following discussions with Historic England on 15 October 2020 the Applicant agreed to establish an exclusion zone where the Order Limits directly abut the boundary of the North Charlton Scheduled Monument to provide additional protection. Reference B-CH1 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been updated to include this and a plan has been produced to show the working area around the North Charlton Scheduled Monument (Appendix B), which is submitted at Deadline 1.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	remains, with great potential to provide understanding settlement in Northumberland when this part of the world was at the front line of conflict between England and Scotland. The camp at West Linkhall is perhaps less well understood. It is likely to date to the Roman period, and to have been used as a temporary camp, perhaps to house troops in transit through the area, or as a fortlet, a more permanent defended installation. The proposed works to the A1 will, we are assured, abut the edge of these monuments, but will not intrude into them. This is welcomed, as are the measures outlined in the outline CEMP to protect these sites from accidental damage as part of the construction process. Our only concern at this stage is that we cannot find a plan within the supporting documents which shows the DCO boundary and the scheduled monuments at a scale sufficient to be clear that they abut but do not coincide. Although we accept, and welcome, the general approach discussed verbally in the CEMP, we would still seek clarity on this matter through an additional plan before we can be completely satisfied that this exclusion of the scheduled sites from the DCO area will be accomplished.	
1.5.2	Grade II Listed milepost (NHL 1153544). This listed building may have to be removed as part of the work and replaced as close as possible to its current location after the works are complete. Historic England has no objection to this suggestion. However, in the CEMP for this structure it suggests a written, drawn, and photographic record of the milepost will be compiled in consultation with Historic England. We believe that this needs to be amended so that this consultation takes place with the conservation specialists at Northumberland County Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has updated the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and it was submitted at Deadline 1. The Achievement Criteria and Report Requirements column in Reference A-CH2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been revised to include NCC as a consultee. It now states: '<i>A written, drawn and photographic record will be compiled of the dismantling of the milepost in consultation with Historic England, NCC and Milestone Society.</i>'</li> </ol>

Table 1-6 - Public Health England – RR-006

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.6.1	The proposed Construction Environmental Action Plan is important to minimise public health impacts from the development; PHE requests that the plan is enacted and reviewed throughout the build.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be secured through the DCO [APP-104], meaning it will be a legal requirement that all measures contained within it are implemented during construction. The CEMP will continue to be reviewed and updated throughout the construction phase and will be developed into a Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP) towards the end of the construction phase, which will set out the ongoing commitments once the Scheme has been completed and which will be substantially based on the CEMP. The HEMP will set out the proposed strategy for future monitoring and management arrangements of environmental mitigation to ensure commitments continue to be met.</li> </ol>
1.6.2	The ES reflects a narrow approach to human health and continues to focus primarily on health protection issues, e.g., air quality, noise and vibration, and flood risk. As such the ES presents limited information on local health priorities and effect of the scheme on these priorities, including on mental health and health inequalities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Health Part A [APP-054] and Chapter 12: Population and Health Part B [APP-055], provided assessments of the effects of the Scheme on human health, undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA112 Population and Human Health. An assessment of mental health has been included, where appropriate, within the health assessment (refer to Chapter 12: Population and Health Part A [APP-054] and Chapter 12: Population and Health</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		Part B [APP-055]. However, the scope of this is limited to mental health issues caused by health determinants listed in DMRB LA112, including changes to air quality, noise and vibration and road drainage and the water environment.
1.6.3	The application does not appear to contain an Equality Statement, or to provide a specific definition of vulnerable groups within the general population that were included in the assessment. There is limited understanding of the differential effects of the scheme on these groups.	1. An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken for Part A and Part B, as it is the Applicant's responsibility to fulfil the Equality Duty as a public organisation, but was not submitted with the DCO application. It was used to inform the assessment in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A and Part B. An EqIA for the Scheme as a whole (Part A and Part B combined) will be produced and submitted at Deadline 2.
1.6.4	The ongoing monitoring of population and human health relates exclusively to health protection factors, that is, air quality, noise and vibration and flood risk. Ideally some level of monitoring to understand the effect of the development on the wider determinants of health for the local population would be valuable for local stakeholders.	1. Rather than the local population as a whole being monitored, the Applicant has focused on those aspects that are likely to be impacted by the Scheme and how they would be monitored in line with DMRB LA112 Population and human health – paragraph 3.21. Monitoring in relation to air quality, noise and vibration and flood risk are detailed in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Part B [APP-041], Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] and Part B [APP-043] and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment Part A [APP-050] and Part B [APP-051] of the ES. As no wider determinants of health have been identified as being likely to be impacted by the Scheme, there would be no requirement to monitor them as additional determinants have been scoped out of the health assessment. PHE responded at the scoping opinion stage for both Part A and Part B. No specific issues were raised in Part A. No significant issues were raised for Part B, although it is worth noting that PHE suggested mental health was scoped into the assessment. An assessment of mental health has been included, where appropriate, within the health assessment within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054] and Part B [APP-055] however the scope of this is limited to mental health issues caused by changes to air quality, noise and vibration and road drainage and the water environment.
1.6.5	We would expect that the PRow Management Plan would have been submitted with the DCO application, however it was not included and instead the ES states it will be produced by the main contractor after the DCO is granted. We question whether this is appropriate.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The PRow Management Plan is secured in requirement 4 of the dDCO [APP-014] as an accompanying plan to be prepared in the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>2. Principles for the management of PRowS are included in item 5.10 within Section 5: Mitigation Measures of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-347]. This will be developed further at detailed design into the PRow Management Plan which will be an accompanying document to support the CEMP.</li> <li>3. Requirement 4 provides that,</li> <li>4. <i>"No part of the authorised development is to commence until a CEMP, substantially in accordance with the outline CEMP, for that part has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority to the extent that it relates to matters relevant to its function."</i></li> <li>5. As such, development cannot commence until the CEMP has been approved in writing by the Secretary of State. Therefore, development of the PRow Management Plan as part of the CEMP at detailed design is appropriate.</li> </ol>

Table 1-7 - National Grid Gas PLC – RR-007

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.7.1	NGG wishes to make a relevant representation to the Project DCO in order to protect its position in relation to infrastructure and land	1. The Applicant has liaised with NGG throughout pre-Application design development and the Order limits are such that suitable works can be undertaken to protect NGG apparatus. The dDCO [APP-

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>which is within or near the proposed Order limits. NGG's rights to retain its apparatus in situ and rights of access to inspect, maintain, renew and repair such apparatus located within or near the Order limits should always be maintained and access to inspect and maintain such apparatus must not be restricted. The documentation and plans submitted for the above proposed scheme are being reviewed in relation to impacts on NGG's existing apparatus and land interests located within this area, and NGG may require protective provisions to be included within the DCO to ensure that its interests are adequately protected and to ensure compliance with relevant safety standards. The NGG project team are liaising with the Promoter in this regard and have been throughout the whole process thus far. NGG assets which have been identified as being within or within close proximity to the proposed Order limits are: HIGH PRESSURE GAS PIPELINE: High Pressure Gas Pipeline (Feeder 13) near Causey Park NGG will continue to review the application documents in liaison with the applicant to adequately protect NGG's retained apparatus and to ensure that NGG will be able to deliver the infrastructure associated with the DCO appropriately, in accordance with the applicant's proposed delivery programme. NGG will advise the Examining Authority of any issues in this regard as the examination progresses.</p>	<p>014] includes protective provisions for gas undertakers in Part 1 of Schedule 10. The Applicant is working with NGG to reach agreement on the protective provisions and will submit progress of this throughout the Examination. The applicant has undertaken a process of procuring C3 diversion cost estimates, including discussing and correspondence agreeing proposed requirements for diversion and protection with NGN, and their C3 diversion proposal is based on these discussions and correspondence.</p>

Table 1-8 - Natural England – RR-008

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.8.1.1	Natural England's advice in these relevant representations is based on information submitted by Highways England in support of its application for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') in relation to A1 in Northumberland – Morpeth to Ellingham (the project).	1. Noted
1.8.1.2	Natural England has been working closely with Highways England and their consultants to provide advice and guidance since 2017. This has included detailed discussions regarding the compensatory planting requirements for the ancient woodland losses within the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and suitable mitigation measures to minimise impacts on the SSSI from the construction of the southern pier. Discussions have also taken place regarding protected species impacts, and the information required to enable Letters of No Impediment to be issued. Progress has been made on a Statement of Common Ground for Part A of the project. Further work is required to agree a Statement of Common Ground for Part B.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Applicant and Natural England was signed in March 2020 for Part A of the Scheme. This is incorporated into the SoCG between the Applicant and Natural England for the Scheme submitted at Deadline 1 which has been shared with Natural England in advance of Deadline 1. The Applicant welcomes further discussion with Natural England to secure a SoCG for the Scheme as a whole (which will include an update to information previously presented for Part A).</li> <li>2. A meeting was held between the Applicant and Natural England on the 15 December 2020 to progress discussions on the whole Scheme.</li> <li>3. Letters of No Impediment (LONIs) with caveats were provided by Natural England for Part A of the Scheme in May 2020. The Applicant is liaising with Natural England to update the referenced Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) name stated on the LONIs. It is not anticipated that the main content of the LONIs will change. As part of this process, the Applicant is also liaising with Natural England to secure LONIs for Part B.</li> </ol>
1.8.1.3	These relevant representations contain a summary of what Natural England considers the main nature conservation issues to be in	1. Noted

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	relation to the DCO application and indicate the principal submissions that it wishes to make at this point. Natural England will develop these points further as appropriate during the examination process. It may have further or additional points to make, particularly if further information about the project becomes available.	
1.8.1.4	Part I of these representations provides an overview of the issues and a summary of Natural England's advice. Section 2 identifies the natural features relevant to this application. Section 3 summarises Natural England's overall view of the application and the main issues which it considers need to be addressed by the Secretary of State.	1. Noted
1.8.1.5	Part II of these representations sets out all the significant issues which remain outstanding, and which Natural England advises should be addressed by Highways England and the Examining Authority as part of the examination process in order to ensure that the project can properly be consented. These are primarily issues on which further information would be required in order to allow the Examining Authority properly to undertake its task or where further work is required to agree on the potential impacts of the development on designated sites and to provide a sufficient degree of confidence as to their efficacy.	1. Noted
1.8.1.6	Natural England will continue discussions with Highways England to seek to resolve these concerns and agree outstanding matters in a statement of common ground. Failing satisfactory agreement, Natural England advises that the matters set out in sections 4 to 7 will require consideration by the Examining Authority as part of the examination process.	1. The Applicant welcomes further discussions with Natural England to resolve any concerns and agree outstanding matters. A meeting was held between the Applicant and Natural England on the 15 December 2020 to progress discussions, which has been documented within the SoCG submitted at Deadline 1.
1.8.1.7	The Examining Authority may wish to ensure that the matters set out in these relevant representations are addressed as part of the Examining Authority's first set of questions to ensure the provision of information early in the examination process. 2. The natural features potentially affected by this application.	1. Noted
1.8.2.1	The designated sites relevant to this application are: 2.1.1. the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	1. Agreed
1.8.2.2	The following European and Nationally protected species may be affected by the proposed project: 2.2.1. Bats – Common pipistrelle; Soprano pipistrelle, Noctule and Natterer's; 2.2.2. Great Crested Newts; 2.2.3. Badgers.	1. Agreed
1.8.2.3	The following areas of non-designated but valuable and sensitive habitat are affected: 2.3.1. Ancient semi- natural woodland; 2.3.2. Lowland meadows; 2.3.3. Ponds; 2.3.4. Lowland mixed deciduous	1. Agreed

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	woodland; 2.3.5. Hedgerows; 2.3.6. Rivers, and 2.3.7. Arable field margins, all of which are habitats of principle importance.	
1.8.2.4	The main issues raised by this application are: 2.4.1. The proposal will result in the loss of SSSI habitat from the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI as a result of the new bridge to be constructed – these impacts will be both temporary during construction, and permanent from the presence of new infrastructure, and increased shadowing of vegetation. This will include the loss of irreplaceable ancient semi-natural woodland from within the SSSI; 2.4.2. The proposal will result in the permanent loss of Habitats of Principal Importance including lowland mixed deciduous woodland, lowland meadows, hedgerows, ponds, rivers and arable field margins; 2.4.3. The proposals will directly and indirectly impact habitats and structures that support European and nationally protected species.	1. Agreed
1.8.3.1	Natural England's advice is that in relation to identified nature conservation issues within its remit there is no fundamental reason of principle why the project should not be permitted but further discussions with Highways England and their consultants in relation to the air quality impact assessment on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI are required.	1. Whilst the Applicant and Natural England continue to discuss the impacts of the Scheme on these receptors, the Applicant notes that Natural England does not consider there to be a reason of principle why the Scheme should not receive development consent.
1.8.3.2	Natural England's headline points are that on the basis of the information submitted: 3.2.1. Natural England is satisfied that the proposal will not be likely to have a significant effect on European designated sites, as we have confirmed directly with the applicants and their consultants previously and included as Appendices C and F of the submitted Habitats Regulations Assessment. 3.2.2. Natural England is satisfied that while the proposals will directly impact on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest both permanently and temporarily, acceptable compensation for the loss of irreplaceable habitats has been identified and will be delivered through the scheme. 3.2.3. Natural England is also satisfied that impacts on protected species have been identified, and sufficient information which has enabled Letters of No Impediment to be issued. 3.2.4. Natural England and Highways England do not agree on the approach to air quality assessment detailed in the updated DMRB, and so will continue discussions to reach agreement on the air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI. 3.2.5. Natural England advises that, if approved, the project must be subject to all necessary and appropriate requirements which ensure that unacceptable environmental impacts either do not occur or are significantly mitigated.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant notes that Natural England is satisfied with the impact assessment in relation to European designated sites, the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI and protected species (items 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 within the Relevant Representation [RR-008]).</li> <li>2. Regarding item 3.2.4 of the Relevant Representation [RR-008], discussions are ongoing between Natural England and the Applicant regarding the approach to air quality assessment detailed in the updated DMRB (LA 105 Air Quality).</li> <li>3. The assessment of air quality carried out for the Scheme was carried out in accordance with Interim Advice Note (IAN) 174/13: Updated advice for evaluating significant local air quality effects for users of DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 Air Quality (HA 207/07), with a sensitivity test completed in accordance with LA 105 Air Quality (as explained in paragraphs 9.4.28 to 9.4.32 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A [APP-048], which are the appropriate methodologies for the assessment of air quality impacts of road schemes. Discussions between Natural England and the Applicant to reach agreement on the assessment of air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI are ongoing, and will be documented within the SoCG.</li> <li>4. In relation to item 3.2.5 of the Relevant Representation [RR-008], the Outline CEMP [APP-346] details mitigation and compensation developed to avoid or reduce the impacts of the Scheme. This includes, for example, protected species mitigation licences.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.8.3.3	Natural England's advice is that the potential impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI from air quality as a result of increased traffic movement require further discussion during the Examination process with Highways England and their consultants. This impacts require agreement before development consent can be granted. However, Natural England's advice is that this matter is capable of being overcome.	1. Discussions between Natural England and the Applicant to reach agreement on the air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI are ongoing, and will be documented within the SoCG. The Applicant agrees that this matter is capable of being overcome.
1.8.3.4	Natural England is satisfied that all other environmental impacts arising from the proposal have been adequately identified and suitable mitigation and compensation identified to minimise these impacts as far as possible.	1. Noted and agreed.
1.8.4.1	Natural England intends to continue discussions with Highways England to reach agreement on the approach to air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI, and to agree a Statement of Common Ground for Part B of the Scheme.	1. The Applicant is grateful for the consultation provided to date and will continue to engage with Natural England. An account of all consultation and agreements made will be documented in a single SoCG for the Scheme as a whole.
1.8.5.1	The DCO must ensure that a detailed CEMP, which includes all necessary mitigation and compensation measures is completed and agreed prior to works starting.	1. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been submitted in support of the DCO application, which collates mitigation and compensation developed to date. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be used to inform a CEMP produced by the Main Contractor in advance of Scheme construction as secured by requirement 4 of the dDCO [APP-014].
1.8.6.1	Schedule 2 of the DCO references the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 – these have been superseded by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The DCO should therefore be amended to reference the correct Regulations, and the paragraph references should also be amended to reflect the correct sections of the latest Regulations.	1. The Applicant thanks Natural England for confirming the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations set out in the draft DCO [APP-014] have been superseded. The draft DCO [APP-014] has been updated to reflect this and other amendments and submitted at Deadline 1.
1.8.6.2	Natural England is satisfied that the requirements of the draft DCO will ensure that habitats and species are given due consideration during works, and that appropriate measures are in place to ensure no harm or damage to protected sites and species occurs. Natural England 28 October 2020  (Attachment)	1. Noted.

Table 1-9 - Northern Gas Networks – RR-009

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.9.1	We object to your planning application Thank you for sending your notice dated 14-09-2020. We enclose a plan showing our plant in the area of Morpeth To Ellingham A1 Northumberland. We object to the planning application on the grounds that the protection given to our plant may be diminished by the works you intend to carry out. There are specific building proximity distances for individual pipelines,	1. The Applicant acknowledges the objection raised by Northern Gas Networks (NGN). The Applicant has liaised with Northern Gas Networks throughout pre-Application design development and the Order limits are such that suitable works can be undertaken to protect NGN apparatus. 2. The dDCO includes protective provisions for gas undertakers in Part 1 of Schedule 10. The Applicant is also working with NGN to reach agreement on protective provisions and will submit progress of this throughout the Examination. The applicant has undertaken a process of procuring C3 diversion cost

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	which are dependent on pre-defined risk levels and the type of development. (Attachments)	estimates, including discussing and correspondence agreeing proposed requirements for diversion and protection with NGN, and their C3 diversion proposal is based on these discussions and correspondence.

**Table 1-10 - BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Royal Mail – RR-010**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.10.1	<p>BNPPRE act on behalf of Royal Mail and whilst our clients do not have an in principle, objection to the proposed scheme we are seeking to secure mitigations to protect our operations within the location of the project. Under section 35 of the Postal Services Act 2011 (the "Act"), Royal Mail (RM) has been designated by Ofcom as a provider of the Universal Postal Service. Royal Mail is the only such provider in the United Kingdom. The Act provides that Ofcom's primary regulatory duty is to secure the provision of the Universal Postal Service. Ofcom discharges this duty by imposing regulatory conditions on Royal Mail, requiring it to provide the Universal Postal Service. The Act includes a set of minimum standards for Universal Service Providers, which Ofcom must secure. The conditions imposed by Ofcom reflect those standards. Royal Mail is under some of the highest specification performance obligations for quality of service in Europe. Its performance of the Universal Service Provider obligations is in the public interest and should not be affected detrimentally by any statutorily authorised project. The Government imposes financial penalties on Royal Mail if its Universal Service Obligation service delivery targets are not met. These penalties relate to time targets for collections, clearance through plant and delivery. Royal Mail's postal sorting and delivery operations rely heavily on road communications. Royal Mail's ability to provide efficient mail collection, sorting and delivery to the public is sensitive to changes in the capacity of the highway network. Royal Mail is a major road user nationally. Disruption to the highway network and traffic delays can have direct consequences on Royal Mail's operations, its ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation and comply with the regulatory regime for postal services thereby presenting a significant risk to Royal Mail's business. There are three operational facilities within 12 miles of this proposal, Alnwick Delivery Office ("DO"), Morpeth DO and Ashington DO. The location, nature and scale of the proposed improvements could present risk of construction phase impact / delays to Royal Mail's road based operations on the surrounding road network. The key concerns to RM's operations will be the impact to collection mail coming from Alnwick DO and Berwick DO (30 miles north of the Scheme), en route to Tyneside Mail Centre for processing. As well as causing</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant notes the response from Royal Mail in respect of maintaining an efficient sorting and delivery service and confirms that the Scheme will result in benefits to users including reduced travel duration. There are no adverse effects identified that will impact on Royal Mail's service as a result of the Scheme. Royal Mail has not provided any evidence that it will be or is likely to be adversely affected.</li> <li>2. The final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is secured by the CEMP at Section 1.2. This will include provision for a mechanism to inform major road users about works affecting the local and strategic road network including Royal Mail distribution facilities in the area surrounding the Scheme (see paragraph 5.13 of the CTMP [APP-347]). This will include notifications related to proposed road closures and associated diversions. Details of the anticipated closures are referenced in paragraph 2.6 of the CTMP [APP-347] and the diversion routes are shown in Appendix C of the CTMP [APP-347]. The proposed diversion routes are already used by the Applicant when overnight closures of the A1 are required for essential maintenance. The majority of the proposed A1 closures will be overnight, with approximately 4 extended closures for each part to allow for construction of tie ins. The diversion routes direct traffic to use suitable parallel routes (A697/A1066), allowing users to complete trips when the A1 is closed.</li> <li>3. However, it is not appropriate to insert specific provisions for the protection for Royal Mail in the dDCO [APP-014]. Rather, the principal means of managing the effects of the Scheme upon the highway network will be by provisions in the CEMP/CTMP, which require consultation with the local highway authorities (see [S-PH5]). This is aligned with and wholly appropriate in all other highway schemes promoted by the Applicant and those authorities and no additional consultation approach is required in this instance.</li> <li>4. The Applicant does not believe that the operation of Royal Mail's service or any of its existing sites will be adversely affected by construction or operation of the Scheme.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>impacts to inward mail deliveries from Tyneside to Alnwick DO. Every day, in exercising its statutory duties Royal Mail vehicles use of the A1 and other subsequent main road that may potentially be affected by additional traffic arising from the construction of the proposed upgrades. Any periods of road disruption / closure, night or day, have the potential to impact operations. Royal Mail does not wish to stop or delay the improvements from coming forward for development. However, Royal Mail does wish to ensure the protection of its future ability to provide an efficient mail sorting and delivering service. In order to do this, Royal Mail requests that: 1. The DCO includes specific requirements that during the construction phase Royal Mail is consulted by Highways England or its contractors at least one month in advance on any proposed road closures / diversions / alternative access arrangements, hours of working, and the content of the final CTMP, and 2. The final CTMP includes a mechanism to inform major road users (including Royal Mail) about works affecting the local highways network (with particular regard to Royal Mail's distribution facilities near the DCO application boundary as identified above). Royal Mail reserves its position to object to the DCO application if the above requests are not adequately addressed.</p>	

## 1.5 NON-STATUTORY ORGANISATIONS

Table 1-11 - Northumberland Estates – RR-011

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.11.1	<p>We confirm that this representation is submitted on behalf of Northumberland Estates which is the organisation responsible for land registered in the name of a number of trusts and/or individuals which form part of Northumberland Estates (including but not limited to The Honourable George Dominic Percy, The Most Noble Ralph George Algernon Twelfth Duke of Northumberland, The Most Noble Richard Walter John Tenth Duke of Buccleuch, the Twelfth Duke of Queensberry, Viscount Matthew White Ridley, The Honourable James William Eustace Percy, The Honourable Richard Charles Percy and Percy Farms). We note that the proposed Development Consent Order ("DCO") affects a wide range of land and interests of Northumberland Estates although we are not able at this stage to confirm with certainty the precise extent of interests affected. Whilst we have engaged with Highways England over the course of the last year, the plans submitted with the DCO application have not previously been shared with the Estate and therefore we need to consider and review these further in order to assess the full impact of the DCO.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant has undertaken diligent inquiry to identify persons with an interest in the land affected by the Scheme as set out under section 44 of the Planning Act 2008. Through this process, the Applicant has identified the following plots of land as under ownership, or in the interest of, Northumberland Estates:</p> <p>11-1c, 11-1d, 11-1i, 11-3a, 11-3b, 11-4a, 12-3e, 12-3l, 12-3o, 12-3p, 12-3r, 12-3v, 12-3w, 12-3z, 13-1g, 13-1i, 13-1j, 13-1l, 13-1m, 13-1o, 13-4c, 13-5b, 13-5c, 15-12a, 15-16a, 15-5a, 16/6a (permanent acquisition)</p> <p>11-1a, 11-1g, 11-1h, 11-1j, 11-1l, 11-4f, 12-1a, 12-2a, 12-3a, 12-3aa, 12-3b, 12-3bb, 12-3c, 12-3cc, 12-3d, 12-3dd, 12-3ee, 12-3ff, 12-3gg, 12-3hh, 12-3ii, 12-3k, 12-3n, 12-3s, 12-3t, 12-3x, 12-3y, 12-4a, 13-1a, 13-1b, 13-1c, 13-1d, 13-1f, 13-1h, 13-1k, 13-1n, 13-1p, 13-5a, 13-5d, 18-1a, 18-2a, 18-2b, 18-3a, 18-3b (permanent acquisition of rights over)</p> <p>11-1b, 11-1e, 11-1f, 11-1k, 11-1n, 11-2d, 11-3c, 11-4b, 11-4c, 11-4d, 11-4e, 12-3f, 12-3g, 12-3h, 12-3i, 12-3j, 12-3m, 12-3q, 12-3u, 13-1e, 13-1q, 14-5a, 19-1a (temporary possession and use of)</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>We are aware at this stage that there are some interests which do not appear to have been acknowledged. In particular, Northumberland Estates own mineral rights south of the A1 near Felton. We require further clarification from Highways England of how the DCO proposes to deal with mineral interests</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Within the Book of Reference (BoR) [APP-020], mines and mineral rights interests have been captured through HMLR titles associated to the plots. Where HMLR titles state that mines and minerals have been excluded but do not provide a named holder, the Book of Reference has shown these by using an 'Unknown' interest name along with a land qualifier stating, 'in respect of mines and minerals'. In cases where the mines and minerals have been registered separately through HMLR, these would be captured within the BoR using the named holder alongside the land qualifier stated above. If the landowner is aware of mineral rights not registered then the Applicant will be able to follow this up for future refreshes of the BoR.</li> <li>2. In line with common practice, Article 27 of the dDCO [APP-014] incorporates the mineral code in terms of Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the Acquisition of Land 1981. Essentially, this mean that the DCO will not authorise acquisition of the minerals. If the owner of minerals desires to work them, the minerals code contains a procedure whereby they serve notice on the undertaker. If the undertaker considers that working the minerals is likely to damage the undertaking then compensation is payable to the minerals' owner.</li> </ol>
	<p>On the basis that we have not yet been able to ascertain the full impact of the proposals on the land/interests of Northumberland Estates, we object to the DCO application insofar as it affects the land/interests of Northumberland Estates and in addition to our comments below we expressly incorporate into our objection those outstanding issues in our letter to Highways England dated 2 May 2019. There are a number of specific concerns which we have shared with Highways England prior to the submission of the DCO application which remain relevant as follows:-</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant is in discussions with Northumberland Estates with a view to resolving their concerns.</li> </ol>
	<p>1) There is an electricity cable which connects to a wind farm and is currently located within the highways verge. Our position is that the electricity cable should continue to be located in the highways verge (albeit in the new location of the verge) and it is not necessary for further land to be acquired for the re-location of the electricity cable. We require further clarity from Highways England in relation to their proposals in respect of this.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal is not practical. To move the cable from its current location to a diverted location in the new highway verge would entail two diversions – first to allow a safe working area; and secondly to provide the final alignment. This is inevitably more work-intensive and also has higher environmental impacts. A cable cannot always be reused in these circumstances, so it would need replacing twice. This is a poor use of resources.</li> <li>2. Due to level changes necessitated by the widening, the cable will need to be located in a position where it can remain whilst the road works are in progress and thereafter. A statutory undertaker corridor outside the highway boundary on third party land (including that of the respondent) was originally devised and easements would have been required for future maintenance. However, through consultation with landowners, including the respondent, and the utility company, an alternative location to have the stats corridor within a similar location but inside the permanent highway boundary has been considered as Parameter 3 in the ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. This location is now preferred by the utility company and will remove the majority of easements over third party land, including Northumberland Estates.</li> <li>3. The high voltage cable is to be diverted to the east of the online widening section of Part B. An overview of the route is described in ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. It will be diverted into a safe working zone trench outside the proposed new carriageway earthworks, adjacent to the temporary haul road as shown in Appendix 2.2 Technical Drawings [APP-188].</li> <li>4. The phasing of works is also set out in Chapter 2 The Scheme of the ES [APP-037] and the CTMP [APP-347]. This has considered that the new highway verge will not exist until the ground is profiled and the road is constructed. Therefore, the Applicant's proposed solution is informed by the timing as well as the need to allow a sufficient working distance to a live cable whilst construction works are</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>underway in accordance with the Construction Design and Management Regulations (CDM Regs) 2015. Put shortly, it is not possible to divert into a highway verge that does not yet exist, so the cable diversion would be laid in new highway land toe reserved early in the construction phasing.</p> <p>5. In order to construct the A1 widening safely whilst maintaining the 66kv operations, the cable needs to be installed in a position where there will be sufficient distance maintained from the main works.</p>
1.11.2	<p>In relation to the northern part of the area which is identified as a site compound on Land Plan 19, we made Highways England aware of the intention to develop this land in a number of meetings held earlier this year. Planning permission was granted for the construction of a 1,700 sqm B2/B8 general industrial shed and storage yards on 22 September 2020. We have instructed contractors to commence the development of this land and works will start imminently. Notwithstanding that we have previously suggested to Highways England that an alternative area of land could be made available and used as the site compound, disappointingly such proposals have not been developed by Highways England nor included in the DCO.</p>	<p>1. Liaison with Northumberland Estates is ongoing and the Applicant has confirmed to the landowner that they have considered the potential impact of reducing the Scheme compound area, impacted by their recent planning permission at Lionheart. The Applicant considers that the scale of the proposed compound can be reduced in size in order to accommodate the development which has been granted planning permission. Given that both developments may be proceeding in tandem, this issue is best addressed in an agreement between the Applicant and Northumberland Estates and this is being pursued by the Applicant. Should it be appropriate to reduce the size of parcels in this location, revised application plans will be supplied. It is proposed to enter into an undertaking with Northumberland Estates for the reduction in the compound area so as not to impact on their development.</p>
1.11.3	<p>In addition to the point made above in respect of the site compound area, we have also notified Highways England that significant infrastructure (at a cost of £1.2 million) has been constructed in order to facilitate the development identified above. Whilst we expressly reserve our position as regards compensation, we are concerned that the approach envisaged in the DCO will to a greater or lesser extent undo or compromise the infrastructure works, and invariably add costs and delays to and adversely affect our proposed development. Furthermore, the DCO in this respect does not appear to have properly considered alternatives. We require further clarity in respect of this.</p>	<p>1. The site compound is an essential element for delivery of the Scheme, but the Applicant does not intend for the Application to compromise the existing development at this site. Liaison with Northumberland Estates is ongoing on the detailed requirements for the use of the Lionheart site compound and draws on the existing infrastructure (access, water, electricity, etc). S-L10 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that, upon completion, areas used as construction compounds will be returned to their original use.</p> <p>2. Compounds are temporarily required to facilitate the construction of the Scheme. The compounds will include staff parking, site accommodation, materials storage, road sweepings management, facilities to wash vehicles and plant, and material maintenance areas. The majority of these cannot be efficiently maintained along the length of the Scheme and can be more safely managed in a compound area.</p> <p>3. At an early stage in development the District Valuer discussed potential compound sites with the landowner who offered this site for potential use. The availability and amount of compensation for rental of the commercial plot is not a matter for this examination.</p> <p>4. Alternative satellite compounds were considered before EIA Scoping Report was published. An alternative compound location would have been to increase the identified satellite compound adjacent to the A1 widening at Charlton Mires (impacting a different landowner), and creating a new satellite compound within this landowners interests. This would have required greater temporary acquisition of agricultural land with associated environmental impacts.</p> <p>5. The Lionheart site is an established area to accommodate welfare facilities, site office and construction plant, materials and waste requirements and its use as a site compound is consistent with the usage of adjacent plots. This location has direct access to the existing road network and available utility supplies and its full establishment as a compound will have a reduced environmental impact when compared to a remote agricultural plot.</p>
1.11.4	<p>We have been engaging with Highways England in respect of the impact which the proposals will have on public rights of way. In</p>	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that only those PRoWs impacted by the Scheme, either temporarily or permanently, are affected. These are identified on the Rights of Ways and Access Plans [APP-009].</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	particular, we have agreed (in principle) the routes of a number of diversions. The DCO application documents appear to still identify land/rights being acquired over the routes of existing rights of way that are proposed to be stopped up. We require further clarity in respect of this as we do not consider such acquisition to be necessary.	Following a review of the references on these Plans, an updated Rights of Ways and Access Plans [APP-009] is submitted at Deadline 1.
1.11.5	We have previously raised concerns with Highways England regarding the impact which the DCO proposals will have on the drainage of the arable fields through which the works will be completed. We consider that a drainage survey should be conducted in advance of the works commencing in order to document the existing drainage arrangements. Following the completion of the survey, a drainage strategy could be developed and agreed to ensure that any impact on the arable fields is mitigated against.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has discussed the principles of advance drainage surveys with Northumberland Estates. The Applicant's approach for advanced surveys is that they will be undertaken prior to start of works to allow detailed design of land drains to be accommodated within the temporary works and final Scheme proposal.</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good. Action S-GS15 confirms there will be a programme of monitoring soil conditions following reinstatement of temporary land take. Suitable remediation would include subsoiling or drainage followed by crop establishment.</li> </ol>
1.11.6	We require further clarity from Highways England on the proposals regarding the fencing, landscaping and ongoing maintenance (including the management of ragwort/other weeds) of the land acquired by Highways England that will be in close proximity to Northumberland Estates' land.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant is committed in Table 3-3 B-PH4 the Outline CEMP [APP-346] Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: Part B for the temporary effects on agricultural land and farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. The Main Contractor will engage with the Landowner to determine the specification for fencing prior to installation.</li> <li>2. With reference to the ongoing landscape maintenance, item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The 3000 specification sets out the how the landscape proposals will be delivered and maintained during the construction and establishment periods, and includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within acceptable levels, and it will be the responsibility of the Applicant to ensure that this is delivered as part of the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346], to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan as required in S-B19 of the Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.</li> <li>3. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in Section 5.2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES.</li> <li>4. Responsibilities for ongoing maintenance of any re-positioned boundary fence will be as per existing arrangements. Ongoing maintenance of accommodation works fencing will be the responsibility of the landowner.</li> </ol>
1.11.7	We are concerned to ensure that the extent of land take from the agricultural fields is limited to the minimum that is required. We require further engagement by Highways England regarding the proposed field boundary re-alignments and clarification and confirmation that all necessary steps will be taken to ensure that the	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land identified as part of the Application has been limited to the minimum required to safely construct, operate and maintain the Scheme. The Applicant has continued to engage with Northumberland Estates on specific aspects of accessibility to be considered at detailed design to the landowners' satisfaction.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	land retained by Northumberland Estates is of a size/shape which allows for continued beneficial use and accessibility with modern commercial machinery.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Applicant confirms that it will continue to engage with Northumberland Estates with regard to the alignment of field boundaries to allow for continued use and accessibility with modern commercial machinery where possible</li> <li>3. Affected Land parcels are as follows. At Silvermoor Farm, parcels 13/1l, 12/3e, 12/3p, 12/3q, 12/5a, 12/3o, 12/3r, 12/3u, 11/1c, 11/2a, 13/4e, 13/1m and 13/1n would be permanently acquired, parcels 12/3f, 12/3q, 12/3j, 12/3i, 12/3h, 12/3g, 12/3u, 11/1b and 11/2c would be required for temporary possession and use of land and parcels 12/3a, 12/3k, 12/1a, 12/2a, 12/4a, 11/1a and 13/1k would be permanently required for rights over land. Affected land at the location of the proposed Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound (parcel 19/1a) would be required for temporary possession and use.</li> <li>4. Within Appendices CA.4 and CA.5 to the Applicant's responses to the written questions on compulsory purchase justifications, detailed justification is provided for all of these plots</li> <li>5. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings (in this case Silvermoor Farm, and land in the location of the proposed Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound), undertaken in accordance with DMRB) Volume 11, Section 11, Part 6. Silvermoor Farm would have 4.95ha of temporary land take and 7.28ha of permanent land take, and closure of two accesses from the A1. This is predicted to result in a slight adverse effect (not significant) for both construction and operation. Use of land at the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound would result in 10.26ha of temporary land take, which is predicted to have a temporary slight adverse effect (not significant) for the Northumberland Estate during construction.</li> <li>6. As outlined in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction. Additionally, appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required and as set out within the Outline CEMP [APP-346] (reference B-PH4(f) any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction would be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. Mitigation measures to be implemented during construction are set out within the Outline CEMP [APP-346] (reference B-PH4(e)).</li> <li>7. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed (or if they were rendered potentially rendered unusable under its current function due to a hindrance resulting from the presence of the Scheme) to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.11.8	Access arrangements and/or the quality of access routes requires further consideration particularly in relation to the access routes to Broxfield Farm, Rennington Moor and Goldenmoor Farm.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scheme does not alter the main access roads to Broxfield Farm, Rennington Moor and Goldenmoor Farm. The Applicant has considered the impact on access routes to all severed field parcels serviced by the three farms in question by ensuring each direct entrance from the A1 closed as part of the dualling has an alternative access from a local road or field access and permanent rights acquired across third party land.</li> <li>2. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] S-PH1 confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve field access arrangements which would include the farm plots in question.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>3. Where permanent access is required following completion of the Scheme, for example to maintain detention basins, these are shown in blue as permanent acquisition of rights on the Land Plans [APP-006].</p>
1.11.9	<p>The extent and location of proposed woodland planting needs to be fully considered in the context of Northumberland Estates' sporting rights.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has held discussions with Northumberland Estates to understand their sporting rights. The Applicant is aware of the commercial shooting activities which take place at the woodland area 200m west of the proposed Detention Basin 23, (Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144]). The landscape proposals set out in Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] have sought to replace or reinforce existing roadside features, that comprise hedgerows and woodland in order to provide an appropriate level of essential landscape integration and screening and/or ecological mitigation.</li> <li>2. The land interest questionnaire completed by the landowner (summarised in Appendix 12.1 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [App-324] did not reference a shoot, therefore it has not formed part of the agricultural land holding assessment in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055].</li> <li>3. The Applicant has factored in the sporting rights of Northumberland Estates from a commercial and recreation aspect. However, as the Scheme is not specifically impacting this woodland area, there is no evidence that sporting rights would be affected, and shooting would continue. Therefore, there would be no permanent effects on the viability of the business. .</li> <li>4. If the commercial shoot was temporarily unable operate due to any localised construction works, a claim for compensation could be submitted, which may be able to account for any demonstrated losses incurred and which would need to be agreed with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant.</li> <li>5. The Applicant has provided Northumberland Estates with a hard copy of the landscape proposals in order for any</li> </ol>
1.11.10	<p>We require further clarity on the accessibility of the field parcel on Goldenmoor Farm bordering the A1 in relation to the permanent acquisition of land. As has been highlighted in previous meetings, farm access needs to be maintained to the parcel west of Denwick Burn that borders the A1.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has considered the impact on access routes to all severed field parcels by identifying existing field access tracks suitable for extension to individual parcels.</li> <li>2. Where permanent access is required following completion of the Scheme, for example to maintain detention basins, these are shown in blue as permanent acquisition of rights on the Land Plans [APP-006]</li> <li>3. Access to the severed plot shown as Plot No 11/1k on Sheet 11 of the Land Plans [APP-006] will be over the newly constructed Denwick Burn culvert. Access for the landowner to this plot will be secured through S-PH10 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] to ensure continued access is provided by maintaining existing access wherever possible, or creating a new tracks or access points.</li> <li>4. The Applicant will also have permanent access of rights for future inspection of the outfall (Plot 11/4f).</li> </ol>
1.11.11	<p>We are concerned about the loss of access to the telecoms mast for which the Estate receives a rent and are concerned that the tenants will lose access and terminate the agreement. We understand that access will be taken by re-opening the old access from Heiferlaw Bank. This is a farm internal estate road and is not sufficient for other traffic. We are concerned that this new right will cause an impact on the farming of this land and lead to trespass. We are concerned about who will be maintaining this new access. We also understand that this will be used to access a retention pond, leading</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant's proposal for future access to the telecommunications mast would be from Heiferlaw Bank via the existing estate road as direct access from the A1 would no longer be facilitated by the Scheme. During the works, access will be maintained under temporary traffic management until the off-network access is established. This would be secured through S-PH10 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]; The Applicant has included within the design of the Scheme the upgrade to the existing estate road as a stoned access track in recognition it would be intermittently trafficked by different types of vehicles.</li> <li>2. It is proposed that the Applicant would ensure that the specification of the upgraded estate road would be suitable for the access to the detention basin. Therefore, the Applicant is seeking the permanent</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	to further use of this small track. Further details are required to alleviate our concerns.	<p>acquisition of rights shown in blue at Plot No.13/1a of the Land Plans [APP-006]. Ownership and maintenance of the estate road will remain with Northumberland Estates.</p> <p>3. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme.</p>
1.11.12	We are concerned about the dust, noise and vibrations affecting neighbouring properties and interests.	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme.</li> <li>2. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.8 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme. This includes the neighbouring properties to the Scheme owned by Northumberland Estates.</li> <li>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> </ol> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality and comprises the identification of a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4, and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. Mitigation measures would be secured through the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme and those properties owned by Northumberland Estates.</li> </ol>
1.11.13	Notwithstanding the guidance on the scope of representations, we reserve Northumberland Estates' position in respect of any further points that may need to be identified following further consultation of the documentation/plans now available. It is not readily apparent what the various impacts of the proposed DCO will be as it would appear to contradict some of the assurances that Highways England have given throughout our discussions (for example, in relation to the public rights of way proposals and the site compound)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> </ol>

Table 1-12 - RWE Renewables UK – RR-012

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.12.1	RWE wish to register as an Interested Party to take part in the Examination of the above application for development consent and submit the following Relevant Representation; RWE owns a majority stake in and is responsible for the day to day operation of Middlemoor Wind Farm to the west of the A1 at North Charlton. It is understood that Highways England's proposed works to the A1 particularly the Alnwick to Ellingham (Part B) section will impact on both the access and grid connection to the wind farm.	
1.12.2	It is critical to RWE that access as well as connections to power, communications and water supply is maintained to the wind farm at all times.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft protective provisions for utilities and statutory undertakers are contained in Part 1 of Schedule 10 to the DCO [APP-014]. The Applicant has engaged with all statutory undertakers and utility providers impacted by this Scheme, and assets/apparatus that require relocation to allow the safe construction of the Scheme will be undertaken by the statutory undertaker unless agreed otherwise. Continuity of supply is the responsibility of the statutory undertaker who are relocating the asset, the Applicant will enter into an agreement to allow apparatus to be diverted. It is the responsibility of the statutory undertaker to provide advance notice to its customers of any planned interruption to supply relating to such works and it is also the responsibility of the statutory undertaker to provide alternative means of supply if this is deemed necessary. However, where a body such as RWE requires such a supply to its own undertaking on an uninterrupted basis it is assumed that it will seek to engage with the Applicant in order to achieve any necessary additional protection under the DCO.</li> <li>2. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes Level 1 mitigation measures to be implemented including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S-N2(p) liaison with local businesses to be kept well informed of the timing and duration of construction works;</li> <li>• S-PH8 ensure that traffic management systems will be in place to maintain access to business/commercial facilities during construction and operation; and</li> <li>• A-PH3 measure to reduce impact by maintaining water supplies and utility services where required. These measures will address the concerns raised.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
1.12.3	<p><b>NORMAL OPERATIONAL ACCESS</b></p> <p>RWE understand from previous consultation with WSP on behalf of Highways England that the current route for day to day operational access to the wind farm at North Charlton is within the scheme extents. However, it will not be affected by any works and this junction layout will not change. TR010059-000424-Consultation Report page 117 states that the Applicant agrees in principle that access will also be maintained during construction although traffic management measures could mean some delays.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Scheme will not alter the existing access route to the windfarm site, however, during construction the Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] will seek to minimise any access delays. By implementing measures such as incident management protocols, driver compliance enforcement and journey time reliability information, any disruption during the Scheme construction will be minimised.</li> </ol>
1.12.4	<p><b>ABNORMAL INDIVISIBLE LOADS (AIL) ACCESS</b></p> <p>TR010059-000424-Consultation Report, Table 31: Summary of statutory consultation responses which have not changed the design - A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham, states that 'a second access route to Middlemoor Wind Farm is not required' and that no design change was made. This appears to contradict previous discussion with WSP who advised that the existing second AIL access route would be affected by the A1 widening works but</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An "abnormal indivisible load" is defined as a load that cannot, without undue expense or risk of damage, be divided into two or more loads for the purpose of being carried on a road and that owing to its dimensions and/or weight cannot be carried on a traditional highway vehicle. Operation and maintenance of a windfarm site will periodically require delivery and removal of atypical equipment from RWE's site. Middlemoor Wind Farm currently use the existing track (which the scheme is not altering) to access both the northbound and southbound A1.</li> <li>2. As part of the consultation, the Applicant has considered the principles of abnormal load routes across the Scheme. In order to provide southbound AIL movements, a modified central reserve is</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	would still remain in use with the addition of a central reserve crossing point. TR010059-000437-Consultation Report Appendix 13 in Table N.10: Statutory Consultation under section 42(1)(a) of the Planning Act 2008 with Prescribed Consultees states that 'The Applicant confirms the consultees queries are for the detailed design and construction stages of the Scheme and will be addressed at that point'. It is not clear to RWE that our concerns regarding AIL access have been addressed and we reserve an objection in the meantime on this basis. RWE welcomes the statement in the TR010059-000747-Construction Traffic Management Plan that the main contractor will liaise with RWE in advance of the construction works. RWE would welcome more detail on the wind farm AIL route design and mechanism for agreeing a workable solution in the absence of any firm commitment in the CTMP at this stage.	included within the Application at approximately CH60,500. This will allow vehicles who currently intend to travel south from the existing Middlemoor Wind Farm access track to navigate across the proposed dual carriageway central reserve and continue their journey south.
1.12.5	<p><b>UTILITIES</b></p> <p>WSP previously advised that diversions for the extra high voltage 66kV cable serving the wind farm would be put in place whilst the existing cable remains in place, with only 1-2 days of downtime for connection. WSP also advised that the same applies for other utilities serving the wind farm (e.g. BT and Northumbrian Water). To reduce the impact on the operation of Middlemoor Wind Farm, RWE maintain a strong preference for outages to occur during the summer months .</p> <p>RWE would also welcome further discussion regarding compensation for any outage related losses.</p> <p>The diversion of the NPG circuit is referred to in paragraph 2.5.279. of TR010059-000439 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - The Scheme. Paragraph 2.5.281 refers to Section 2.11 for further details, but Section 2.11 Off-Site Works does not appear to reference utilities. RWE are unable to find any reference to the location of or impact upon communication links or water supplies. It is not clear to RWE that all our concerns regarding utilities have been addressed and we reserve an objection in the meantime on this basis .</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The alternative diversion of the NPG circuit should refer to section 2.12 of Chapter 12: Population and Health of the ES [APP-037] and not section 2.11. Section 2.12.5 sets out the particular assumptions made for Part B and includes Parameter 3 which sets out the alternative diversion. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes Level 1 mitigation measures to be implemented S-N2(p) liaison with local businesses to be kept well informed of the timing and duration of construction works. S-PH8 ensure that traffic management systems will be in place to maintain access to business/commercial facilities during construction and operation. A-PH3 measure to reduce impact by maintaining water supplies and utility services where required.</li> <li>2. It is not anticipated that any temporary reduction in amenity would be permanently detrimental to the business. However, if the business was temporarily unable operate due to any localised construction works, a claim for compensation could be submitted, which may be able to account for any demonstrated losses incurred and which would need to be agreed with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant.</li> <li>3. Draft protective provisions for utilities and statutory undertakers are contained in Part 1 of Schedule 10 to the DCO [APP-014]. The Applicant has engaged with all statutory undertakers and utility providers impacted by this Scheme, utilities that are required to be relocated to allow the safe construction of the scheme will be undertaken by the utility owner unless agreed otherwise. Continuity of supply is the responsibility of the utility company who are relocating the asset, the Applicant will enter into an agreement with each utility provider to allow apparatus to be diverted as appropriate by the asset owner. It is the responsibility of the utility provider to provide advance notice to its customers of any planned interruption to supply and it is also the responsibility of the utility provider to provide alternative means of supply if this is deemed necessary. However, where a statutory undertaker requires such a supply on an uninterrupted basis it is assumed that it will seek to engage with the Applicant in order to achieve any necessary additional protection under the DCO.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-13 - Transport Action Network – RR-013**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.13.1	I am very concerned that this road will significantly increase carbon emissions and undermine our efforts to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2050 (Climate Change Act 2008). The ES states that	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The emissions data presented by Transport Action Network in their Relevant Representation makes reference to the data presented within Chapter 14: Climate Part A [APP-058]. The Scheme emissions data are presented in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects [APP-062], where emissions are</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>the scheme will increase emissions by 1,855,000 additional tonnes of carbon due to increased traffic, and 34,750 tonnes due to construction. This isn't 'not significant' as the ES claims. At current trajectories the UK is unlikely to reach net zero by 2050, with road transport emissions playing a significant role in that failure. It is vital we *reduce* emissions much faster than we are doing now, and not increase them. This scheme takes us backwards on tackling climate change.</p>	<p>anticipated to increase by 2,487,000 tonnes for the lifecycle of the Scheme (59,000 tonnes related to construction phase and 2,428,000 tonnes related to operational phase).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Chapter 14: Climate Part A [APP-058] and Chapter 14: Climate Part B [APP-059], sets out the assessment of the effect of the Scheme on climate change (Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions), has been completed in line with the appropriate methodologies available at the time of writing. These include IEMA EIA Guide to Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance (2017); NPS NN (2014); TAG Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal, Chapter 4 Greenhouse Gases; and PAS 2080:2016 Carbon management in infrastructure.</li> <li>3. The assessment of significance of effects in these chapters and for the Scheme (Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects [APP-062]) aligns with the methodology set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NN NPS). The estimated GHG emissions arising from the Scheme (Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects [APP-062]) have been compared with UK carbon budgets and the associated reduction targets (refer to Table 16-8 of Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects [APP-062]). NN NPS Paragraph 3.8 sets out that <i>“the impact of road development on aggregate levels of emissions is likely to be very small”</i> and that <i>“the annual CO<sub>2</sub> impacts from delivering a programme of investment on the Strategic Road Network of the scale envisaged in Investing in Britain's Future amount to well below 0.1% of average annual carbon emissions allowed in the fourth carbon budget”</i>. It is acknowledged that the Scheme would result in an increase in GHG emissions and this would contribute to the carbon budgets. However, the emissions associated with the Scheme have been minimised through the mitigation measures detailed in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and are relatively small when compared to the carbon budgets (between 0.00824% and 0.01074%).</li> <li>4. As set out in Section 14.10 of Chapter 14: Climate Part A [APP-058] and Chapter 14: Climate Part B [APP-059], and carried through for the Scheme (Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects [APP-062]), in the absence of agreed thresholds for what level of GHG emissions is considered significant for an EIA, professional judgement has been used to assess the significance of effects. This, in combination with the guidance set out in the NN NPS, has determined the Scheme to be not significant.</li> <li>5. The UK Government's commitment to new Net Zero carbon targets for 2050 is not a moratorium on the development of new roads or the improvement of existing roads. The Net Zero target includes the provision for emissions to increase, as long as there is a commensurate decrease, at national scale. Although the Scheme is expected to result in an increase in emissions it is not possible to deduce that the Scheme would stop the UK Government from meeting the target.</li> <li>6. Building a new road does not conflict with banning the sale of specific technologies or the use of different technologies on the road. The ban on new petrol and diesel cars for sale from 2040 does not mean that the Scheme will not be required. The strategic road network is capable of being used by electric vehicles as well as those run on conventional fuel sources, and any ban on such vehicles inevitably necessitates a shift to electric vehicles. A ban on conventional fuel sourced vehicles does not therefore impact on the need for or use of the Scheme and does not render the Scheme redundant as it is capable of being used by all vehicle technologies consistently with Government policy.</li> <li>7. The Climate Change Act commits the UK to net zero carbon emissions by 2050, and Highways England, along with all sectors of the UK economy, must play its part in meeting this target. Highways England is pursuing a range of opportunities to support the vision for the Strategic Road Network (SRN) set out in the second Road Investment Strategy (RIS). This 2050 vision states: “the majority of all vehicles using the SRN, including almost all cars and vans, are zero emission at the tailpipe, transforming the impact of the SRN on air quality and carbon emissions”.</li> <li>8. In its last road period, Highways England met and exceeded a target to ensure 95% of the SRN is within 20 miles of an electric vehicle charging point. This is one measure by which the Applicant will</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		help overcome possible range anxiety and support the transition away from petrol and diesel. The Applicant is continuing to prepare the SRN for evolving mobility demands. The Scheme forms an integral part of that process.

Table 1-14 - The Woodland Trust – RR-014

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.14.1	<p>We are concerned about the direct loss of 0.68 hectares of Dukes Bank Wood (grid reference: NZ175998), an area of ancient woodland that falls on both sides of the current A1. Dukes Bank Wood is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Local Wildlife Site (LWS). Ancient woodland is defined as an irreplaceable natural resource that has remained constantly wooded since 1600AD. Ancient woodland takes centuries to develop and evolve, creating vital links between plants, animals and soils – a habitat for many of the UK's most important and threatened fauna and flora species. Therefore, it cannot be re-created and cannot afford to be lost. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 175 states: "When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons<sup>58</sup> and a suitable compensation strategy exists". Paragraph 5.32 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks also contains wording related to the protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees, stating: "The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the national need for and benefits of the development, in that location, clearly outweigh the loss." The proposed scheme will result in direct loss to SSSI-designated Dukes Bank Wood, with loss of habitat and compaction of the valuable ancient woodland soils. As well as direct impacts, indirect impacts from construction and operation of the scheme can also be expected in the form of habitat fragmentation, noise and light pollution, increased exposure, dust pollution and a potential increase in traffic emissions (leading to increased deposition of nitrates). We acknowledge that the applicant is proposing compensation planting at a ratio of 12:1. We believe that the level of compensation needs to be commensurate with the irreplaceable nature of the habitat lost and therefore ask that the applicant adopts a ratio of 30 hectares of new planting for every one hectare of ancient woodland lost. We are also concerned about the translocation of ancient woodland soils for new areas of planting as we understand that invasive species such as Himalayan Balsam are present in the area and any translocation process could aid the spread of such species. In summary, the Trust</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that ancient woodland is an irreplaceable resource. Potential route corridors to avoid the ancient woodland in its entirety were considered (see paragraph 3.3.8 of Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives of the ES [APP-038]). However, the only options to avoid the ancient woodland would require a significant length of additional dual carriageway (between 4 to 5 miles), which would negate the objectives of the Scheme. As such, it was not possible to design a Scheme that would avoid ancient woodland entirely.</li> <li>2. Due to the unavoidable impacts to ancient woodland, Appendix 9.21, Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247] has been developed and agreed in consultation with Natural England. An explanation of the need for and benefits of the Scheme in the national public interest is presented within the Case for the Scheme [APP-344]. In consideration of the case for the Scheme and the Ancient Woodland Strategy developed, the Applicant is in compliance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks and paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework due to wholly exceptional reasons i.e. that the Scheme is an NSIP where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss of the habitat as set out in footnote 58.</li> <li>3. The Scheme would result in a direct loss of 0.27ha of Duke's Bank Wood ancient woodland and SSSI (not 0.68ha as stated), as detailed in Appendix 9.21 paragraph 2.1.2, bullet point a. of the Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247]. Duke's Bank Wood is designated for its ancient woodland habitat. The Scheme would also result in the loss of 0.41ha of woodland within the Coquet River Felton Park LWS. This area of woodland is not designated, although has been adopted as ancient woodland for the purposes of mitigation as explained in Appendix 9.21 paragraph 2.1.2, bullet point B of the Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247]. During the design of the Scheme, construction methods were explored to minimise the extent of land required for to construct the bridge. As such, the Order limits were reduced where possible to minimise the loss of ancient woodland. For the purposes of the impact assessment, it was assumed that all ancient woodland within the Order limits would be lost. As such, the direct loss of 0.68ha of ancient woodland is considered a maximum figure. This figure will be explored further at detailed design, as discrete areas within the Order limits may be subject to temporary loss or damage.</li> <li>4. There is no set guidance for the ratio for woodland compensation in relation to ancient woodland, with assessments made on a case-by-case basis. The provision of woodland planting, which equates to a 12:1 ratio (creation:loss), was decided in agreement with Natural England, in consideration of the relatively small area of ancient woodland impacted by the Scheme, the efforts to avoid or reduce the extent of impacts through Scheme design and the efforts to mitigate impacts by implementing protective and salvage measures (implementation of the mitigation hierarchy). The proposed area of woodland creation (8.16ha) is considered proportionate to the likely effects of the Scheme.</li> <li>5. In relation to indirect impacts, these are considered within the Appendix 9.21 Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247]. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been developed and includes measures to reduce the indirect impacts as a result of noise, light and dust pollution. These measures include, for example, implementation of best practicable means and adherence to best practice to control noise and vibration (S-N2 [APP-346]), implementation of a suitable lighting</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	is opposed to the proposed scheme on the basis of loss, damage and deterioration to a SSSI-designated ancient woodland. On account of the impact to irreplaceable habitat, we consider that this scheme in its current form contravenes national planning policies.	<p>strategy (S-G5 [APP-346]) and implementation of damping/other suppressant techniques to reduce dust emissions (S-A3 [APP-346]).</p> <p>6. An assessment of effects from operational air quality has been undertaken, documented within paragraphs 1.7.1 to 1.7.13 of Appendix 16.6 Biodiversity Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-332] and paragraphs 8.1.4 to 8.1.42 of Appendix 16.7 Biodiversity DMRB Sensitivity Test: The Scheme [APP-333]. Both assessments identified no significant effects to the ancient woodland of the River Coquet valley as a result of operational air quality associated with the Scheme.</p> <p>7. As detailed in Appendix 9.21 paragraph 3.2.11 of the Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247], baseline surveys have not recorded invasive species within the Order limits, such as Himalayan balsam. However, as a precaution, the Strategy details appropriate mitigation to avoid the spread of invasive species (see paragraphs 3.2.11, 3.2.12, 4.4.6, 5.3.4, 5.4.1 and 5.4.4 [APP-247]).</p> <p>8. In summary, the linear nature of the Scheme means that it is not possible to avoid the ancient woodland in its entirety. The Scheme is a transport infrastructure scheme of national significance which provides an exceptional justification for the loss of the woodland. The Applicant has sought to reduce the scale of loss so far as practicable. The level of compensatory planting is appropriate for the circumstances and has been agreed with the relevant statutory body.</p>

## 1.6 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND BUSINESSES

Table 1-15 - Tom Lloyd – RR-015

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.15.1	I welcome and support the applicants request to the secretary of state for a DCO to progress with the design and planning of the proposed highway improvements. The A1 in Northumberland greatly needs widening to accommodate the increasing volume of traffic using the road. The scheme will reduce travel time by use of slip roads and roundabouts giving better access to the highway. Road safety will also be greatly improved. The current road suffers from long delays and sadly there are still many RTA's causing loss of life. My property is directly affected by the road expansion as it is land adjoining the current highway. I am satisfied with the information provided and previous consultation work carried out by the developer. I fully support this DCO application.	1. Noted

Table 1-16 - Andrew Kirkman – RR-016

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.16.1	I have cycled extensively throughout Northumberland - touring, fitness training, and commuting. I now live in [ ] and cycle in the lanes to the north west and south west but I struggle to find a cycle friendly route east/west across the A1 that would link up to the coast and castles cycle route and all the facilities and attractions of the coast. I see a stream of cyclists come up from the Newcastle direction	<p>1. The Applicant has had due regard to the needs of cyclists in the design of the Scheme. The results of the surveys carried out for WCH are included at Appendix TT.1 of the Applicant's Responses to the ExA's First Written Questions (document reference 7.8.17).</p> <p>2. The Applicant confirms that whilst there is no dedicated cycle infrastructure proposed on the A1, east-west crossing of the A1 is made safer for cyclists due to new bridges providing a grade-separated route over/under the A1 at Highlaws Junction, Fenrother Junction, Causey Park Overbridge, Burgham Park</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>through Whalton and Netherwitton but there is no good route back to the coast across the A1 that would allow them to do a loop - and spread their coffee/cake/lunch money at more businesses - cyclists are good customers - usually very hungry and thirsty! There is the very good cycle track alongside the new by-pass to Ashington and you can work your way out to the coast that way - but essentially it is alongside a major road - good for commuting but maybe not for pleasure/fitness/family cycling. Back in Summer 2018 I queried cycling provision in the new A1 Morpeth to Felton scheme - see attached emails. The plans showed no obvious provisions for cyclists to cross the A1. At the showing of the plans the answer I got was 'cyclists can use the pavements on the new roundabouts and bridges. The written reply amounts to pointing out that there will be a bridge at Causey Park. I wonder if - as the plans have developed - there are specific cycle access and routes now planned? One of the best east/west routes I think is from Longhorsley through Causey Park/Chevington Moor and pass the Seddon's caravan park to Widdrington roundabout then to Druridge. There is a new cycle cafe at Cresswell or the visitors centre at Druridge Bay to spur you on! Please see the photo attached - for this route to be cycle friendly there are two issues with the section from Causey Park Bridge to Chevington Moor - marked in green on the map.</p>	<p>Underbridge, West Moor Junction, Heckley Fence Overbridge and Charlton Mires Junction. These new bridges mean that cyclists will no longer require to cross the A1 at grade.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition, the proposed extension of the de-trunked section of the A1 to tie into West Moor has a combined footway/cycleway.</li> <li>Whilst promotion of cycling is not the responsibility of Highways England as the strategic highway authority, it is aware that Northumberland County Council (NCC) supports cycling initiatives as the relevant responsible body. The Applicant will continue to support initiatives around sustainable transport. Subject to funding availability and meeting set criteria, such as being able to demonstrate it is an activity deemed beyond business as usual that is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme, there may be opportunities to make use of Designated Funds, working with NCC. Designated Funds are a series of ring-fenced funds provided by Government to address a range of issues over and above the traditional focus of road investment and may be available to deliver additional enhancements, for example, cycling provision to enhance safety, connectivity and integration. The Applicant will liaise with local interest groups to identify possible enhancements for which Designated Funds can be applied for and if successful may be delivered alongside the Scheme.</li> </ol>
1.16.2	<p>The crossing of the A1 at Causey Park Bridge and the safe linking to the road to Chevington Moor. Do you think it needs more thought than just saying there will be a bridge?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there is no dedicated cycle infrastructure currently proposed at Causey Park the new bridge will provide a safer east-west crossing of the A1 compared to the current at-grade crossing. It removes conflict between cyclists travelling east-west and the high volumes of traffic on the A1 trunk road. The need for any additional cycling measures such as signing and lining in the local area (including the bridge) will be appraised in accordance with current design standards during detailed design. The design will also be subject to an independent road safety audit where cyclist and pedestrian safety is assessed against the design provision and improvements identified where required</li> </ol>
1.16.3	<p>Most of the road from Causey Park Bridge to Chevington Moor is a 'new' road made wide, straight, and fast with wide verges on both sides. Quite a bit of traffic uses this road as a 'rat run'. At the time the road was 'improved' it is unlikely that they would have been thinking that provision of a cycle lane on one of the wide verges was a priority. I think with the work on the A1 underway this might be a great time to remedy this omission and put in a cycle lane using one or both of the wide verges - this would have to filter into the 0.5 miles of original lane at the Chevington Moor end unless the cycle lane could run alongside the road in the fields similar to the Warkworth to Alnmouth route. I can provide a map if needed.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road referred to is an existing road which forms part of the local road network. A programme of measures to promote the provision of facilities for cyclists on this link to Chevington Moor is outside the remit of Highways England as it is the body responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of the strategic road network. The provision of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on the local road network are matters that fall within the responsibility of local highway and transport authorities as opposed to the operator of the strategic road network.</li> <li>As explained in 1.16.1, there may be opportunities to make use of Designated Funds to deliver enhancements such as cycle provision. The Applicant will liaise with NCC to identify possible enhancements for which Designated Funds can be applied for and, if successful, these could be delivered alongside the Scheme. There may also be other funding opportunities for cycle provision that NCC can explore such as through the Department for Transport Transforming Cities Fund.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-17 - Gareth Moor – RR-017 and Colin Moor – RR-018**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.17.1	<p>My concerns with the scheme are mainly associated with the proposed works within West View Morpeth and the detrimental impact they will have. These proposals introduce extensive works within West View and introduce dangers within a residential area during the construction phase of the works but more importantly will introduce dangers not presently within the street and within the hospital grounds access roads, when the proposed works are completed. These dangers will be permanent feature thereafter. The proposals do not adhere to the Construction Design and Management Regulations. If the regulations had been followed, then this design would not have been put forward. I find it concerning that a scheme presented on behalf of a government agency, appears not to confirm with government regulations.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Westview is a residential development located in the grounds of the old Northgate Hospital site to the east of the A1 at Morpeth. Plots 1/5a and 1/5b on Sheet 1 of Land Plans [APP-006] are required to upgrade the existing road and to also provide access to properties at [REDACTED] and Northgate Farm.</li> <li>2. The Applicant understands that the developer of the old Northgate hospital site has entered an agreement with NCC to undertake modifications to the road to bring it up to adoptable standards</li> <li>3. The Applicant is proposing to undertake these modifications to West View as part of this application, which includes a footway along its length in addition to formal parking bays to ensure that they are completed prior to completion of the new access road. These modifications will also allow adoption by NCC as provided in Article 13 of the dDCO [APP-014]. The additional works forming part of the Scheme to be undertaken by the Applicant will comprise the construction of a new road as a northern extension of West View to provide access to the properties at [REDACTED] and Northgate Farm together with access to a woodland area and three field plots. The proposed access road is shown on Sheet 1 of the General Arrangement Plans [APP-008]. As the new access road only serves a small number of properties the additional traffic flows on West View generated by the access road will be very low.</li> <li>4. It is incorrect that the proposals do not adhere to the Construction Design and Management (CDM) Regulations 2015. During the preparation stage the preliminary design of the Scheme has been undertaken in accordance with the CDM Regulations. Risk assessments have been undertaken and the small number of additional vehicles using West View after completion of the Scheme will not give rise to additional dangers. During construction, the Principal Contractor will plan and manage the construction phase in accordance with the CDM Regulations 2015. This will be outlined within the Construction Phase Plan which will require to comply with the CDM Regulations, and which will ensure that the Works are carried out without risk to health and safety including the safety of nearby residents.</li> </ol>
1.17.2	<p>There will be an increased risk of flooding.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms the Flood Risk Assessment Part A [APP-254] at Appendix 10.1 of the ES details the hydraulic modelling undertaken which provides a comparison between the existing and proposed scenarios. Section 6 of Appendix 10.1 confirms that generally the hydraulic modelling shows that there would be no increase in fluvial flood risk to any upstream or downstream receptors as a result of the Scheme. In particular, the assessment has demonstrated that Cotting Burn which is the watercourse associated with West View, would not experience any change in downstream flows as a result of the Scheme. Consequently, there will not be an increased flood risk to West View.</li> </ol>
1.17.3	<p>Natural sound reducing landscaping will be removed introducing more noise within the street.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that Figure 7.9: Vegetation Clearance Plans Part A [APP-096] and Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] both show the majority of the existing vegetation between the A1 and West View to be retained. There would be some trees lost at the north end between West View and the field to the north (approximate Chainage 10500) to form a new access road to the properties to the north, see plot 1/5a on Sheet 1 of Land Plans [APP-006]</li> <li>2. To achieve noise reduction from trees and vegetation, they would need to be densely planted and evergreen, and would also need to cover a wide area. The vegetation which would be lost in this locality as a result of the Scheme is not considered to be dense or covering a deep / wide area. Consequently, the removal of vegetation would have little or no effect on the noise levels present at West View.</li> <li>3. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that significant adverse effects are not predicted at West</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		View during the operational stage of the Scheme. Therefore, no mitigation applicable to operational road traffic noise has been proposed within the vicinity of West View.
1.17.4	This will also introduce more light pollution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms that there would be some replacement of lighting columns at West View, however modern lighting standards and the incorporation of directional lighting cowls, would reduce light spill experienced and as required by item S-G5 within Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. There may be a very marginal increase in the degree to which vehicle lights are visible, obliquely along the new link road towards the A1 / A697 merge lane further north. However, there would be no change in the extent to which the trees screen the direct views of the A1 in front of West View. As a result, there will not be a noticeable change in the current light pollution. Refer to paragraphs 7.10.50 to 7.10.57 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044] which outline the assessment of the night-time effects and conclude that there would be a slight adverse (non-significant) significance of effect.</li> </ol>
1.17.5	There are safer alternative routes which are shorter and eliminate the danger from West View and can be constructed with very limited. Risk to the public. The street will no longer be a cul-de-Sac reducing the streets ability to meet government safer by design standards. The street will no longer be a safe area for children to play.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The additional works forming part of the Scheme to be undertaken by the Applicant will comprise the construction of a new road as a northern extension of West View to provide access to the properties at [REDACTED] and Northgate Farm together with access to a woodland area and three field plots. As such West View will still be a cul-de-sac and given the limited additional traffic will still be a safe place to play. The preliminary design which has been undertaken to date was subject to a Stage 1 road safety audit in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (standard HD19/15) and no safety concerns were identified with regards to West View or the new extension.</li> <li>The Applicant will undertake the detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design to discharge Requirement 3 of the dDCO [APP-014] including the detailed design of the modifications to West View and the northern extension. This will include undertaking a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit in accordance with the DMRB. In addition, a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit of the completed works will be undertaken prior to the new road becoming operational.</li> <li>The Applicant confirms that an alternative off-network access was considered and discounted. The alternative track was aligned to the field boundaries to the east extending an existing field track from Hebron Road. It would require upgrade of the short stretch of field track and existing private track (approx. 260m) as well as the construction of a new 1800m long new access track. However, the lengths of track to be constructed and consequent use of resources would be disproportionate to the proposed usage. It is acknowledged that the road usage will change but the update to adoptable standards is already planned and the traffic increase is generally low.</li> </ol>
1.17.6	The design brings more traffic in to the street, but also significant large agricultural vehicles will use the street for access to fields North of West View at currently they have never had access to the fields from West View.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme will result in a small number of agricultural vehicles using West View to gain access to a woodland area and three field plots. The increase in the number of vehicle movements will not be significant. The modifications to West View which will be undertaken as part of the Scheme will cater for the safe passage of agricultural vehicles. As set out in the response to point 1.17.5 above a stage 1 road safety audit has been undertaken and stage 2 and 3 road safety audits will be undertaken prior to the completion of the detailed design stage and also prior to the extended road becoming operational.</li> </ol>
1.17.7	The Design will require the relocation of gas houses (not required with other designs).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant understands an agreement between the housing developer and NCC already exists for future modifications to the road to bring it up to adoptable standards and that this agreement will require modification to utilities. As the Applicant is now undertaking these modifications the same utility diversions will be undertaken as part of the Scheme. The re-location of gas houses is only required due to the creation of the PMA to Warreners. Part 1 of Schedule 10 to the dDCO [APP-014] includes</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		provisions to protect the position of statutory undertakers whose apparatus may be affected by the works.

**Table 1-18 - Dr Mark Green – RR-019**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.18.1	I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed Charlton Mires Junction. I am a keen cyclist living in []. The existing route between Rock and South Charlton represents an important gateway for cyclists, enabling us to travel from the coastline into the Cheviot hills and vice versa, without having to travel through any towns and encounter associated motor traffic. Unfortunately, the existing route involves a staggered section on the A1 which is difficult and dangerous even for experienced cyclists. The proposed junction has the potential to make the route safe and open it to less experienced and junior cyclists as well as encouraging cycle tourism. This is, however, subject to the following points: 1. The inclusion of an over bridge is essential.	1. The bridge at Charlton Mires Junction will be provided as part of the Scheme. Whilst there is currently no dedicated cycle infrastructure proposed at Charlton Mires Junction, the it will provide a safer east-west crossing of the A1 compared to the current at-grade crossing. It removes conflict between cyclists travelling east-west and the high volume of traffic on the A1 trunk road.
1.18.2	Clearly marked cycle lanes must be included on the entrance to the junction from each side of the B6347 and on the junction itself. Ideally these lanes would be on a different level to the road, such as on a mixed use pavement.	1. General Arrangement Plan [APP-008, Sheet 15] show proposed road markings at Charlton Mores Junction. However, these are indicative and the finalised requirements for, and details of, cycling infrastructure at Charlton Mires Junction (including mixed use pavements, signing, lining and crossing facilities) will be assessed in accordance with current design standards during detailed design. The design will also be subject to an independent road safety audit where cyclist and pedestrian safety is assessed against the design provision and improvements identified where required. at this stage.
1.18.3	Signage warning motorists that cyclists are using the junction must be included to raise awareness and safety.	1. The CTMP [APP-347] has considered Signage Strategy during construction but permanent signage would only be confirmed at detailed design following Highways England Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) sign standards. The Applicant will consult NCC during the detailed design stage to confirm a Signing Strategy. Refer to the Outline CEMP [APP346] (reference S-PH3).

**Table 1-19 - M E Beal and Sons – RR-020**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.19.1	Our first contact with HE with regards this section of the A1 was in 2014 when we were informed that the dualing of the A1 was going ahead & my farm was going to be majorly affected. Ever since then we have had countless meetings, emails, phone calls, on site visits, surveys (some all through the night with no notice, which resulted in my elderly parents thinking we were being burgled!) trail pits dug on my land, made to move farm stock & horses, remove fences, remove gates, padlocked gates cut off by A1 workmen, meetings cancelled by HE with no notice, meetings with miss-information presented by	1. The land is situated at Charlton Mires Farm and includes a residential dwelling, farm buildings and agricultural land on both sides of the A1. 2. The land to be permanently acquired is shown in plots 15-1c, 15-1k, 15-5a, 15-6a, 15-8a and 15-23a on sheet 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. Plots 15/1c and 15/6a are required as part of the new Charlton Mires Junction including the construction of a single span single carriageway overbridge crossing the new A1 carriageways, new local access road linking Charlton Mires Junction and West Linkhall, new northbound slip road from the realigned A1 dual carriageway, and two new detention basins. Plots 15/1k and 15/5a are required for the construction of a local access road linking Charlton Mires Junction and West Linkhall, including the construction of a culvert extension (Linkhall) under the

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>HE &amp; had to be rescheduled &amp; untold hours of work in relation to this scheme, not to even mention the huge impact all this is having on my [] year old parents &amp; mine &amp; my partners health.</p>	<p>new southbound carriageway of the A1 dual carriageway. Plot 15/8a is required for the realignment and resurfacing of the B6341. Plot 15/23a is required as part of the realignment of the 66kV electrical cable to service the Middlemoor Wind Farm, including the realignment and resurfacing of the B6347.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The land to be possessed temporarily is shown in plots 15-1a, 15-1b, 15-1d, 15-1h, 15-6d, 15-6f, 15-6g, 15-8b, 15-8c, 15-23b and 15-23d on sheet 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. Plot 15/1a is required as part of work to lower the tributary bank. Plots 15-1b and 15/6g are required to facilitate works relating to the realignment and resurfacing of the B6347. Plots 15/1d, 15/23b and 15/23d are required to facilitate works relating to the erection of fencing on the highway perimeter. Plot 15/1h is required for a storage area and associated access. Plot 15/6d is required for a storage area and associated access. Plot 15/6f is required to facilitate works relating to the diversion of Kittycarter Burn.</li> <li>4. The land over which new rights are to be permanently acquired is shown in plots 15-1j, 15-6b, 15-6c and 15-6e on sheet 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. Plot 15/1j is required for to provide permanent rights of access associated with the utility diversion. Plots 15/6b and 15/6c are required to provide permanent rights of access associated with the realignment of the 66kV electrical cable to service the Middlemoor Wind Farm. Plot 15/6e is required to provide permanent rights of access for the new outfall from the detention basin.</li> <li>5. Since working on the feasibility study for the route, the Applicant has sought to develop and maintain a positive relationship with the landowner to explain the proposals and the effect the proposed dualling will have upon their home and livelihood.</li> <li>6. The landowner has kindly permitted access for surveys. Whilst efforts were made to communicate survey windows, there were occasions where this was not possible.</li> </ol>
1.19.2	<p>At the initial contact with HE my parents &amp; I were obviously devastated that our farmhouse, steading, a third of our land including our caravan storage business, the airfield &amp; 116 years of our family history was to be wiped out. However, the DV reassured &amp; promised us, in front of our agent GFW, that they would offer us a full "lift &amp; shift" for my entire farmhouse &amp; steading to a new plot on the [] side of the remaining land. This was questioned by us, our agent &amp; solicitor several times &amp; we were reassured by the DV that this would happen, quote "We've done it before, we can do it again" at which point the other members of the team all nodded &amp; agreed.</p> <p>Further to this, we have 2 emails from the DV to our agent GFW, confirming that they agree to the cost basis of relocating the farmhouse &amp; steading exactly as they stand to a new site on the remaining land. On this basis, we were also advised to engage the services of a chartered surveyor, at my expense, to provide measured drawings &amp; costings for the redevelopment of Charlton Mires Farmhouse &amp; steading. Since then the DV has reneged on this &amp; has even refused to pay for the pre-planning application to allow us to relocate to try &amp; rebuild our lives.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed route of the upgrade to the in A1 Northumberland results in the demolition of the Charlton Mires farmhouse and farm buildings and also acquires around 40 acres of farmland. Discussions have been ongoing with the landowners since 2016 through the Applicant's appointed District Valuer.</li> <li>2. In 2019, the landowner served a blight notice in relation to the whole of their farm. The Applicant served a counter notice to only purchase the part required for the scheme (Farmhouse, buildings and around 40 acres). The Applicant is now legally required to purchase the property, value negotiations are ongoing between both parties.</li> <li>3. The Applicant has reviewed, with the landowner, all documented evidence in the form of emails and meeting minutes where any commitments made by the appointed District Valuer from the Valuation Office Agency have been recorded formally.</li> <li>4. The Applicant has satisfied themselves that all discussions and negotiations held between the landowner and the District Valuers have been in line with legislation and under Section 5 Land Compensation Act 1961.</li> <li>5. The option of a 'lift and shift' of the existing Charlton Mires farmhouse does not meet with Rule 5 of the Section 5 Land Compensation Act 1961 which only allows for the adoption of equivalent reinstatement as a valuation approach where there is no market for the purpose to which the property is put.</li> <li>6. In the case of the land and property at Charlton Mires Farm the Applicant's District Valuer has provided a market value for the property and this is a value considered as being on the basis of the freehold value of property taken, it is on this basis that the landowners agents and the Applicants District Valuer have been negotiating on.</li> <li>7. The Applicant in discussion with the Landowner has agreed to the appointment of an external Valuer, who is completely independent from the VOA. The Applicant's intention will be to share the independent valuation report with the landowner and agent in due course in the hope this will unlock the process.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.19.3	<p>We did request from HE to please keep their land take on the west side of the A1 to an absolute minimum &amp; after countless reassurances from them they would, even going so far as to provide us with a revised set of plans showing a slightly reduced curve onto the flyover to try &amp; fulfill this request. However, upon receipt of the blight notice they have earmarked 2 large blocks of land over &amp; above what is needed for the actual road but HE have consistently refused to provide any details as to why they require this extra land take.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Through regular engagement during pre-application alternative configurations of junction layouts were discussed with the landowner. Areas of landtake shown on the Land Plans [APP-006] to the west for the permanent acquisition of plot 15/1c where the western approach to the bridge and connection of the local access road to West Linkhall from the new junction have been designed within Design Manual for Roads &amp; Bridges (DMRB) standards to be kept close to the compact junction arrangement.</li> <li>2. The two other plots mentioned are temporary possession of plots 15/1a as a temporary storage area and 15/1h to allow lowering of the Kittycater Burn tributary bank. As these plots are required for a temporary period of time only, there will be an opportunity for the landowner to repurchase land when the temporary activities for which they are required are complete.</li> <li>3. At a meeting on 14/12/20, the Applicant talked the landowner through the DCO Application Lands Plans [APP-006] and explained how they translate from the plan included in their 2019 Blight Counter Notice. The landowner should now be clear on the land take and use.</li> </ol>
1.19.4	<p>We currently have an underpass which is just usable due to being very narrow &amp; very low. HE's suggestion to simply extend it in its current form but to now pass under 8 lanes of traffic as opposed to the present 2 lanes &amp; onto land either side that we will no longer own, is completely impracticable &amp; simply would not work as it will be impossible to force livestock through such a long, narrow dark tunnel, as we have told HE numerous times. Quite clearly the loss of a usable underpass will drastically reduce the value &amp; efficiency of my farm. HE &amp; the DV are refusing to even discuss this with us or find a solution to this major problem.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The culvert referred to by the landowner which is located beneath the existing A1 currently allows the landowner to access land plots 15/1a and 15/6a, the culvert is an asset owned by the Applicant, the Landowner has been able to utilise the culvert as a means of access to land with the Applicant's consent.</li> <li>2. The Applicant intends to extend this culvert as part of the construction of the new dual carriageway, the primary purpose of the culvert is to provide free discharge to Kittycarter Burn underneath the A1.</li> <li>3. The applicant has served a blight counternotice to the landowner, land take set out within the counternotice shows that the Applicant is acquiring the land to both the east and west of the culvert (plots 15/1a and 15/6a) as these plots will no longer be owned by the landowner, they will not have access to the culvert.</li> <li>4. The Applicant is aware that the landowner will be impacted as a result of the land acquisition and loss of use of the culvert as a means of getting cattle across the A1, the Landowner will have to transport cattle across the A1 by use of the new Charlton Mires grade separated Junction. The impact on the landowner will be compensated for by the Applicant in agreement with the appointed District Valuer.</li> </ol>
1.19.5	<p>We were also promised by the DV that on acceptance of the blight notice &amp; submission of the DCO that we would be entitled to claim 90% of the DV's estimated valuation. Now they are insisting that a contract must be signed with stagey devalued due to the fact the line of trees that presently screen the A1 is to be completely removed despite the fact that after numerous meetings, site visits &amp; emails confirming that the trees would be left in place, we discovered that this is completely untrue &amp; they are all to be removed.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The landowner served a blight notice on the whole of their farm to the Applicant in 2019. The Applicant served a counter notice to only purchase the part required for the scheme (Farmhouse, buildings and around 40 acres of land). The Applicant is now legally required to purchase the property, value negotiations are ongoing between both parties.</li> <li>2. The Applicant is bound under the land compensation act 1961 to pay 90% of the agreed blight valuation to the land/property owner upon signing by both parties of a contract of sale with the remaining 10% payable upon completion.</li> <li>3. As the Landowner in this case wishes to build themselves a new property rather than purchase a new property the landowner is required to sign a contract of sale that includes a long stop date., This is a date by which the land owner agrees to vacate the property.</li> <li>4. The Applicant has set a long stop date that allows the landowner time to construct a new property to live in before the property is required by the Applicant for acquisition and demolition.</li> <li>5. The existing woodland planting area associated with EFD/EFB LE 2.1 on the SW of the proposed roundabout on Part B sheet 5 of 10 Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan [APP-144] has a note indicating, "existing hedgerow / tree planting to be retained and protected during the work, in accordance with arboricultural recommendations". Whilst the assessment of effects outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], has assumed that this would be removed, this is in order to assess the worst-case scenario. The Applicant has set this out on site and communicated that as much of the existing planting as is reasonably practical, should be retained and protected. This will be under the responsibility of the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW), and in line with the REAC S-B10 of the Outline CEMP (APP-346] where vegetation clearance and tree felling is to be kept to a minimum, as far</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		as reasonably practicable. The ECoW will agree the area identified to be protected within a works plan. In addition, and as required in S-L6 (k) of Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme of the Outline CEMP [APP-346], advanced planting would be undertaken, in conjunction with vegetation that is retained, to provide screening to the receptors to the south west (receptor 7 on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptor Plan [APP-136]).
1.19.6	My elderly parents & I have been manipulated, misled & are being pressurized, bullied & intimidated by the [] into accepting less than market value for our property & all our losses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As the land interests would be acquired in the exercise of compulsory powers, compensation on the basis of market value would be payable in the normal manner under the Compensation Code. There is no question of the objectors being pressured to settle for less than they are lawfully entitled to. Should they be dissatisfied it is open to them to address the matter to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) following acquisition.</li> </ol>

Table 1-20 - Max Squires – RR-021

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.20.1	I am concerned that the project will be further delayed or fragmented and intend to make representation about the need for urgent completion of this project. I am a regular user of the A1 between Ellingham and Newcastle for my business purposes and am concerned that continued delays to the upgrade of this important highway will have an increasingly detrimental impact on the economy and quality of life in North Northumberland.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With regard to the timing for completion from this point of the proposed scheme's progress, the Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) which carries a statutory duty to carry out consultation on the proposal. The length of time taken to prepare and consult on this Scheme was dependent on its scale and complexity. The Planning Act 2008 (the "2008 Act") process was introduced to streamline the decision-making process for major infrastructure projects, making it fairer and faster for communities and applicants alike.</li> <li>2. The DCO application was accepted for examination on 4 August 2020. The Examining Authority (ExA) has a statutory duty to complete the Examination within six months. The examination will commence on 5 January 2021 following the closure of the second Preliminary Meeting due to take place on the same day. The purpose of the Preliminary Meetings is to allow the ExA to set out to Interested Parties how they intend to conduct the examination and the principles issues to be examined. The Examination process is important to carefully consider all important and relevant matters, including the representations from Interested Parties. Following closure of the examination expected in July 2021 the ExA produce their Recommendation Report. The ExA has a statutory duty to produce and submit the Recommendation Report to the Secretary of State for Transport within three months following closure of the examination. It is expected that the Recommendation Report will be submitted in October 2021. The Secretary of State for Transport has a statutory duty to confirm their decision to either grant or refuse development consent within three months of receipt of the Recommendation Report. The Secretary of State for Transport's decision is expected in January 2022.</li> <li>3. Before works can commence the DCO has a number of conditions (known as Requirements) which have to be consulted on with the local planning authority and other statutory bodies such as Natural England and approved by the Secretary of State for Transport. Once the decision is received the Applicant will seek to complete this process as soon as is practicable to ensure the Scheme can commence construction no later than Spring 2022.</li> <li>4. Further information on the statutory periods for the Scheme can be found on the National Infrastructure Planning website: <a href="https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/north-east/a1-in-northumberland-morpeth-to-ellingham/?ipcsection=overview">https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/north-east/a1-in-northumberland-morpeth-to-ellingham/?ipcsection=overview</a></li> <li>5. The Applicant acknowledges the support for the Scheme within this response and would anticipate that the above explanation to now secure consent of a defined scheme will demonstrate the commitment to</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>dualling the A1 in this part of Northumbria. It should also be noted that commitment to the scheme is supported in the Government's Road Investment Strategies (RIS): RIS1 and 2 (for periods 2015 to 2020 and 2020 to 2025 respectively). These set out the five-year strategy for investment in and management of the Strategic Road Network and of which both RIS specifically support the dualling of the A1 between Morpeth and Ellingham.</p> <p>6. RIS1 set out to tackle longstanding problems on the road network with a specifically clear description for the Proposed Scheme which stated a requirement for <i>"upgrading multiple sections of the A1 to dual carriageway to provide continuous high quality dual carriageway from Newcastle to Ellingham, north of Alnwick"</i>.</p> <p>7. RIS2 retains these commitments under the title of 'Levelling Up' stating aims for: <i>"not only fixing the network we have but helping to create the economic infrastructure that we need in the years ahead"</i>. The RIS therefore demonstrates the current Government commitment to take forward improvements for the A1 in Northumberland.</p>

Table 1-21 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Robert John Fenwick Thorp - RR-022

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.21.1	My client is concerned about the signage of the scheme to his property and the holiday business. At present there is a sign to the property, and given this access will be blocked up, we are concerned that the new service road will be badly signed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The affected land is situated at Charlton Hall, approximately 920 metres to the east of the A1 at North Charlton. The land to be permanently acquired is shown in plots 16/9a, 16/9b and 16/9c on sheet 16 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. The land to be possessed temporarily is shown in plots 16/9d and 16/9e on sheet 16 of the Land Plans [APP-006].</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms there is an existing sign located on the western verge of [the existing A1] opposite the priority junction providing direction to Charlton Lodge. The direct access to the property from the A1 in this location will be stopped up as part of the Scheme. The proposed East Linkhall Access Road (Work No 29I) will provide access from Charlton Mires Junction to the properties and agricultural land to the east of the existing A1. The East Linkhall Access Road will be a two-lane carriageway which will accommodate agricultural traffic. The design is to be developed during detailed design to consider the future development plans at Charlton Hall and will be undertaken through ongoing liaison with NCC</li> <li>3. The Applicant's draft DCO [APP-014] seeks powers to replace and update verge signage as a result of the Scheme. Strategic positioning of new road verge signs has been accounted for within the Order limits for the Scheme.</li> <li>4. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty. The Outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.</li> </ol>
1.21.2	My client is concerned about the service road, the width and the future maintenance. It is unclear if the entire service road is to be a maintainable road at the Highways expense or at the Councils or to the users. We are also concerned about the width of the road given the huge amount of traffic. My client is concerned about the reduced access provisions from his property which currently are directly to the [] near his drive.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is agreed in principle with NCC that East Linkhall Road will be adopted by NCC, and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads will be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> <li>2. The Applicant can confirm that all existing access onto the A1, including the access to this property, will be closed on the grounds of safety as a result of the Scheme. The proposed East Linkhall Access Road (Work No 29I) will provide access from Charlton Mires Junction to the properties and agricultural</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>land to the east of the existing A1. The East Linkhall Access Road will be a two-lane carriageway which will accommodate agricultural traffic. The design is to be developed during detailed design to consider the future development plans at Charlton Hall and will be undertaken through ongoing liaison with NCC</p> <p>3. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties</p>
1.21.3	My client is concerned with the plans to erect permanent habitat mitigation on his property and the impacts those will have over the management of the woodland in particular.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that bat boxes (permanent habitat mitigation) are proposed to be installed within the Order limits and parallel with Charlton Hall Road. The Applicant proposes to take temporary possession of land in plot 16/9e to facilitate the access. The existing road will be accessed from the Scheme's East Linkhall Road, Work No.29I on sheet 16 of the Works Plan [APP-007].</li> <li>2. The bat boxes form part of the compensation strategy of a bat European Protected Species (EPS) licence, which will be obtained from Natural England. In accordance with the programme presented in Table 2-7 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of the ES [APP-037], it is anticipated that a licence application would be made in Autumn 2021. Only upon receipt of an EPS licence from Natural England can the relocation of bat boxes be undertaken, which will be restricted to during the active bat season, but outwith the maternity season (April to mid-May and mid-July to October, inclusive). Permanent rights are required to permit the visual inspection and monitoring of the bat mitigation boxes, a requirement of the EPS licence. Monitoring would be undertaken for a period of at least 5 years post-construction of the Scheme (to be confirmed with Natural England). It is currently proposed that monitoring would include two inspection visits between May and August during the first, third and fifth years post-construction (2024, 2026 and 2028). It is also proposed that trees will be safeguarded from felling, or other works with the potential to disturb the bat boxes, for a minimum period of 30 years post-construction; the final duration will be confirmed by Natural England as a condition of the EPS licence when granted.</li> <li>3. The Applicant has discussed and clarified the requirement for access and mitigation for bat boxes with the land agents representing Mr Thorp on 08/12/20 and agreement has been reached in principle. Liaison with the landowner's representative will continue.</li> </ol>
1.21.4	My client is concerned about the increase noise, dust and vibration to his property as the [] gets closer to the highway and would like to ensure that suitable mitigation is installed to reduce this impact.	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The following response has been prepared in relation to both Charlton Hall and West Lodge. Charlton Hall is located at considerable distance from the scheme, with West Lodge located much closer. The response first considers the comment with reference to Charlton Hall and then follows on to consider West Lodge.</li> </ol> <p><u>Charlton Hall</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although the Scheme will result in the A1 getting approximately 18m closer to this property, the Applicant confirms that Charlton Hall is located outside of the construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] appropriately following the guidance presented within DMRB HD 213/11. Significant effects outside of these areas are not expected.</li> <li>2. Charlton Hall is located at a distance of more than 540m from the Order limits and over 800m from the Scheme. Significant construction and operational stage noise and vibration effects are not expected at this property.</li> </ol> <p><u>West Lodge</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. West Lodge is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>043]. The Scheme will result in the A1 also getting approximately 18m closer to this property. The property is approximately 55m from the Scheme and 5m from the boundary of construction activity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at West Lodge.</li> <li>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>6. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. Although the Scheme will result in the A1 getting approximately 18m closer to this property, the noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at West Lodge. Mitigation is therefore not required.</li> </ol> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with HA207/07 and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works (including West Lodge); and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. For receptors located more than 200m from the Scheme, including Charlton Hall, no significant air quality effect is anticipated.</li> <li>2. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors Part A [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B [APP-041]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at any property within 200m of potential works.</li> <li>3. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> </ol>
1.21.5	They would like to ensure that the current tree plantation is protected.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As far as practical within the design of the Scheme, vegetation clearance has been avoided, but that which would be cleared is identified on Figure 7.11 Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145]. In this location, there would be the need to remove some or all of the existing block of woodland between the A1 and the access at West Lodge to facilitate forward visibility for users of the A1 and the realignment of the local watercourse to flow through the extended culvert beneath the A1. At detailed design stage it may be feasible, to retain some of this woodland. Further, in line with Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], and where sufficient planting space is identified, in line with guidance</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		on planting distances from structures outlined in LD117, replacement native woodland edge would be planted.
1.21.6	My clients are concerned about the water pollution of the stream running through their property and under the A1. There are no details about water protection included.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms proposed drainage strategies for the Scheme have been produced and form part of the DCO application. These can be found at Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix 10.3, Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314]. The Applicant confirms the runoff from the new works on the A1 in this area will be collected and discharged to Detention Basin 27 which in turn will outflow into Kittycarter Burn. The potential impacts associated with the new works with regard to the chemical quality of the receiving surface water features and the impact of the proposed mitigation measures within the surface water management strategy are assessed in the Appendix 10.3 Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment Part B [APP-313] of the ES. The results of the assessments demonstrate that through implementation of the drainage strategy and the measures set out in the outline CEMP [APP-346] there would not be a significant effect on the receiving surface water features in this location.</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (reference S-GS3) confirms that the proposed drainage strategy will be designed to reduce the risk of potential physical and chemical contaminants from entering the surrounding surface watercourses and that runoff from the highway is discharged into existing surface watercourses via storage detention basins. These detention basins will provide for sediments and the like settling out and they will control the rate of discharge to watercourses.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (reference S-GS9) also sets out the measures which will be implemented during construction to avoid the pollution of watercourses including the Shipperton Burn.</li> </ol>

Table 1-22 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Matthew Thomas Gray - RR-023

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.22.1	Mr Gray is the owner of No[] & No []. they are accessed directly from the A1 at[]. We are concerned about the new access arrangements to the property.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The properties, [REDACTED] are a residential dwelling located approximately 35 metres west of the A1. There is no direct land take from the property however the access to the property is affected by the Scheme. The existing direct access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety following completion of the Scheme. Future access will be facilitated by the construction of a new access road, West Linkhall Road, which will join the A1 via the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires.</li> </ol>
1.22.2	It is unclear if this road is to be maintainable at the public expense,	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has agreed in principle with NCC that West Linkhall Road will be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads will be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> </ol>
1.22.3	is wide enough to allow traffic to safely pass and	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The current design provides for West Linkhall road to be a two lane carriageway to allow traffic to safely pass. The road is designed to accommodate HGVs and combine harvesters.</li> </ol>
1.22.4	ensuring that we are able to maintain our services to the properties.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 including the access at West Linkhall Cottages will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include West Linkhall Cottages.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed, which will include topics such as: communication; site establishment; access; traffic management; working hours; health and safety; environmental issues;</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		waste and material management; dust, noise and vibration and the outline construction programme (this list is not exhaustive).
1.22.5	Access to the properties if one is heading north will also be impeded and increase travel time for Mr Gray.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant acknowledges that the residents of this property will have a greater distance to travel to access the A1. However, it is not anticipated that journey times will increase significantly. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken as described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP344]. Section 4.8 of Chapter 4 details the forecast improvements to average journey times as a result of the Scheme, which will help to offset any increase in journey time for drivers accessing the A1 from the property. Drivers will also benefit from using the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires which will enable safer access and reduced delays compared with the current at grade junction.</li> </ol>
1.22.6	We are also concerned that the current screening of the road will be reduced and removed as part of the works and we would like to understand further the mitigation that HE plan to include.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms as indicated on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] the existing belt of shrubs and trees that currently provides for screening of part of the A1 in summer, and filtered views in winter, would be replaced by a linear belt of shrubs and trees, not dissimilar to the existing planting. In addition, and extending northwards and across the existing access to West Linkhall Road, this linear belt of shrubs and trees would provide additional screening to the north east, tying into a new proposed block of woodland north of the current access point. The effect of this planting would be to form a continuous belt of shrubs and trees across the entire extent of the view towards the A1. The assessment of visual effects is outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 10, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect during construction, extending to the winter of Yr. 1, however, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising a linear belt of shrubs and trees, set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], the effect would reduce to moderate adverse (significant).</li> </ol>
1.22.7	We are also concerned about the increased noise, dust and vibration from the new highways.	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is 17-70m from the Scheme and 7-14m from the boundary of construction activity.</li> <li>The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> <li>An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) (APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme, which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with HA207/07 and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors of the ES [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10, Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</li> <li>2. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> </ol>

Table 1-23 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Paul Gray trading as D G Gray &amp; Son - RR-024

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.23.1	We are concerned about access being maintained to both sides of the farm.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land is situated at West Link Hall Farm and includes agricultural land to the east and west of the existing A1 north of Charlton Mires. Mr Gray is a tenant of this land. The Applicant proposes to: permanently acquire 3.21ha of land in plots 15-4b, 15-4e, 16-5b, 16-5d; acquire permanent rights over 0.86ha of land in plots 15-4f, 16-5e, 16-5g, 16-5a; and take temporary possession of 0.41ha of land in plots 15-4a, 15-4d, 16-5c, 16-5f, 16-5i, 15-4c, 16-5h. This is set out in the Book of Reference [APP-020], the Land Plans [APP-006], and the Statement of Reasons [APP-018].</li> <li>2. The existing direct access onto the A1 from the agricultural land to the east and west of the existing A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety as a result of the Scheme. However, access to the land to the east and west of the existing A1 will be maintained through the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires. A detailed description of the access arrangements for this land is provided at 1.23.2-4, below.</li> <li>3. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties.</li> </ol>
1.23.2	We understand a new access road for the land to the east will be installed but require this to be maintainable at the public expense and suitable for agricultural traffic.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed East Linkhall Access Road will provide access from Charlton Mires Junction to the properties and agricultural land to the east of the existing A1. The East Linkhall Access Road will be a two-lane carriageway which will accommodate agricultural traffic. The design is to be developed during detailed design to consider the future development plans at Charlton Hall and will be undertaken through ongoing liaison with NCC.</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms it has been agreed in principle with NCC that East Linkhall Road and West Linkhall Road will be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads will be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.23.3	We are also concerned about the access to the fields to the [] which is directly off the A1, a new access from the farm entrance will be needed and suitable for agricultural traffic.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing direct access onto the A1 from the farm to the east of the existing A1 will be closed. A new access to the farm will be provided off West Linkhall Road and this access will be suitable for the turning movements of normal agricultural vehicles. The Applicant also confirms that new accesses will be provided to fields to the east and west of the existing A1 where an existing access has been severed. The Applicant understands that there is one field access to the west of the existing A1 and three field accesses to the east of the existing A1.</li> <li>2. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The outline CEMP (reference B-PH4(f)) confirms that appropriate accesses to the affected fields will be provided.</li> </ol>
1.23.4	We are concerned about access to West Linkhall. again, we understand that a new accessway is to be created from Charlton Mires, this needs to be suitable for modern agricultural traffic and maintainable at the public expenses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed West Linkhall Road will provide access from Charlton Mires Junction to the properties and agricultural land to the west of the existing A1. The West Linkhall Road will be formed from the existing A1 carriageway and will be a two-way carriageway that it is designed to accommodate agricultural vehicles and will be wide enough to allow traffic to pass safely.</li> <li>2. It has been agreed in principle with NCC that West Linkhall Road will be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads will be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> </ol>
1.23.5	My client will be losing farmable land and also the sheep pens. We require suitable alternative pens to be installed and suitable field drainage and fencing. Roadside fencing will need to be maintainable by the Highways authority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land being permanently acquired is set out in the response to 1.23.1 above and is for the construction of the A1 carriageway, the construction of the East Linkhall access road and environmental mitigation works. The land being acquired is the minimum required to construct, operate, maintain and mitigate the Scheme. Plots 15/4f, 16/5e and 16/5g are for the permanent acquisition of rights for the installation and future access to the re-positioned high voltage cable while plot 16/5a is for the permanent acquisition of rights for the installation and future access to an agricultural track running north from West Linkhall Farm.</li> <li>2. The plots, as listed in the response to 1.23.1 above, where temporary acquisition of rights are being acquired are for temporary access for construction, utility diversions and landscaping.</li> <li>3. The Applicant notes that the landowner did not mention the sheep pens in their returned Land Interest Questionnaire.</li> <li>4. The Applicant will continue to engage with the landowner to understand the location and use of the sheep pens. The Applicant confirms with respect to field drainage that the Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that surface drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good.</li> <li>5. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also confirms that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated on a like for like basis.</li> <li>6. The detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging Requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014], including the detailed design and specification in relation to fencing.</li> <li>7. The form of fencing will be in accordance with Requirement 13 contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [APP-014] which stipulates fencing should be constructed and installed in line with Volume 1, Series 0300 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works.</li> <li>8. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in Section 5.2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES.</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		9. Responsibilities for ongoing maintenance of any re-positioned boundary fence will be as per existing arrangements. Ongoing maintenance of accommodation works fencing will be the responsibility of the landowner.
1.23.6	We are also losing valuable hedgerows which provide screening and shelter for the stock grazing in the fields on the east side of the A1 and we are concerned about the loss of this.	1. As shown on Figure 7.11 Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145], existing roadside vegetation, comprising hedgerows, small pockets of woodland and individual trees would be removed bordering plots 15/4a, 15/4b, 15/4e and 16/5d. As shown on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B of the ES [APP-144] (and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014]) the boundary of the A1 with the farmland to the east would be reformed with a combination of woodland and hedgerows with hedgerow trees, and similarly to the west by woodland and individual trees. On establishment, this would provide screening and shelter comparable to the adjacent fields, with the existing field boundaries.
1.23.7	Lastly, our client is concerned about journey times in accessing the land, it will take longer and be more problematic than the current access arrangements, which will impact on the farming methods on the farm.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that accessing fields on the east side of the existing A1 via Charlton Mires grade separated junction will result in a longer journey time from the farm building itself. However, the use of the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires will enable safer access to the farm and fields and will reduce delays resulting through queuing to turn right at the farm and field accesses and through waiting at accesses to join the A1.</li> <li>2. Table 12-51 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] recognises that there will be a low level of severance for East Link Hall Farm in the long term with the closure of an access directly from the A1. In combination with the expected land take as a result of the Scheme, it is recognised within Table 12-51 that a slight reduction in viability of the land holding is anticipated. The permanent effect on East Link Hall Farm is reported in Chapter 12 as slight adverse (not significant).</li> <li>3. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>

Table 1-24 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Ann Riley - RR-025

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.24.1	We represent the owners of No []. Our current access to the property is directly from the A1 at the []. We understand that the proposals are to block up this access road and provide a new access from the North through Rock Estate. We are concerned about the new road and require this to be fully adopted and maintained at the public expenses. We will object if this is to be a private road.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property is a residential dwelling, [REDACTED], located approximately 800 metres east of the A1. The existing access to the property is approximately 2.1km south of the proposed Charlton Mires Junction and consists of a single lane road. There is no direct land take from the property however the access to the property is affected by the Scheme. The Applicant can confirm that the existing access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety as a result of the Scheme. A replacement road will be constructed to Rock Midstead and onto the B6347, where access to the A1 would be via the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires.</li> <li>2. It is agreed in principle with NCC that as the existing road to Rock South Farm is adopted by NCC, the replacement road (Work No 30B) will therefore also be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads are proposed to be adopted by NCC.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.24.2	The road needs to be sufficient to allow traffic to pass safely and not have to pull onto soft verges.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new access road will be single lane but will permit two-way traffic movements through the provision of regular passing bays to ensure that damage to verges is minimised. The Applicant considers that a single lane access road with passing places is sufficient and represents an improvement on the highway provision in situ at the present because of the provision of passing bays. This design will allow traffic to pass safely, with the straight alignment of the proposed access road providing good visibility of oncoming and allowing passing bays to be utilised. It should be noted that absent the Scheme it was not proposed to upgrade the road.</li> </ol>
1.24.3	We require confirmation that the bin service will continue to Rock South Farm and all other services will continue as normal.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the Applicant is not responsible for refuse collection there is no reason to believe that NCC would not continue to collect refuse during construction of the Scheme and after completion of the Scheme. Similarly, while the Applicant is not responsible for the provision of any other services which utilise the existing access road the Applicant is not aware of any reasons why these services could not utilise the replacement access road.</li> <li>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. As part of the current design a new turning head will be provided at the eastern end of the existing Rock South Farm access road and will cater for refuse vehicles once the Scheme has been completed.</li> </ol>
1.24.4	We are concerned that people and delivery drivers may not know how to access the road and will need clear directions to [].	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed design of strategic destinations for Advance Directional Signs (ADS) and other approved signs are to be confirmed in the Signage Strategy. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.</li> </ol>
1.24.5	We are concerned that our travel journeys to the south will increase significantly as a result of these proposals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant acknowledges that the residents of the property will have a greater distance to travel to access the A1; heading south this will be 4km. However, it is not anticipated that journey times will increase significantly. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken as described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP344]. Section 4.8 of Chapter 4 details the forecast improvements to average journey times as a result of the Scheme, which will help to offset any increase in journey time for drivers accessing the A1 from the property. Drivers will also benefit from using the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires which will enable safer access through avoiding right turn traffic movements and reduced delays compared with the current at grade junction.</li> </ol>
1.24.6	We require the new access to Rock South to be installed before the current access is stopped up during construction.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed, which will include topics such as: communication; site establishment; access; traffic management; working hours; and the outline construction programme (this list is not exhaustive). The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include Rock South Farm.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-25 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of C J Bosanquet Children's Trust - RR-026, Rock Farms Ltd – RR-041 and Rock Settled Estate RR-042**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.25.1	<p>Whilst we have engaged with Highways England over the course of the last year, the plans submitted with the DCO application have not previously been shared with the Estate and therefore we need to consider and review these further in order to assess the full impact of the DCO. We are aware at this stage that there are some interests which do not appear to have been acknowledged. On the basis that we have not yet been able to ascertain the full impact of the proposals on the land/interests of Rock Estates, we object to the DCO application insofar as it affects the land/interests of Rock Estates. There are a number of specific concerns which we have shared with Highways England prior to the submission of the DCO application which remain relevant as follows:-</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Rock Estate holds land interests within 59 plots of land within the Order limits, predominately covering a large area of arable land to the west of Rock village. The land interests' details can be found in the BoR [APP-020] and the extent of the related land parcels is shown on the Land Plans [APP-006].</li> <li>2. The Applicant has engaged with the Rock Estate team, representing C J Bosanquet Childrens Trust, Rock Farms Ltd and Rock Settled Estate. As the Scheme has developed during the different phases of pre-application consultation, the latest general arrangement plans were discussed with Rock Estates at each stage. The Land Plans [APP-006] submitted for the DCO Application have been available to the objector since the application date. A teleconference call was held with Rock Estates' agent on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020 to go through the Land Plans [APP-006] in detail.</li> </ol>
	<p>1) There is an electricity cable which connects to a wind farm and is currently located within the highways verge. Our position is that the electricity cable should continue to be located in the highways verge (albeit in the new location of the verge) and it is not necessary for further land to be acquired for the re-location of the electricity cable. We require further clarity from Highways England in relation to their proposals in respect of this.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plot numbers relevant to the wind farm cable diversion are 13/2b, 14/1e, 14/1f, 14/4d, 14/4e, 14/4h, 14/4i, 14/6a, 14/6b, 15/18b, 15/18g, 15/24a, 15/24b. In addition, the plot numbers relevant to acquiring rights to access the cable are 13/2c, 15/18c, 15/18h, 15/24d, 15/24e, 15/24f, 15, 26c and 15/27a.</li> <li>2. The alternative proposal is not practical. To move the cable from its current location to a diverted location in the new highway verge would entail two diversions – first to allow a safe working area; and secondly to provide the final alignment. This is inevitably more work-intensive and also has higher environmental impacts. A cable cannot always be reused in these circumstances, so it would need replacing twice. This is a poor use of resources.</li> <li>3. Due to level changes necessitated by the widening, the cable will need to be located in a position where it can remain whilst the road works are in progress and thereafter. A statutory undertaker corridor outside the highway boundary on third party land (including that of the respondent) was originally devised and easements would have been required for future maintenance. However, through consultation with landowners, including the respondent, and the utility company, an alternative location to have the stats corridor within a similar location but inside the permanent highway boundary has been considered as Parameter 3 in the ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. This location is now preferred by the utility company and will remove the majority of easements over third party land, including Northumberland Estates.</li> <li>4. The high voltage cable is to be diverted to the east of the online widening section of Part B. An overview of the route is described in ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. It will be diverted into a safe working zone trench outside the proposed new carriageway earthworks, adjacent to the temporary haul road as shown in Appendix 2.2 Technical Drawings [APP-188].</li> <li>5. The phasing of works is also set out in Chapter 2 The Scheme of the ES [APP-037] and the CTMP [APP-347]. This has considered that the new highway verge will not exist until the ground is profiled and the road is constructed. Therefore, the Applicant's proposed solution is informed by the timing as well as the need to allow a sufficient working distance to a live cable whilst construction works are underway in accordance with the Construction Design and Management Regulations (CDM Regs) 2015. Put shortly, it is not possible to divert into a highway verge that does not yet exist, so the cable diversion would be laid in new highway land toe reserved early in the construction phasing.</li> <li>6. In order to construct the A1 widening safely whilst maintaining the 66kv operations, the cable needs to be installed in a position where there will be sufficient distance maintained from the main works.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.25.2	<p>We have previously raised concerns with Highways England regarding the impact which the DCO proposals will have on the drainage of the arable fields through which the works will be completed. We require a full survey to be done of existing drainage and then install a new system. The land either side of the A1 here is prone to waterlogging and the drainage is extremely sensitive. We are concerned that suitable mitigation will not be provided.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The hydraulic connectivity of watercourses and smaller tributaries crossed by the Scheme will be maintained, with no identified significant change to catchment hydrology or flow within the watercourses. This is discussed in Chapter 10 Part A [APP-050] of the ES and Chapter 10 Part B [APP-051] of the ES.</li> <li>2. The Applicant will ensure that any localised connections of the Scheme on the adjacent agricultural land will have detailed drainage design robust to accommodate the change in drainage regime. The design of the works will take account of the impact on agricultural land and, to the extent that the landowner considers that there has been a deleterious effect, it is open to them to seek compensation in accordance with the national compensation code.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(d) and (e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that land and surface drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and the land restored to a functional state, with any damage to drains made good.</li> <li>4. The Applicant has discussed the principles of advance drainage surveys with Rock Estates. This included the recent liaison call held with Rock Estates agent on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The Applicant's approach for advanced surveys is that they will be undertaken prior to the start of works to allow any alterations required to the existing land drains to be identified and accommodated within the temporary works and final Scheme proposal. The Applicant will engage with landowners with regards to these matters when the detailed design and specification has commenced.</li> <li>5. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4 in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, in order to reduce the temporary impact of the scheme on the agricultural land. Action (d) of the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments section states that although the Scheme will tie into existing suitable drainage, where this is considered to have too many defects, it will be abandoned and replaced with new. Action (e), as set out in the. This confirms that land drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and the land restored to a functional state, and any damage to drains will be made good.</li> <li>6. Action S-GS15 confirms there will be a programme of monitoring soil conditions following reinstatement of temporary land take. Suitable remediation would include subsoiling or drainage followed by crop establishment.</li> </ol>
1.25.3	<p>We are concerned that the current access under the A1 near Rock South junction will be lost. We have had initial discussions with HE over this culvert and we require further clarification over the access rights that are required to be maintained at this point under the A1.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant understands that the landowner is referring to the current access between plot 14/4d on the east side of the A1 and plots 14/4c and 14/4f on the west side of the A1, which is afforded via Whitehouse Burn Culvert. The two parcels 14/4c and 14/4f would be acquired as a result of the Scheme, meaning that access via the culvert would no longer be necessary. The landowner owns other parcels of land to the west which are remote from the A1 and outside the Order limits. These parcels can be access from the B6341.</li> <li>2. Whilst Whitehouse Burn Culvert (ref 23.1) is to be extended, this is not a matter of relevance to the point made. This extension will consist of prefabricated box sections with an opening of 3.6 m high by 3.0 m wide.</li> <li>3. In a recent liaison call with Rock Estates agent on 30/11/2020, the issue was briefly discussed.</li> </ol>
1.25.4	<p>We are concerned with the land take to the West of the A1 and it is unclear as to how much land is going to be acquired. We are not certain if all the land is necessary but are also concerned about future access to this land, which is current from the A1 which is due</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land owned by the objector to the West of the A1 that is proposed to be subject to powers of compulsory acquisition comprises plots 13/2a, 14/4c and 14/4f which are to be acquired for a detention basin, environmental mitigation and the access to the detention basin and plots 14/1c, 14/4a and 15/18f which are to be acquired for the construction of the northbound carriageway of the A1. These</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	to be shut off. We require further clarification and discussion over the land take and whether this is all necessary and what rights will be acquired. The estate requires rights of access to any land retained and it is unclear as to where this will occur.	<p>are as set out in the Book of Reference [APP-020], the Land Plans [APP-006], and the Statement of Reasons [APP-018]. Therefore, there is no lack of clarity as to the extent of acquisition.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land to be acquired was reconfirmed on a recent liaison call with the landowner's agent on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020.</li> <li>All direct field accesses from the A1 will be stopped up as they will no longer be required by the landowner.</li> <li>The Applicant also confirms that new accesses will be provided to fields where an existing access has been severed.</li> <li>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The outline CEMP (reference B-PH4(f)) confirms that appropriate accesses to the affected fields will be provided.</li> <li>Access to Ellsnook Plantation further to the west, required by Rock Estate, will continue to be accessed via the existing local road, B6341.</li> </ol>
1.25.5	The estate is concerned about the impact on the estate to the new access road to Rock South. We are concerned with the lack of information as to whether this will be a public adopted road as the estate cannot be held liable for maintenance in the future due to other users of this road. We also require this road to be wide enough for traffic to pass without causing damage to the verges.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant can confirm that the existing access from Rock South onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety as a result of the Scheme to avoid right turning movements on the A1 across live traffic. A replacement road will be constructed to Rock Midstead and onto the B6347, where access to the A1 would be via the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires.</li> <li>It is agreed in principle with NCC that, as the existing road to Rock South Farm is adopted by NCC, the replacement road (Work No 30B) would therefore also be adopted and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads are proposed to be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> <li>The new access road will be single lane but will permit two-way traffic movements through the provision of regular passing bays to ensure that damage to verges is minimised. The Applicant considers that a single lane access road with passing places is sufficient and represents an improvement on the highway provision in situ at the present because of the provision of passing bays. This design will allow traffic to pass safely, with the straight alignment of the proposed access road providing good visibility of oncoming and allowing passing bays to be utilised. It should be noted that absent the Scheme it was not proposed to upgrade the road.</li> </ol>
1.25.6	We note that the current access to Rock South will be shut off. We require the road to be returned to the ownership of the Estate to prevent this being used for flytipping and illegal uses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is agreed in principle with NCC that, as the existing road to Rock South Farm is adopted by NCC, the replacement road (Work No 30B) would therefore also be adopted and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads are proposed to be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> <li>The Applicant confirms that the truncated section will have a turning head installed so that farming vehicles can continue to benefit from the surface and the full truncated length of the existing access track is proposed to be returned to the landowner.</li> </ol>
1.25.7	The estate needs to maintain a farm road to Rock South so as to avoid making unnecessary damage to the new road. It is unclear if this is included in the proposed works.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms the new access road (Work No 30B) for Rock South Farm will be constructed adjacent to the existing agricultural access track, to the west of the existing hedgerow, to enable the existing track's continued use by agricultural traffic during and following completion of construction.</li> </ol>
1.25.8	The estate object to the current access from the new road to Rock South joining the current highway at Rock Midstead. We require this to be a roundabout access. This is a dangerous junction and	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Application proposes for Work No 30A to connect the new access road (Work No 30B) to the existing B6347 Rock South Farm at Rock Midstead, approximately 750m east of the proposed Charlton Mires junction, with an at-grade priority junction.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	there are many car accidents here. With the amount of traffic, the current arrangements we believe are not sufficient and wish to object to the current proposals.	2. The last five years of available accident data show that there have been no recorded accidents at Rock Midstead. Therefore, there is no justification for significant junction improvement at this location on the grounds of road user safety.
1.25.9	We require further clarity from Highways England on the proposals regarding the fencing, landscaping and ongoing maintenance (including the management of ragwort/other weeds) of the land acquired by Highways England that will be in close proximity to Rock Estates' land.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014], including the detailed design and specification in relation to fencing and landscaping. Measures relating to fencing, landscaping and ongoing maintenance for Part B are set out within items S-L2, S-L5, S-L9, S-L11, S-L12 and S-L13 in Table 3-1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, and items B-L1 and BL2 in Table 3-3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: Part B of the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>2. The form of fencing will be in line with requirement 13 contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [APP-014] which stipulates fencing should be constructed and installed in line with Volume 1, Series 0300 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This will commit to the reinstatement of any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction, to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also states that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated like for like.</li> <li>4. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES. Item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The 3000 specification includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within acceptable levels, and it will be delivered as part of the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan as required in S-B19 of the Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
1.25.10	We are concerned to ensure that the extent of land take from the agricultural fields is limited to the minimum that is required. We require further engagement by Highways England regarding the proposed field boundary re-alignments and clarification and confirmation that all necessary steps will be taken to ensure that the land retained by Rock Estates is of a size/shape which allows for continued beneficial use and accessibility with modern commercial machinery.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land to be permanently acquired comprises plots 13-2a, 13-2b, 13-3a, 14-1c, 14-1e, 14-1h, 14-4a, 14-4c, 14-4d, 14-4f, 14-4h, 14-4k, 14-4m, 14-4n, 14-6a, 14-6d, 15-18b, 15-18f, 15-18g, 15-18i, 15-18j, 15-18k, 15-24a, 15-24f, 15-26b, 15-26d, 15-26e, 15-26f, 15-26g, 15-26h, 15-27b. The reasons for acquiring each plot are given in Appendix CA.5 Compulsory Acquisition- Affected Persons and Effects on Human Rights and also the Statement of Reasons [APP-018].</li> <li>2. As stated in 5.3.3 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-018] the land included in the DCO is the minimum required to construct, operate, maintain and mitigate the Scheme. The Applicant has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land take and securing sufficient land to ensure delivery of the Scheme, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be developed.</li> <li>3. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> <li>4. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This will commit to the reinstatement of any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction to maintain the boundary. B-PH4(f)</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>also states that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated like for like such that the alignment of the new farm boundaries allows for the continued beneficial use and accessibility with modern commercial machinery.</p> <p>5. The Applicant will continue to engage with Rock Estates with regard to the alignment of field boundaries.</p>
1.25.11	<p>The extent and location of proposed woodland planting needs to be fully considered in the context of Rock Estates' sporting rights. Notwithstanding the guidance on the scope of representations, we reserve Rock Estates' position in respect of any further points that may need to be identified following further consultation of the documentation/plans now available. It is not readily apparent what the various impacts of the proposed DCO will be as it would appear to contradict some of the assurances that Highways England have given throughout our discussions.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has held discussions with Rock Estates and have not been made aware of any sporting activities on Rock Estates. The landscape proposals set out in Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] have sought to replace or reinforce existing roadside features, that comprise hedgerows and woodland in order to provide an appropriate level of essential landscape integration and screening and/or ecological mitigation.</li> <li>2. The land interest questionnaire completed by the landowner did not reference sporting rights, therefore it has not formed part of the agricultural assessment.</li> <li>3. If a commercial shoot was temporarily unable operate due to any localised construction works, a claim for compensation could be submitted, which may be able to account for any demonstrated losses incurred. Any longer term deleterious effect would potentially be capable of an application for compensation for injurious affection pursuant to the National Compensation Code.</li> </ol>

Table 1-26 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Craig McLaren - RR-027

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.26.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There is concern over the general disruption to the property as a result of the scheme</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The residential property, [REDACTED], is located on the west side of the A1 north of Charlton North. There is no direct land take from the property. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-054], provided an assessment of the likely effects as a result of the Scheme on private property, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. The residence is considered under the group of properties at West Linkhall, denoted as location number 10 on Figure 12.3: Properties and Commercial Facilities Part B [APP-183], and Table 12-25 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-054]. The residential property is to the west of the A1, immediately adjacent to the Order limits and land parcel 16/3dd (which is to be permanently acquired) as denoted on the Land Plans [APP-006] and is accessed from the A1 via the track which falls within parcel 16/3dd.</li> <li>2. As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-054], Part B would either retain the existing standard or improve access arrangements to residential properties. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to residential properties and private land holdings.</li> <li>3. Accesses to the property as identified by private accesses 16/1 and 16/2 on the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] would only be stopped up once temporary or permanent access arrangements are in place (particular measures relating to the West Linkhall property are outlined within Table 6 of the CTMP [APP-347] and include advanced warning to residents to minimise disruption to their daily routine, ongoing dialogue regarding their operations and to understand measures needed to mitigate such disruption. The property has been included in the Communications Plan to be produced by the main contractor as part of the CEMP (refer to Section 5.13 of the CTMP [APP-347]).</li> <li>4. In the case of this property, the existing access from the A1, via the track which falls within parcel 16/3dd, would be stopped up. This would be replaced by the West Linkhall Access Track (PA16/1).</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>Prior to the construction of the replacement access track, temporary access (the exact location of which will be determined during the detailed design stage) would be provided until the replacement access is available for use. Disruption to visual amenity has been addressed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 10, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect during construction, extending to the winter of Year 1, however, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising a linear belt of shrubs and trees, set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], the effect would reduce to moderate adverse (significant).</p> <p>5. Detailed responses as to the other forms of disruption detailed in the Relevant Representation are provided under 1.26.2-6, below.</p>
1.26.2	'2.2 Land Plans' released show on page 16 show a temporary possession and use of land on the northern side of the property. My clients do not know what this is for.	<p>1. The Applicant notes that plot 16/5f is tenanted by another party. The Applicant confirms that temporary possession of Plot No 16/5f as shown on the Land Plans [APP-006] and set out in Annex A of the Statement of Reasons [APP-018] is required for pole re-positioning and replacement together with the potential re-cabing of existing BT services leading to the adjacent properties which need to be altered to accommodate the Scheme. The alterations would be on the same line as the existing services.</p>
1.26.3	The plans also show land take up to the front of their property. There is concern of the intended purpose of this land take.	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that Plot 16/3dd, covering the verge between the existing public road and the property boundary fence, is owned the Applicant but there will be no change to the property boundary fence at this location as a result of the Scheme. The new West Linkhall access road will have a verge separating the new road from the property fence.</p> <p>2. Plot No 16/3dd (shown shaded pink on the Land Plans [APP-006]) is required for the upgrade of the existing oxbow layby track as part of the construction of the new local access road from Charlton Mires Junction to the south, to retain access to West Linkhall once the existing direct accesses off the A1 (the entrance and exit to the layby) north of Charlton Mires Junction have been stopped up.</p> <p>3. It is agreed in principle that the new West Linkhall access road will be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads are proposed to be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</p>
1.26.4	There are concerns over the ingress of weeds from HE contractors and from the highway verge. Currently the verge is infested with Ragwort and is never dealt with by HE.	<p>1. A pre-commencement walkover survey will be undertaken to confirm the presence or absence of invasive non-native species (INNS). Should invasive species be recorded within the construction area, this will be addressed through implementation of the Biosecurity Method Statement, refer to S-B8 and S-B13 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. to be developed at detailed design.</p> <p>2. S-B13 confirms that the Method Statement will detail the extent and location of any invasive or biosecurity concerns and the measures to control or eradicate the species from an area, measures to prevent the spread of the species and good site hygiene practices such as Check, Clean Dry.</p> <p>3. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES. Item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346], requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The 3000 specification includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within acceptable levels, and it will be delivered as part of the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan as required in S-B19 of the Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP</p>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		[APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.
1.26.5	There is concern over noise, dust and light pollution caused as a result of the works	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is approximately 14m from the Scheme and 7m from the boundary of construction activity.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> <li>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [APP-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>6. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</li> </ol> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with HA207/07 and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works (which includes the property); and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B [APP-041]. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</li> <li>2. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> </ol> <p><u>Light Pollution</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As outlined in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B of the ES [APP-045], should task specific construction lighting be required, it is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect, including at the property. This would be achieved through appropriate mitigation measures, including working hours that avoid the need for unnecessary night-time lighting, directional lights to</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		reduce light spill and switching lights off when not required, as set out in paragraphs 1.2.16, 1.2.23, and item SG-5 and SB-16 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. In addition, no operational lighting is proposed for the Scheme. As such, the assessment of night time effects was scoped out of the LVIA, additional information relating to the potential effects is set out in 7.10.24 – 7.10-26 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B of the ES [APP-045]. In addition, the planting proposals as set out in Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] require that a continuous belt of planting would be provided between the property and the main carriageways. This planting would screen the property from the existing junction with the A1, reducing awareness of the Scheme beyond, which in turn will reduce the light pollution from passing vehicles.
1.26.6	There is concern over the visual impact of the scheme from the residential property	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of the visual effects outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B of the ES [APP-045] and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 10, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. identifies that, due to the orientation of the buildings, their proximity to the existing A1 and the nature of the works associated with construction and operation, the occupants of the receptors would be subject to a large adverse (significant) effect during construction and would remain in winter Year 1. The Applicant confirms that, as shown on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014], the existing belt of shrubs and trees between the property and the A1 that currently provides for screening of part of the A1 in summer, and filtered views in winter, would be replaced by a linear belt of shrubs and trees, not dissimilar to the existing planting. In addition and extending northwards and closing the gap at the existing access to West Linkhall Road, this linear belt of shrubs and trees would provide additional screening to the north east, tying into a new proposed block of woodland north of the current access point. The impact of this planting would be to form a continuous belt of shrubs and trees across the entire extent of the view towards the A1 from the property, which upon establishment in summer Yr 15 would reduce awareness of traffic movements and reduce the significance of effect to moderate adverse (significant).</li> </ol>

Table 1-27 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Dallas Allen - RR-028

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.27.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There is concern over the general disruption of the business as a result of the scheme</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property is agricultural land, Humbleheugh Farm, on the west side of the A1. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the effects on this land. The assessment outlines that there would be temporary and permanent land take (directly west of the Scheme) from agricultural land under the ownership of Humbleheugh Farm (13/1d, 13/1b, 13/1a and 13/1c (permanent rights over land), and 13/1i and 13/1j (permanent acquisition of land) as denoted on the Land Plans [APP-006]), and that disruption would be limited to that caused by traffic management during construction. There is no identified severance of land as a result of the Scheme for the agricultural land holding.</li> <li>As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], Part B would either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements to properties. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to private land holdings (particular measures are outlined within the CTMP [APP-347]). Accesses would only be stopped up once temporary or permanent access arrangements are in place</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>(as outlined within the CTMP [APP-347] and as identified by private access 13/1 on the Rights of Way and Access Plans, which is accessible via the B6341 [APP-009]).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Additionally, any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required. The mitigation measures for use during construction are outlined within the CTMP [APP-347] and the Outline CEMP [APP-346], which is to be developed further prior to commencement of the construction of the Scheme. For example, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346], reference S-PH12 in Table 3-1: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme states any temporarily required land required will be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction, restoration will be carried out to a high standard and compensation will be paid for loss of profits as a result of the Scheme. Reference B-PH4 of Table 3-3: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: Part B states that appropriate access to the affected fields will be provided where required.</li> <li>4. Detailed responses as to the other forms of disruption alleged in the Relevant Representation are provided under 1.27.2-9, below.</li> </ol>
1.27.2	<p>'2.2 Land Plans' released show on pages 13 &amp; 14 show a permanent acquisition of rights over land on a farm access tracks to an attenuation pond. There is concern over this as it is used heavily as a farm access track. Additional use will damage the track and lack of access during construction will cause practical issues in dealing with livestock. There is also concern over the future maintenance of the track post works</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant proposes to acquire permanent rights over the land in plots 13/1a, 13/1b, 13/1c and 13/1d to facilitate maintenance access to Detention Basin 24. Following construction of the Scheme, the access track will be used by maintenance vehicles attending Detention Basin (DB24) for occasional inspection and maintenance purposes. As such there will be very limited additional use of the track which will not significantly impact on its usage for farm purposes.</li> <li>2. During construction, the Applicant is committed to mitigating and minimising the impacts of the Scheme. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references B-PH4(e) and (f)) confirm that during construction land and surface drainage affected by the works will be reinstated, land restored to a functional state and any damage to land will be made good and appropriate access to any affected fields will be maintained where required.</li> </ol>
1.27.3	<p>There is concern over the amount of land take which will impact on the running and profitability of the farm.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 of Chapter 12 outline the likely effects on this land for affected parcels 13/1a, 13/1b, 13/1d, 13/1e and 13/1g associated with the access track to the telecoms mast and proposed detention basin DB24, and plots 13/1i, 13/1j and 14/5a which form the western boundary of the existing A1. They state that there would be a total of 0.47 ha of temporary land take and 0.17 ha of permanent land take. The Applicant considers that this is the minimum required for the Scheme.</li> <li>2. The land is required for the construction of the maintenance access track and the creation of a new public right of way.</li> <li>3. This is referenced in Appendix CA.4 Temporary Possession Powers and Appendix CA.5 Public Benefit of the Applicant's Responses to the ExA's First Written Questions submitted at Deadline 1. As stated in Tables 12-50 and 12-51 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B, this land take is predicted to result in a slight reduction in viability of the land holding. It is reported in Chapter 12 that a slight adverse effect (not significant) is predicted on the agricultural land holding for both construction and operation periods. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.27.4	<p>There is concern over the loss of agricultural land for the planting of trees and woodland</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Affected parcels are 13/1a, 13/1b, 13/1d, 13/1e and 13/1g associated with the access track to the telecoms mast and proposed basin DB24, and plots 13/1i, 13/1j and 14/5a which form the western boundary of the existing A1.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Plots 13/1i and 13/1j would be permanently required to re-establish the boundary planting of a native hedgerow with trees that would be removed by Part B to the west of the existing A1 and along the existing highway boundary. This is considered essential mitigation to ensure that the landscape framework of hedgerow, trees and woodland is retained and avoid potentially significant landscape, visual and ecological effects which would otherwise arise in the absence of such measures, as outlined above. This is secured through item c of S-L2 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>3. The design of the Scheme has been developed to minimise land-take. Whilst the removal of trees and woodland has been minimised, the necessary removals are outlined in Figure 7.11 Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145]. As such, it is necessary to mitigate these removals and replace these landscape features; to provide replacement habitat; and/or provide visual screening to reduce the potential effects on the landscape and biodiversity. The mitigation planting is indicated on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], and has avoided the unnecessary loss of agricultural land.</li> </ol>
1.27.5	Drainage schemes have not been made available to demonstrate impacts and plans/procedures to make good the existing schemes post works.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has set out the preliminary design of the drainage for the Scheme in relation to this landholding within section 4.3 and Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 3 of 7 in Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES. The Applicant confirms that highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1-year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). The runoff from the developed areas will be controlled at the detention features to ensure that the runoff rate to existing watercourses is no greater than the current Greenfield Runoff Rates. The detailed design and specification for the drainage of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014].</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that surface drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good.</li> </ol>
1.27.6	Stock fencing and hedges adjacent to the existing A1 will be removed. The farm is currently heavily stocked with cattle and sheep. There are concerns over the quality of new fencing and the interim period during works where boundaries will be removed. There is also concerns over the future maintenance of these boundaries.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging Requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014], including the detailed design and specification in relation to fencing.</li> <li>2. The form of fencing will be in accordance with Requirement 13 contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [APP-014] which stipulates fencing should be constructed and installed in line with Volume 1, Series 0300 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also confirms that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated on a like for like basis such that new stockproof fencing is provided to replace existing stockproof fencing where required. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in Section 5.2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES. Responsibilities for ongoing maintenance of any re-positioned boundary fence will be as per existing arrangements. Ongoing maintenance of accommodation works fencing will be the responsibility of the landowner.</li> </ol>
1.27.7	The diversion of public footpaths through the farm is a concern - there has been very little information or consultation from HE with the Allen family to discuss or agree matters	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing PROW 129/021 will be stopped up as shown on Sheet 13 of 19 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] to eliminate at grade crossings of the proposed A1 and a new PROW 13/2 will be provided to run south from the existing PROW 110/010 to divert PROW users to the proposed Heckley Fence overbridge. The new PROW will run along the landowner's boundary with the A1.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>2. Materials produced for the Statutory Consultation included plans showing two potential options for the overbridge location at Broxfield and Heckley Fence. These plans included details of the alterations required to Public Rights of Way. Copies of these plans were posted on the Scheme website and hard copy versions of these plans were set out on display in each of the exhibition areas during the consultation events in Alnwick and Rennington. The Applicant considers that it has adequately consulted with regards to the changes required to Public Rights of Way.</p>
1.27.8	Generally, there has been very little to no interaction with the Allen family over the impact or proposed scheme throughout the initial planning stages	<p>1. The Applicant acknowledges that there has been limited direct contact with Mr Allen during the pre-application stage. However, the Applicant has liaised regularly with the landowner, Northumberland Estates [RR-011] and Mr Allen's appointed Land Agent, since the Preferred Route Announcement (PRA) in September 2017, responding to issues raised as appropriate. The Applicant will continue to work with Mr Allen and his land agent to resolve the issues raised in his relevant representation.</p>
1.27.9	There are concerns over the ingress of weeds from HE contractors and from the highway verge. Currently the verge is infested with Ragwort and is never dealt with by HE.	<p>1. A pre-commencement walkover survey will be undertaken to confirm the presence or absence of invasive non-native species (INNS). Should invasive species be recorded within the construction area, this will be addressed through implementation of the Biosecurity Method Statement, refer to S-B8 and S-B13 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. to be developed at detailed design. S-B13 confirms that the Method Statement will detail the extent and location of any invasive or biosecurity concerns and the measures to control or eradicate the species from an area, measures to prevent the spread of the species and good site hygiene practices such as Check, Clean Dry.</p> <p>2. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES.</p> <p>3. Item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The Series 3000 specification includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within acceptable levels, and it will be the responsibility of the Applicant to ensure that this is delivered as part of the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item, S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP) as required in S-B19 of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.</p>

**Table 1-28 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Felicity Hester - RR-029**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.28.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>The proposal is that the entire property is compulsorily purchased. This includes the residential property and adjoining land.</p>	<p>1. The property is a residential dwelling, East Cottage, and adjoining agricultural land which are located approximately 90 metres to the east of the existing A1. East cottage and the agricultural land are currently accessed via the B6347, East Cottage is located north of the B6347 and the agricultural land to its south. On page 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006], plot 15-16a, covering East Cottage, and plot 15-12a, the agricultural land, are to be acquired permanently by the Applicant for the creation of the proposed Charlton Mires junction.</p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The property is located adjacent to the staggered junction of the B6347 to the east of the existing A1. At this location it falls under the footprint of the proposed Charlton Mires junction. The compact grade separated junction will tie into the B6347.</li> <li>3. Three options were considered for the proposed A1 route between Alnwick and Ellingham as part of the development of the Scheme. Two of those options included offline sections that bypassed Charlton Mires altogether, and therefore avoided the demolition of the East Cottage. However, these two options were materially more expensive and offered much lower value for money. Further, the offline sections of these options were predicted to result in greater environmental impacts. Therefore, both options were discounted. The remaining option to be progressed was the online widening option identified as the 'Orange Route' in the Preferred Route Announcement, published in September 2017.</li> <li>4. Table 3.4 of Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives of the ES [APP-038] presents options development of the Scheme design (Part B). In relation to the location of the proposed Charlton Mires junction four different options are described. Option 2 was deemed to be in the optimal position based on connectivity with the surrounding local road network and access considerations for the residents, properties, and businesses at East Linkhall and West Linkhall. This results in the blight of the property.</li> </ol>
1.28.2	A purchase price has not yet been formally agreed with HE - This processes is massively distressing to the whole family which includes young children and an elderly mother	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Since working on the feasibility study for the route, the Applicant has sought to develop and maintain a positive relationship with the landowner to explain the proposals and the effect the proposed dualling will have upon their home and livelihood.</li> <li>2. Negotiations have been ongoing with the representatives of the family since acceptance of the blight claim in 2017. The appointment of the current land agent has seen productive discussions take place including an opening exchange of information meeting in January 2020 followed by a number of e-mail and telephone exchanges. In August 2020 a virtual Zoom meeting enabled progress to be made on specific matters such as the solar income. An exchange of offers throughout October 2020 resulted in an agreement being reached for the main heads of claim. Final discussions surrounding minor disturbance items are underway (January 2021) and it is expected these will be finalised very soon enabling a formal signed agreement to be submitted.</li> </ol>
1.28.3	'2.2 Land Plans' released show on page 15 show a permanent land take from the property. The land take is significant and constitutes the entire property.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extent of the permanent acquisition at this property is shown on page 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006], and constitutes plot 15-16a, covering East Cottage, and plot 15-12a, the agricultural land.</li> <li>2. Following early consultation around the A1 in Northumberland Scheme a Blight Notice was served on the Applicant in respect of the whole of the property and land known as East Cottage. This was received by the Applicant in November 2017 and accepted in December 2017 on the basis that the property was unlikely to be able to be sold on the open market except at a price substantially lower than it would otherwise have achieved but for the proposed scheme. The acceptance of the Blight Notice as submitted compelled the Applicant to acquire the entirety of the holding known as East Cottage and its associated equestrian land.</li> </ol>
1.28.4	The agricultural land being taken is used for the grazing of livestock – it is the only field. There is concern about the housing of this stock within the grazing window and throughout the rest of the year – it will be very difficult to relocate these animals at a location with like for like facilities (menage/stables etc).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With serving of the blight notice for the entire holding, the ownership of the land will be passed to the Applicant and as such will be passed with vacant possession. As part of the blight agreement, compensation has been discussed with the District Valuer, on behalf of the Applicant, and a sum agreed for the relocation of livestock and equipment.</li> </ol>
1.28.5	There is concern over the loss of the family home and the issues surrounding finding another like for like rural property with land. Properties have been sought for a number of years now and it has been extremely difficult. This has been made more so by the spike in residential prices as a result of the corona virus.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Final discussions surrounding these disturbance items are underway (January 2021) and it is expected these will soon be finalised, enabling a formal signed agreement to be concluded.</li> </ol>

1.28.6	There is concern over the loss of the businesses being run from the property which include a livery stud business and a fabrication business constructing shepherds huts.	1. As part of the blight negotiations all losses have been discussed and agreed.
1.28.7	There is concern over the timing of the scheme and the uncertainty of the movement of the family prior to works starting.	1. Dialogue will continue with the landowner and the Applicant as the blight claim is finalised. A back date will be discussed and included within the final blight agreement which will include provisional dates for exchange of contracts.

**Table 1-29 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of House of Haggerston Ltd trading as Carnabys - RR-030**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.29.1	We have planning consent for a road sign advertising our shop and cafe at []. the sign is located on the []side of the A1 on land forming part of []. We are extremely concerned that the movement of the carriageways to the east will mean that our sign is redundant which will have a major impact on our business.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Carnaby's Café is located on the western side of the A1 at the Brownieside junction and is outwith the Order limits, to the north.</li> <li>2. The Applicant is not aware of a road sign or consented advertisement for Carnaby's Café within the Order limits.</li> </ol>
1.29.2	We have planning consent for this sign and yet no provision has been made to ensure that our sign is not lost and the consequential impact on our trading business as a result of this application.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any required alterations to existing planning consents, including advertisement consents, should be discussed with NCC.</li> <li>2. Should the sign be negatively impacted by the Scheme, pursuant to the Compensation Code, injurious affection compensation could be sought. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.29.3	We are also concerned about the extent of the works traffic and ensuring that our business is not impacted by the construction works.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Carnaby Café was not included in the assessment of commercial property within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-055] because it lies outside of the 500m study area adopted for the assessment as explained in Chapter 12, north of the Order Limits. There is a direct access for the Café from the A1 north and southbound which lies outside of the Order Limits, and which would remain unaffected. There may be some temporary disruption and delay to users of the A1 within the extents of the Scheme during construction when temporary traffic measures are implemented, but the phasing as listed in section 2.1.6 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] would allow two-way traffic to resume use of the A1 throughout construction, and therefore maintain passing traffic and custom.</li> <li>2. Given that the café is located approximately 800m north of the northern extent of the Scheme it is not envisaged that the operation of the café would be impacted by works traffic.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed, which will include topics such as: communication; site establishment; access; traffic management; working hours; health and safety; environmental issues; waste and material management; dust, noise and vibration; and the outline construction programme (this list is not exhaustive). The CEMP will include requirements for maintaining access to businesses, based on the traffic management strategy detailed in section 1.2.6 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346], and S-PH8 which states "<i>Traffic management systems and, potentially, diversion routes will be put in place to maintain access to the identified community facilities, residential properties and communities, businesses/commercial facilities and private land holdings during construction and operation</i>".</li> <li>4. With the implementation of measures included in the CEMP, it is not anticipated that the outcome of the population and human health assessment would be altered.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-30 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of J E G Grahamslaw & Sons - RR-031**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.30.1	Current access is directly from the A1 to the farm which also holds an operating licence for HGV's from the farm. We are concerned that access to the farm will be constrained and restricted by the proposed developments.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property, East Link Hall Farm, is located approximately 360 metres east of the A1. The Applicant proposes to permanently acquire the land in plots 16/8a and 16/11b to construct the southbound carriageway of the A1 and the East Linkhall Access Road. The Applicant also proposes to acquire the permanent acquisition of rights over plot 16/11a for the installation and future access to the re-positioned high voltage cable and to take temporary possession of the land in plot 16/11c for temporary access for a utility diversion. Further detail is provided in the Book of Reference [APP-020], the Land Plans [APP-006], and the Statement of Reasons [APP-018] and in the response to 1.30.5 below.</li> <li>2. The existing direct access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety. Future access will be facilitated by the construction of a new access road, East Linkhall Road (Work No 29I), which will join the A1 via the grade separated junction at Charlton Mires, approximately 1.2 km south of the existing direct access. The new access road will be a two-lane carriageway designed to adoptable standards and will accommodate HGV movements.</li> <li>3. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties</li> </ol>
1.30.2	We require the new service road to be adopted by the local authority and to be maintainable at the public expense. we will object if the proposals are that we are to maintain the road.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms it has been agreed in principle with NCC that East Linkhall Road will be adopted by NCC, once construction is completed, and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads will be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> </ol>
1.30.3	The road needs to be suitable for traffic to pass including passing for HGV's.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The East Linkhall Access Road will be a two-lane carriageway which will accommodate two way traffic, including HGVs. The design is to be developed during detailed design to consider the future development plans at Charlton Hall and will be undertaken through ongoing liaison with NCC.</li> </ol>
1.30.4	We are concerned about the signage to the property and ensuring that services continue as normal.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant's draft DCO [APP-014] seeks powers to replace and update verge signage as a result of the Scheme. Strategic positioning of new road verge signs has been accounted for within the Order limits for the Scheme.</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.</li> </ol>
1.30.5	We have concerns about the land take and the impact on the farming business.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land being permanently acquired comprising plots 16/8a and 16/11b is for the construction of the new southbound carriageway of the A1 and the construction of the East Linkhall access road. The land being permanently acquired is the minimum required to construct, operate, maintain and mitigate the Scheme. The land over which a permanent acquisition of rights is to be obtained, plot 16/11a, is for the installation and future access to the re-positioned high voltage cable and is the minimum required for safe installation of the cable. In addition, at plot 16/11c, temporary acquisition of rights is being acquired is for temporary access for utility diversions as set out in CA.4 Temporary Possession Powers submitted at Deadline 1.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the likely effects on this land and the farming business.</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. During construction it is predicted that there would be a loss of 1.28ha (of which 1.11ha would be permanent) of land in addition to the permanent closure of one access from the A1 for East Link Hall during construction. Potential impacts to soil and land drains were also predicted, with some reduction in viability of the enterprise predicted (of medium magnitude prior to the implementation of mitigation and low magnitude with the implementation of mitigation). Residual permanent effects to the land holding were predicted as being a loss of 1.11ha of land resulting in a slight reduction in the viability of the enterprise. It is reported in Chapter 12 that a slight adverse effect (not significant) is predicted on the agricultural land holding for both construction and operation periods.”</li> <li>4. The design of the Scheme has been developed to minimise land-take for this landowner by maintaining the minimum distance between the mainline and the parallel East Linkhall Road and by utilising the existing track. As outlined in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required.</li> <li>5. Mitigation measures for use during construction are outlined within Tables 3-1 and 3-3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>6. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.30.6	We are concerned about field drainage and the reinstatement of the field boundaries. these need to take into account modern farming methods and machinery.	<p><u>Field Boundaries</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging Requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014], including the detailed design and specification in relation to fencing.</li> <li>2. The form of fencing will be in accordance with Requirement 13 contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [APP-014] which stipulates fencing should be constructed and installed in line with Volume 1, Series 0300 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also confirms that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated on a like for like basis.</li> <li>4. The Applicant notes that the eastern boundary of plot 16/11b as shown on the Land Plans [APP-006] is relatively straight and should therefore readily allow for use of the remaining part of the field by modern farming methods and machinery.</li> </ol> <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has set out the preliminary design of the drainage for the Scheme in this location within pages 21 to 24 and Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 6 of 7 in Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES and confirms that highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1-year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface water flooding of the carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). The surface water runoff from the developed areas will be controlled at the detention features to ensure that the runoff rate discharging to existing watercourses is no greater than the current Greenfield Runoff Rates. The detailed design and specification for the drainage of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014].</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that surface water drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good.</p>
1.30.7	We are concerned as well about the fences and hedgerow replacement and who will be responsible for ongoing maintenance.	<p>1. Details as to the provision for fencing and hedgerows are set out at 1.30.6, above. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in Section 5.2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES.</p> <p>2. Responsibilities for ongoing maintenance of any re-positioned boundary fence will be as per existing arrangements. Ongoing maintenance of accommodation works fencing will be the responsibility of the landowner.</p>
1.30.8	We are also concerned about the impact on the residential properties with increase noise, dust and vibration.	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is approximately 320m from the Scheme and 260m from the boundary of construction activity.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> <li>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme, which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>6. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</li> </ol> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with HA207/07 and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>2. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</p> <p><u>Light Pollution</u></p> <p>1. As outlined in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [APP-045], construction lighting is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect. This would be achieved through appropriate mitigation measures, including working hours that avoid the need for unnecessary night-time lighting, directional lights to reduce light spill and switching lights off when not required, as set out in paragraphs 1.2.16, 1.2.23, and item SG-5 and SB-16 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. In addition, no operational lighting is proposed with the Scheme. As such, the assessment of night-time effects was scoped out of the LVIA, additional information relating to the potential effects is set out in 7.10.24 – 7.10-26 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [APP-045].</p>
1.30.9	<p>Lastly, we understand that additional land is proposed to be acquired to accommodate the wind farm electric cable which is currently in the highway verge. we do not consider this to be necessary as it can be relocated in the highway verge. We wish to object on the basis of additional land take which is not necessary.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As set out in our response to 1.30.5 above a permanent acquisition of rights is to be obtained over plot 16/11a for the installation and future access to the re-positioned high voltage cable.</li> <li>2. The alternative proposal of re-locating the cable in the highway verge is not practical. To move the cable from its current location to a diverted location in the new highway verge would entail two diversions – first to allow a safe working area; and secondly to provide the final alignment. This is inevitably more work-intensive and also has higher environmental impacts. A cable cannot always be reused in these circumstances, so it would need replacing twice. This is a poor use of resources.</li> <li>3. Due to level changes necessitated by the widening, the cable will need to be located in a position where it can remain whilst the road works are in progress and thereafter. A statutory undertaker corridor outside the highway boundary on third party land (including that of the respondent) was originally devised and easements would have been required for future maintenance. However, through consultation with the landowners agent and the utility company, an alternative location to have the stats corridor within a similar location but inside the permanent highway boundary has been considered as Parameter 3 in the ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. This location in plot 16/11b shown on the Land Plans [APP-006] is now preferred by the utility company and will remove the majority of easements over third party land.</li> <li>4. The high voltage cable is to be diverted to the east of the online widening section of Part B. An overview of the route is described in ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. It will be diverted into a safe working zone trench outside the proposed new carriageway earthworks, adjacent to the temporary haul road as shown in Appendix 2.2 Technical Drawings [APP-188].</li> <li>5. The phasing of works is also set out in Chapter 2 The Scheme of the ES [APP-037] and the CTMP [APP-347]. This has considered that the new highway verge will not exist until the ground is profiled and the road is constructed. Therefore, the Applicant's proposed solution is informed by the timing as well as the need to allow a sufficient working distance to a live cable whilst construction works are underway in accordance with the Construction Design and Management Regulations (CDM Regs) 2015. Put shortly, it is not possible to divert into a highway verge that does not yet exist, so the cable diversion would be laid in new highway land toe reserved early in the construction phasing.</li> <li>6. In order to construct the A1 widening safely whilst maintaining the 66kv operations, the cable needs to be installed in a position where there will be sufficient distance maintained from the main works.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-31 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of James Douglas - RR-032**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.31.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There is concern over the general disruption to the property and business as a result of the scheme</p>	<p>1. Mr Douglas is a tenant on land at Charlton Mires Farm and lives at Drythropple Cottage.</p> <p><u>Charlton Mires Farm</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land to be permanently acquired is shown in plots 15-1c, 15-1k, 15-5a, 15-6a, 15-8a and 15-23a on sheet 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006].</li> <li>2. The land to be possessed temporarily is shown in plots 15-1a, 15-1b, 15-1d, 15-1h, 15-6d, 15-6f, 15-6g, 15-8b, 15-8c, 15-23b and 15-23d on sheet 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006].</li> <li>3. The land over which new rights are to be permanently acquired is shown in plots 15-1j, 15-6b, 15-6c and 15-6e on sheet 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006].</li> <li>4. Assessment of Charlton Mires Farm as an agricultural land holding is outlined in Tables 12-50, 12-51 and Table 12-52 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055]. Impacts are identified as 4.81ha of temporary land take, 8.67ha of permanent land take, loss of access from the A1 and loss of property which in combination, is predicted to affect the viability of the holding. This will have a large (significant) effect on this land holding.</li> <li>5. Pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol> <p><u>Drythropple Cottage</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land to be possessed temporarily is shown on plot 15/25a on sheet 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006], and comprises the section of the B6347 from which the residence is accessed.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the effects on this land. An assessment of the likely effects as a result of the Scheme on private and commercial property, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6, has also been undertaken. The residence, Drythropple Cottage, is denoted as location number 13 on Figure 12.3: Properties and Commercial Facilities Part B of the ES [APP-183], and Table 12-24 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055].</li> <li>3. As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], Part B would either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements to properties. Accesses would only be stopped up once temporary or permanent access arrangements are in place (particular measures areas as outlined within Table 4 of the CTMP [APP-347]).</li> <li>4. Additionally, any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required. The mitigation measures for use during construction are outlined within the CTMP [APP-347] and the Outline CEMP [APP-346], which is to be developed further prior to commencement of the construction of the Scheme. For example, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346], reference S-PH12 in Table 3-1: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme states any temporarily required land required will be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction, restoration will be carried out to a high standard and compensation will be paid for loss of profits as a result of the Scheme. Reference B-PH4 of Table 3-3: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: Part B states that appropriate access to the affected fields will be provided where required.</li> </ol>
1.31.2	<p>'2.2 Land Plans' released show on page 15 show a temporary possession and use of land on the only road way leading to and from the farm.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms it is seeking temporary possession and use of plots 15/22b, 15/25a, 15/26a shown green on the Land Plans [APP-006] which are within the existing highway boundary. The temporary possession and use of land are required as part of the works to Charlton Mires junction and</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>also for the realigned junction at rock Midstead. These works will consist of environmental mitigation works, alteration and realignment of road markings and new or relocation of signs.</p>
1.31.3	<p>The farm includes livestock, mechanical works and the direct sale of fruit vegetables and eggs from the roadside. To restrict the adjacent access will create significant business loss for the []</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant notes that the existing access to Drythrople Cottage is from the B6347. As shown in the Book of Reference [APP-020], the Land Plans [APP-006], and the Statement of Reasons [APP-018] the Applicant is acquiring temporary rights over plot 15/25a within the existing highway boundary for the alteration and re-alignment of road markings and the installation of new or re-located traffic signs. As such there should be no need to close the existing access to the property.</li> <li>2. The Applicant also confirms that new accesses will be provided to fields where an existing access has been severed.</li> <li>3. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties.</li> <li>4. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the effects on this land. This assessment has identified that there is likely to be some temporary disruption to access for Drythrople Cottage during construction. During periods of works and traffic management which affect the B6347, it is likely that there would be a temporary reduction in the viability of the enterprise due to the disruption of access along the road to the farmgate, disrupting trade. However, with implementation of traffic management this is predicted to result in a slight reduction in viability of enterprise due to disruption of access road to the farmgate. Access along the B6347 will not be impeded to traffic during operation and no significant permanent effects on the agricultural land holding are anticipated.</li> <li>5. As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], Part B would either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements to properties. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to private land holdings (particular measures are outlined within the CTMP [APP-347]).</li> <li>6. As access will not be impeded during operation, any temporary disruption causing a loss in profits will be discussed with the District Valuer as part of ongoing liaison. As the Applicant does not foresee any impacts on trade, the District Valuer cannot discuss or agree any loss until it occurs. However pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.31.4	<p>There are concerns over the ingress of weeds from HE contractors and from the highway verge. Currently the verge is infested with Ragwort and is never dealt with by HE.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A pre-commencement walkover survey will be undertaken to confirm the presence or absence of invasive non-native species (INNS). Should invasive species be recorded within the construction area, this will be addressed through implementation of the Biosecurity Method Statement, refer to S-B8 and S-B13 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. to be developed at detailed design. S-B13 confirms that the Method Statement will detail the extent and location of any invasive or biosecurity concerns and the measures to control or eradicate the species from an area, measures to prevent the spread of the species and good site hygiene practices such as Check, Clean Dry.</li> <li>2. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES. Item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The 3000 specification includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>acceptable levels, and it will be delivered by the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan as required in S-B19 of the Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.</p>
1.31.5	<p>There is concern over noise, dust and light pollution caused as a result of the works - There is concern over the visual impact of the over bridge from the residential property</p>	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is approximately 290m from the Scheme and 5m from the boundary of the construction activity.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> <li>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>6. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</li> </ol> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors Part B [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</li> <li>2. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p><u>Light Pollution</u></p> <p>1. As outlined in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B of the ES [APP-045], construction lighting is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect. This would be achieved through appropriate mitigation measures, including working hours that avoid the need for unnecessary night-time lighting, task specific directional lights to reduce light spill and switching lights off when not required, as set out in paragraphs 1.2.16, 1.2.23, and item SG-5 and SB-16 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. In addition, no operational lighting is proposed with the Scheme. As such, the assessment of night-time effects was scoped out of the LVIA, additional information relating to the potential effects is set out in 7.10.24 – 7.10-26 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B of the ES [APP-045].</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual</u></p> <p>1. The assessment of visual effects as outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 13, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that during the construction phase, this property would be subject to large adverse effects, arising primarily as a result of the construction of the Charlton Mires Junction, the associated bridge and slips roads, and associated compounds, plant and haul roads. Upon completion of the Scheme, and during the winter of year 1 following completion, the presence of the Charlton Mires Junction, and the widened A1 corridor would result in a moderate adverse effect. Whilst extensive mitigation measures would be in place, comprising new planting as outlined on Figure 7.11 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] and secured through item S-L2 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346], it would as yet, be immature and not achieving its function of providing screening and of integrating the junction into the wider landscape. The effects during construction and in winter year 1 following completion are both considered to be significant. In the summer of year 15 following completion, and with the mitigation planting having established and performing its function of screening the Charlton Mires Junction and A1 corridor, the effects are anticipated to have reduce to slight adverse, which is not considered to be significant.</p>
1.31.6	The diversion of public footpaths through the farm is a concern – there has been very little information from HE in this respect	<p>1. The only public footpaths in proximity to the property at Charlton Mires Junction are shown on Sheet 15 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] and comprise a new footway across the overbridge and associated link roads and a footway from Charlton Mires Junction along the east side of the B6341 to a point just south of Rock Lodge. As such the new footways are within the highway boundary and do not pass through the farm.</p>
1.31.7	There is concern over the reduction in value of the residual property as a result of the loss of amenity value	<p>1. The Scheme will look to mitigate any long term effects of the Works on the property and the residual land through accommodation works. Where it can be demonstrated that a loss in value has occurred as a result of the Scheme then pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</p>
1.31.8	There is concern over the speed of traffic moving in front of the property on the adjacent highway having just left the newly constructed off ramp	<p>1. The Applicant has submitted Traffic Regulations Measures Plans [APP-010] with the DCO application. Sheet 5 of these plans confirms that the Scheme does not propose any changes to speed along this section of the B6347 local highway. Further, the revised arrangement of the junction at Charlton Mires will not induce increased vehicle speeds in the existing side road network, as traffic crossing the Charlton Mires Junction Overbridge will have to negotiate the Tee junction with the B6347 before heading east.</p>

**Table 1-32 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of James Robson - RR-033**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.32.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There is concern over the business disruption caused by the scheme.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The business owned by the objector that has been considered in the ES is Goldenmoor Farm, which is an agricultural land holding comprising arable crops and an equestrian livery business.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the effects on Goldenmoor Farm, which includes temporary possession of 0.88ha of land as shown in plots 11/1k, 11/4b, 11/4c, 11/4d and 11/4e; permanent acquisition of 2.58ha of land as shown in plots 11/1i and 11/4a; and permanent acquisition of rights over 0.1ha of land as shown in plots 11/1j, 11/1l and 11/4f of the Land Plans [APP-006]. No severance, loss of dwelling or impact on nuisance is anticipated but a slight reduction in farm viability is expected. Based on these impacts, it is reported in Table 12-52 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055] that a slight adverse effect (not significant) is predicted on the agricultural land holding for both construction and operation periods.</li> <li>3. This land is to the east of the A1 and is mainly used for arable crops. Slight adverse effects (not significant) are predicted for Goldenmoor Farm during both construction and operation.</li> <li>4. As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], the Scheme would either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements to properties, furthermore appropriate access to affected fields would be provided where required as set out in Table 3-1 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346], Ref S-PH8 and S-PH10. In this case, the holding is accessed from the south east via the B1430 and therefore there is not anticipated to be any significant disruption to access or severance that would impact significantly on the operation of the holding.</li> <li>5. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to private land holdings (with measures outlined within Sections 3, 5 and 5 of the CTMP [APP-347]). Additionally, any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required] as set out in Table 3-1 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346], Ref s-PH12.</li> <li>6. Mitigation measures for use during construction are outlined within Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the CTMP [APP-347] and Tables 3.1 and 3.3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>7. Detailed responses as to the concerns and objections detailed in the Relevant Representation are provided under 1.32.2-12, below.</li> </ol>
1.32.2	<p>'2.2 Land Plans' released show on page 11 a temporary possession and use of land which is not deemed necessary for the scheme and will create additional damage to cropped land</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Temporary possession of Plot No 11/1k shown shaded green on Sheet 11 of the Land Plans [APP-006] is required for the establishment of Topsoil Storage Location 1, which has been estimated based on the volume of topsoil to be generated by the scheme and to be temporarily stockpiled on seven storage areas along the length of Part B, see Figure 2.6 Temporary Construction Works: Part B [APP-071]. Temporary stockpiles of topsoil would be stored to a maximum height of 2 m, with a gradient no greater than 1:2, and stacked no closer than canopy spread of boundary vegetation.</li> <li>2. As stated in Table 12-50 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] the temporary land-take required is predicted to result in a slight reduction to the viability of the land holding with impacts to land drains and soils resources identified as potentially occurring. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good. Action S-GS15 confirms there will be a programme of monitoring soil conditions following reinstatement of temporary land take. Suitable remediation would include subsoiling or drainage followed by crop establishment.</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.32.3	The nature of the permanent acquisition of land particularly within 11/1i makes the arable cropping of land extremely difficult particularly within the northern part of the parcel.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The permanent acquisition of Plot 11/1i is required as part of the Scheme to accommodate works associated with the widening of the A1, the diversion of an extra high voltage electricity cable serving Middlemoor Wind Farm and proposed woodland planting. One of the boundaries of Plot 11/1i generally follows the line of the Denwick Burn. The burn imposes a level of constraint on the arable cropping of the land in any event. As stated in 5.3.3 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-018] the land included in the DCO [APP-014] is the minimum required to construct, operate, maintain and mitigate the Scheme. The Applicant has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land take and securing sufficient land to ensure delivery of the Scheme, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be developed.</li> <li>2. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed (or as in this case, potentially rendered unusable under its current function due to a hindrance resulting from the presence of the Scheme) to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.32.4	There is concern over the additional flood risk and subsequent damage to arable crops and livestock as a result of the large body of water stored on land.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no additional flood risk as a result of the proposed detention basin DB22 to be situated on plot 11/4a as shown on sheet 11 of the Land Plans [APP-006]</li> <li>2. The preliminary design strategy for detention basin DB 22 and the drainage network linking to it is set out in section 4.3 of Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES. The detention basin has been designed to accommodate a 1 in 100 year flood event (greater than average rainfall) and also has an allowance for freeboard (greater capacity) above that water level the detention basin would therefore only be overtopped in a very extreme flood event that is an event which had a return period much greater than 1 in 100 years. In such an event it is likely that surface water directly from rainfall would lie on low lying areas of land.</li> <li>3. If there was to be flooding from the basin it would flow out to the adjacent Denwick Burn which flows from north west to south east and is immediately to the south of the detention basin. The foregoing assessment concludes the likelihood of the detention basin overtopping is very low and if that event were to occur the overspill from the detention basin would not lead to flooding to the land that would damage arable crops and livestock.</li> </ol>
1.32.5	There is concern over the dirty nature of the water being stored on the farm in the retention pond and that dirty road water being released in to the waterway which is used as a water source for livestock.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There will be mitigation provided so that water released from detention basin DB22 is suitable for release to watercourses.</li> <li>2. The runoff from the Scheme on the A1 will be collected and discharged to local watercourses. The quality of this runoff has been assessed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (LA113). The assessment concludes that the quality of the discharged water will not adversely affect the water quality in the receiving watercourse. This is detailed in Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment - Part A [APP-256] and Appendix 10.3: Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment - Part B [APP-313]. The drainage system provides for the treatment of water prior to discharge through the filtration provided by the granular materials within filter drains and the settling out of silts within detention basins as set out in Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES.</li> <li>3. The detention basin tie. This ensures that the flow rates in the burn do not increase and lead to greater siltation. Greenfield runoff rates have been calculated with the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems, Chapter 6 (ICP SuDS) method which is suitable for catchment areas below 50 ha as per this Scheme. The flow control rates for the greenfield runoff have been modelled as flow depth relationships and these are included in the Hydraulic Model appendix of Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES.</li> <li>4. Item B-B6 in Table 3-3 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that surface water drainage systems will be installed with a robust</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		treatment system using filter drains, grassed detention basins, swales and reed beds to achieve sufficient sediments and pollutant removal.
1.32.6	There is concern and confusion over the nature of the permanent acquisition of rights over land 11/4f and the adjacent temporary land take. There has been no discussion or explanation as to the purpose of this	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The acquisition of permanent access rights shown shaded blue over land at Plot No: 11/4f of the Land Plans [APP-006] is required to allow for the construction and future maintenance of the proposed drainage outfall from Detention Basin 22 into Denwick Burn as set out in page 79 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-018].</li> <li>2. The adjacent temporary possession shown shaded green at Plot Nos 11/4c and 11/4e on the Land Plans [APP-006] is required in order to provide sufficient working space for the construction of the new fence that will become the new highway boundary (Plot No. 11/4c) and the new outfall (Plot No.11/4e).</li> <li>3. The Applicant considers the proposed land take is the minimum required for the safe construction of these works.</li> <li>4. The Land Plans [APP-006] submitted for the DCO Application have been available to the landowner since the application date.</li> </ol>
1.32.7	There is concern and confusion over the nature of the temporary possession and use of land at 11/4d and 11/1b. There has been no discussion or explanation as to the purpose of this	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The temporary possession and use of land for plots 11/4d and 11/1b shown shaded green on the Land Plans [APP-006] is for the re-cabling and /or re-positioning of posts for overhead post top electric services, including the installation of replacement posts or new stays to support existing posts. The alterations would be on the same line as the existing services. The Applicant considers the proposed land take is the minimum required by the statutory undertaker for the safe construction of these works.</li> <li>2. The Land Plans [APP-006] submitted for the DCO Application have been available to the landowner since the application date.</li> </ol>
1.32.8	There is concern over the nature of the new access way to the retention pond being used as a fly tipping or access point for poachers or other trespassers. Sufficient security measures are required, and confirmation of this point has not been made clear.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The access track to detention basin DB22 falls wholly within Plot 11/1d which will be permanently acquired by the Applicant. The Applicant will therefore be responsible for the security of access to this track to maintain access to the detention basin. The new boundary fence will be located to the east of the track throughout the length of the access track from the layby to the detention basin.</li> <li>2. The obligation for ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in Section 5.2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES.</li> </ol>
1.32.9	There is concern over significant land damage being caused on the farm from work taking place in areas which are known to regularly flood.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has discussed the principles of advance surveys with the landowner and set out the approach which is to undertake them prior to start of works. This will allow the detailed design of land drains to be accommodated within the temporary works and final Scheme proposal. Land and surface drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and land restored to a functional state. Any damage to the land and drains will be made good. This commitment is set out at REAC B-PH4.e in the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> </ol>
1.32.10	Drainage schemes have not been made available to demonstrate impacts and plans/procedures to make good the existing schemes post works.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has set out the preliminary design of the drainage for the Scheme in this location within section 4.3 and Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 1 of 7 in Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES and confirms that highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1-year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). The runoff from the developed areas will be controlled at the detention features to ensure that the runoff rate to existing watercourses is no greater than the current Greenfield Runoff Rates. The detailed design and specification for the drainage of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014].</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that surface drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.32.11	Stock fencing and hedges adjacent to the existing A1 will be removed. The farm is currently heavily stocked. There are concerns over the quality of new fencing and the interim period during works where boundaries will be removed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design will be developed in discharging requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014]. The Applicant will be undertaking the detailed design and specification in relation to fencing and landscaping and to discharge requirement 13 contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [APP-014] which stipulates that fencing should be constructed and installed in line with Volume 1, Series 0300 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works.</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also confirms that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated on a like for like basis such that new stockproof fencing is provided to replace existing stockproof fencing where required.</li> </ol>
1.32.12	There is concern over likely damage to soil structure and land as a result of temporary land take for working areas such as 11/1k	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The temporary acquisition of plot 11/1k is required for temporary storage of soils and associated access. As confirmed in Appendix 11.5 Soils and Agricultural Land Quality Report Part B [APP-321] this area has been classified as Grade 4 (poor quality) agricultural land, not being best and most versatile agricultural land. The Applicant can confirm that the potential for a reduction in agricultural soil quality is recognised within Chapter 11: Geology and Soils Part B of the ES [APP-053], Section 11.8. As set out at paragraph 11.9.13 of Chapter 11, the Applicant has identified that a soil handling strategy will be produced to limit the likely damage caused in areas of temporary land take. The requirement for a soil handling strategy is included at Actions S-GS5 and S-GS6 of the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. The soil handling strategy will be designed in accordance with key guidance documents (including Defra (2009) Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Construction Sites and Defra (2000) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils) and will include as a minimum the requirement to strip, separate and appropriately store topsoil and subsoil from areas of temporary land take, the use of appropriate machinery and the return of topsoil and subsoil to its original source area as far as practicable.</li> </ol>

Table 1-33 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Jill Mary Gray - RR-034

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.33.1	Mrs Gray is the owner of No[] & No [ ] they are accessed directly from the A1 at[]. We are concerned about the new access arrangements to the property.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property is a residential dwelling, [REDACTED], located approximately 150 metres west of the A1. There is no direct land take from the property however the access to the property is affected by the Scheme. The existing direct access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety following completion of the Scheme. Future access will be facilitated by the construction of a new access road, West Linkhall Road, which will join the A1 via the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires.</li> </ol>
1.33.2	It is unclear if this road is to be maintainable at the public expense, is wide enough to allow traffic to safely pass and	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has agreed in principle with NCC that West Linkhall Road will be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads will be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> <li>2. The current design provides for West Linkhall road to be a two lane carriageway to allow traffic to safely pass. The road is designed to accommodate HGVs and combine harvesters.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.33.3	ensuring that we are able to maintain our services to the properties.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1, including the access at [REDACTED] will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include [REDACTED]</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed, which will include topics such as: communication; site establishment; access; traffic management; working hours; health and safety; environmental issues; waste and material management; dust, noise and vibration; and the outline construction programme (this list is not exhaustive).</li> </ol>
1.33.4	Access to the properties if one is heading north will also be impeded and increase travel time for Mrs Gray.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that the residents of this property will have a greater distance to travel to access the A1. However, it is not anticipated that journey times will increase significantly. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken as described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP344]. Section 4.8 of Chapter 4 details the forecast improvements to average journey times as a result of the Scheme, which will help to offset any increase in journey time for drivers accessing the A1 from the property. Drivers will also benefit from using the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires which will enable safer access through avoiding right turn traffic movements and reduced delays compared with the current at grade junction.</li> </ol>
1.33.5	We are also concerned that the current screening of the road will be reduced and removed as part of the works and we would like to understand further the mitigation that HE plan to include.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of the visual effects outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B of the ES [APP-045] and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 10, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. identifies that, due to the orientation of the buildings, their proximity to the existing A1 and the nature of the works associated with construction and operation, the occupants of the receptors would be subject to a large adverse (significant) effect during construction, and would remain in winter Year 1. As shown on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014], the existing belt of shrubs and trees, between the property and the A1, and that currently provides for screening of part of the A1 in summer, and filtered views in winter, would be replaced by a linear belt of shrubs and trees, not dissimilar to the existing planting. In addition, and extending northwards and closing the gap at the existing access to West Linkhall Road, this linear belt of shrubs and trees would provide additional screening to the north east, tying into a new proposed block of woodland north of the current access point. The impact of this planting would be to form a continuous belt of shrubs and trees across the entire extent of the view towards the A1 from the Property, which upon establishment in summer Year 15 would reduce awareness of traffic movements and reduce the significance of effect to moderate adverse (significant).</li> </ol>
1.33.6	We are also concerned about the increased noise, dust and vibration from the new highways.	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is 17-70m from the Scheme and 7-14m from the boundary of construction activity.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</li> </ol> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality and comprises the identification of a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors Part B [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</li> <li>An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> </ol>

Table 1-34 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Mick Holland - RR-035

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.34.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There is concern over the general disruption to the property as a result of the scheme.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property is a residential dwelling, Heckley Fence Farm, located approximately 245 metres west of the A1. Mr Holland has a tenancy agreement over the land which forms part of the Northumberland Estate. The Applicant proposes to acquire permanent rights over 0.01ha of land in plot 12/3c for the creation of a new byway. The Applicant also proposes to take temporary possession of 0.03ha of land in plot 12/3h to facilitate the construction of the Heckley Fence accommodation overbridge and associated ramps over the widened A1. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on private property, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. This property is considered under the group of properties at Heckley Fence, denoted as location number 4 on Figure 12.3 Properties and Commercial Facilities Part B [APP-183], and Table 12-25 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055].</li> <li>As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], the Scheme would either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements to properties.</li> <li>The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the likely impacts on this land. It is reported in Table 12-52 of Chapter 12 that a slight adverse effect (not significant) is predicted</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>on the agricultural land holding for during construction with a neutral impact predicted during the operational period.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Temporary impacts are predicted to include temporary land-take (0.04ha), temporary changes to access arrangements, potential impacts to land drainage and a slight reduction in the viability of the enterprise due to land loss. It is not predicted that any permanent impacts (including land-take) will occur.</li> <li>5. As outlined in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required.</li> <li>6. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to residential properties and private land holdings (particular measures are outlined within the CTMP [APP-347]). In this case, direct access from the A1 to fields between Heckley Fence and the A1 would be stopped up. The residents of this property would continue to use the access to the fields from the B6341, and access to the A1 would be from the new Charlton Mires Junction.</li> <li>7. Disruption to visual amenity have been addressed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 4, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect during construction, extending to the winter of Year 1, however, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising extensive woodland planting forming woodland belts, as set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014], the effect would reduce in the summer of Year 15 to moderate adverse (significant).</li> <li>8. Detailed responses as to the other forms of disruption alleged in the Relevant Representation are provided under 1.34.2-7, below.</li> </ol>
1.34.2	<p>Land Plans' released show on page 12 show a permanent acquisition of rights over land on a farm access tracks to the new bridge at Heckley Fence. There is concern over this as it is used heavily as a farm and residential access track. Additional use will damage the track and lack of access during construction will cause practical issues in dealing with livestock. There is also concern over the future maintenance of the track post works.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the permanent acquisition of rights over plots 12/3b, 12/3c and 12/3d on sheet 12 of the Land Plans [APP-006] will be required for the creation of a byway to access the new Heckley Fence Overbridge, Work No. 27 on the Work Plans [APP-007].</li> <li>2. As the existing direct access from the A1 will be stopped up the access track will no longer be used for residential access to Heckley Fence Farm on completion of the Scheme.</li> <li>3. The use of the byway will be for all traffic. However, due to low usage of the existing BOAT at Broxfield from the WCH survey] the primary usage of the byway will be by pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists, in addition to the existing use by farm traffic. Results from the WCH survey are summarised in TT.1 Walking, Cycling and Horse riding survey data submitted at Deadline 1 in response to WQ TT.1.1. The specification of the track is compacted stone (apart from the section over Heckley Fence overbridge which will be a bound surface). This surface is designed for agricultural vehicles. The use by pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists would not result in significant damage to the track.</li> <li>4. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include Heckley Fence Farm</li> <li>5. The Applicant confirms that future maintenance of the access track would be undertaken by the landowner.</li> </ol>
1.34.3	<p>There is concern over the amount of land take which will impact on the running and profitability of the farm business.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the likely impacts on this land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temporary impacts are predicted to include temporary land-take (0.04ha), temporary changes to access arrangements, potential impacts to land drainage and a slight reduction in the viability of the enterprise due to land loss. It is not predicted that any permanent impacts (including land-take) will occur. It is reported in Table 12-52 of Chapter 12 that a slight adverse effect (not significant) is predicted on the agricultural land holding for both construction and operation periods.</li> <li>The design of the Scheme has been developed to minimise land-take to 0.04ha during the construction of the scheme, however this would be a temporary acquisition and no permanent land-take would be required</li> <li>As outlined in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required.</li> <li>The mitigation measures for use during construction are outlined within the Outline CEMP [APP-346], which is to be developed further prior to commencement of the construction of the Scheme and secured through a final CEMP. For example, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346], reference S-PH12 in Table 3-1: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme states any temporarily required land required will be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction, restoration will be carried out to a high standard</li> <li>Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.34.4	There is concern over the visual impact of the bridge from the residential property	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant acknowledges that the Heckley Fence farm accommodation works bridge would have a significant adverse effect (large adverse) on the visual amenity of this property (set out in pp 3 and 4 of Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule Part B [APP-287]). The significance of this would reduce over time as the mitigation planting, comprising extensive woodland planting forming woodland belts, as set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014], matures. As the planting establishes, the new woodland planting that extends across the bridge embankment and along the adjacent field to the boundary of the property, would substantially reduce views of the bridge from the property, nevertheless there is anticipated to remain in Year 15, a moderate adverse effect.</li> </ol>
1.34.5	There is concern over noise, dust and light pollution caused as a result of the works	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is approximately 220m from the Scheme and 20m from the boundary of construction activity.</li> <li>The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</p> <p>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>6. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 of the ES [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</p> <p>2. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</p> <p><u>Light Pollution</u></p> <p>1. As outlined in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], should task specific construction lighting be required, it is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect. This would be achieved through appropriate mitigation measures, including working hours that avoid the need for unnecessary night-time lighting, task specific, directional lights to reduce light spill and switching lights off when not required, as set out in paragraphs 1.2.16, 1.2.23, and item SG-5 and SB-16 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. In addition, no operational lighting is proposed with the Scheme. As such, the assessment of night-time effects. was scoped out of the LVIA, additional information relating to the potential effects is set out in 7.10.24 – 7.10-26 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045]. In addition, the planting proposals as set out in Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] require that a continuous belt of woodland planting would be provided between the property and the main carriageways, as this matures it would reduce awareness of the Scheme beyond, which will in turn reduce the light pollution from passing vehicles.</p>
1.34.6	There are concerns over the ingress of weeds from HE contractors and from the highway verge. Currently the verge is infested with Ragwort and is never dealt with by HE.	<p>1. A pre-commencement walkover survey will be undertaken to confirm the presence or absence of invasive non-native species (INNS). Should invasive species be recorded within the construction area, this will be addressed through implementation of the Biosecurity Method Statement, refer to S-B8 and S-B13 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. to be developed at detailed design. S-B13 confirms that the Method Statement will detail the extent and location of any invasive or biosecurity concerns and the measures to control or eradicate the species from an area, measures to prevent the spread of the species and good site hygiene practices such as Check, Clean Dry.</p>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>2. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES. Item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The 3000 specification includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within acceptable levels, and it will be delivered by the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan as required in S-B19 of the Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.</p>
1.34.7	The diversion of public footpaths through the farm is a concern – there has been very little information from HE in this respect	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that new bridleways and a public right of way will be created as part of the Scheme. These are also shown on Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] and show a new bridleway linking with PR12/2 at Broxfield and running North to Heckley Fence as shown on sheet 12. In addition, a new public right of way will be created from Heckley Fence heading north to tie into the existing PROW ref 129/021 shown on sheet 13. The section of the new bridleway and PROW in proximity to this property will run along the landowner's boundary with the A1.</p> <p>2. The Applicant confirms that diversions to Public Rights of Way across the Scheme have been considered and reported in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055].</p> <p>3. An email response from the Applicant dated 9 April 2019 was sent to Mr Holland's agent, Mr Thompson, including the plans of the proposed PROW alterations. As set out in the Consultation Report Appendix N Table N.8 [APP-034] a follow up meeting to the resident's consultation response was held on 28 June 2019, the residents confirmed they were agreeable to the location of the overbridge and associated PROWs, subject to further detail on landscaping proposals being provided at detailed design.</p>

Table 1-35 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Mr and Mrs A Kelly – RR-036

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.35.1	<p>We represent the owners of No []. Our current access to the property is directly from the A1 at the[].</p> <p>We understand that the proposals are to block up this access road and provide a new access from the North through Rock Estate.</p>	<p>1. The property is a residential dwelling, [REDACTED], located approximately 800 metres east of the A1. The existing access to the property is approximately 2.1km south of the proposed Charlton Mires Junction and consists of a single lane road. There is no direct land take from the property however the access to the property is affected by the Scheme. The Applicant confirms that the existing access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety as a result of the Scheme. A replacement road will be constructed to Rock Midstead and onto the B6347, where access to the A1 would be via the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires.</p>
1.35.2	We are concerned about the new road and require this to be fully adopted and maintained at the public expenses. We will object if this is to be a private road.	<p>1. It is agreed in principle with NCC that as the existing road to Rock South Farm is adopted by NCC, the replacement road (Work No 30B) will therefore also be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads are proposed to be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.35.3	The road needs to be sufficient to allow traffic to pass safely and not have to pull onto soft verges.	1. The new access road will be single lane but will permit two-way traffic movements through the provision of regular passing bays to ensure that damage to verges is minimised. The Applicant considers that a single lane access road with passing places is sufficient and represents an improvement on the highway provision in situ at the present because of the provision of passing bays. This design will allow traffic to pass safely, with the straight alignment of the proposed access road providing good visibility of oncoming and allowing passing bays to be utilised. It should be noted that absent the Scheme it was not proposed to upgrade the road.
1.35.4	We require confirmation that the bin service will continue to[] and all other serves will continue as normal.	1. While the Applicant is not responsible for refuse collection there is no reason to believe that NCC would not continue to collect refuse during construction of the Scheme and after completion of the Scheme. Similarly, while the Applicant is not responsible for the provision of any other services which utilise the existing access road the Applicant is not aware of any reasons why these services could not utilise the replacement access road. 2. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. As part of the current design a new turning head will be provided at the eastern end of the existing Rock South Farm access road and will cater for refuse vehicles once the Scheme has been completed.
1.35.5	We are concerned that people and delivery drivers may not know how to access the road and will need clear directions to [].	1. Detailed design of strategic destinations for Advance Directional Signs (ADS) and other approved signs are to be confirmed in the Signage Strategy. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.
1.35.6	We are concerned that our travel journeys to the south will increase significantly as a result of these proposals.	1. The Applicant acknowledges that the residents of the property will have a greater distance to travel to access the A1; heading south this will be 4km. However, it is not anticipated that journey times will increase significantly. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken as described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP344]. Section 4.8 of Chapter 4 details the forecast improvements to average journey times as a result of the Scheme, which will help to offset any increase in journey time for drivers accessing the A1 from the property. Drivers will also benefit from using the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires which will enable safer access through avoiding right turn traffic movements and reduced delays compared with the current at grade junction.
1.35.7	We require the new access to Rock South to be installed before the current access is stopped up during construction	1. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed, which will include topics such as: communication; site establishment; access; traffic management; working hours; and the outline construction programme (this list is not exhaustive). The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include Rock South Farm.

Table 1-36 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Neil and Elizabeth Elder - RR-037

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.36.1	<p>We are the owners of No [] and no []. We live in No[] and we use o [] as a holiday cottage. Our current access to the property is directly from the A1 at the []. We understand that the proposals are to block up this access road and provide a new access from the North through Rock Estate.</p> <p>We are concerned about the new road and require this to be fully adopted and maintained at the public expenses. We will object if this is to be a private road.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property is a residential dwelling, [REDACTED], located approximately 800 metres east of the A1. The existing access to the property is approximately 2.1km south of the proposed Charlton Mires Junction and consists of a single lane road. There is no direct land take from the property however the access to the property is affected by the Scheme. The Applicant can confirm that the existing access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety as a result of the Scheme. A replacement road will be constructed to Rock Midstead and onto the B6347, where access to the A1 carriageway would be via the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires.</li> <li>2. It is agreed in principle with NCC that as the existing road to Rock South Farm is adopted by NCC, the replacement road (Work No 30B) will therefore also be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads are proposed to be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</li> </ol>
1.36.2	<p>The road needs to be sufficient to allow traffic to pass safely and not have to pull onto soft verges.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new access road will be single lane but will permit two-way traffic movements through the provision of regular passing bays to ensure that damage to verges is minimised. The Applicant considers that a single lane access road with passing places is sufficient and represents an improvement on the highway provision in situ at the present because of the provision of passing bays. This design will allow traffic to pass safely, with the straight alignment of the proposed access road providing good visibility of oncoming and allowing passing bays to be utilised. It should be noted that absent the Scheme it was not proposed to upgrade the road.</li> </ol>
1.36.3	<p>We require confirmation that the bin service will continue to[]and all other serves will continue as normal.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. While the Applicant is not responsible for refuse collection there is no reason to believe that NCC would not continue to collect refuse during construction of the Scheme and after completion of the Scheme. Similarly, while the Applicant is not responsible for the provision of any other services which utilise the existing access road the Applicant is not aware of any reasons why these services could not utilise the replacement access road.</li> <li>2. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. As part of the current design a new turning head will be provided at the eastern end of the existing Rock South Farm access road and will cater for refuse and other vehicles once the Scheme has been completed.</li> </ol>
1.36.4	<p>We are concerned that people and delivery drivers may not know how to access the road and will need clear directions to[].</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detailed design of strategic destinations for Advance Directional Signs (ADS) and other approved signs are to be confirmed in the Signage Strategy. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.</li> </ol>
1.36.5	<p>We are concerned that our travel journeys to the south will increase significantly as a result of these proposals.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that the residents of the property will have a greater distance to travel to access the A1; heading south this will be 4km. However, it is not anticipated that journey times will increase significantly. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken as described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP344]. Section 4.8 of Chapter 4 details the forecast improvements to average journey times as a result of the Scheme, which will help to offset any increase in journey time for drivers accessing the A1 from the property. Drivers will also benefit from using the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires which will enable safer access through avoiding right turn traffic movements and reduced delays compared with the current at grade junction.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.36.6	We require the new access to Rock South to be installed before the current access is stopped up during construction.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed, which will include topics such as: communication; site establishment; access; traffic management; working hours; and the outline construction programme (this list is not exhaustive). The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include Rock South Farm.</li> </ol>
1.36.7	We are concerned about direction and how our guest to the holiday cottage will find the new access road. WE require confirmation that satellite navigation systems will be changed, and appropriate signage put in place.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detailed design of strategic destinations for Advance Directional Signs (ADS) and other approved signs are to be confirmed in the Signage Strategy.</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.</li> <li>3. Changing satellite navigation systems is not the responsibility of the Applicant.</li> </ol>

Table 1-37 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Paul Dawson – RR-038

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.37.1	There is concern over business interruption from the construction of an upgraded access way adjacent to the property boundary. There is concern over the impact on the holiday cottage business being run from the property as a result of the construction.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property is a residential dwelling, Heckley House, located approximately 665 metres west of the A1. An acquisition of rights will be obtained over plots 12/4a and 12/2a to provide for construction of a track providing access to detention basin DB23. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on private property, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. The property is considered under properties at Heckley Fence, denoted as location number 3 on Figure 12.3 Properties and Commercial Facilities Part B [APP-122], and Table 12-25 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055].</li> <li>2. As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], the Scheme would either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements to residential properties. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to residential properties and private land holdings (particular measures are outlined within Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the CTMP [APP-347]). In the case of this property, access from the A1 would be stopped up, but access would remain from the B6341.</li> <li>3. Although this property has been assessed in terms of a private dwelling, a holiday cottage in this location was not identified within the Population and Human Health Assessment, as the Applicant was unaware it was being used for this purpose. Therefore, no assessment was made of likely effects on a commercial property in this location. A formal assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on this receptor is being carried out and will be submitted at Deadline 2 in line with Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] of the ES. In the interim, a consideration of the potential for impacts is set out below.</li> <li>4. Based on the assessment on the impact of other commercial properties within the Order limits there may be some temporary reduction in the amenity of users of the holiday cottage during the construction period due to the presence of the construction plant and construction works. As outlined within the Outline CEMP [APP-346], standard working hours would be from 7:00 am until 7:00 pm, Monday to Friday. However, extended hours including night time, weekend and Bank and Public Holiday working</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>would be required for some construction operations and would be subject to approval in advance by NCC. It is not anticipated that any temporary reduction in amenity would be significant or detrimental to the business, as the amendments to Byway 110/013 (set out on the Rights of Way and Access Plans, Sheet 12 [APP-009]) which provides access to the property consist of stopping up at its junction with the A1, to the east of the property.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Disruption to visual amenity has been addressed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 3, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect during construction, extending to the winter of Year 1, however, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising extensive woodland planting forming woodland belts, as set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014], the effect would reduce in the summer of Year 15 to moderate adverse (significant).</li> <li>6. There may also be the opportunity to let the property during construction of the Scheme to construction workers if this was acceptable to the owner. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> <li>7. Mitigation measures during construction are outlined within Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the CTMP [APP-347] and the Tables 3.1 and 3.3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> </ol>
1.37.2	<p>There is concern over increased numbers of personnel walking and driving past the property leading to issues such as theft and fly tipping. There is concern over livestock being let out of fields or not being properly secured by contractors and members of the public during and after construction.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that a new track will be constructed to provide access to a new detention basin DB23. Following construction, the additional traffic using the track in proximity to the property would be for maintenance personnel accessing Detention Basin BD23. Given the limited inspection and maintenance inputs required the traffic volumes passing the property for this purpose will be very low. There is presently a gate at the location where the new access track joins the B6341 and the Applicant confirms that a new gate would be provided across the entrance to the access track to deter flytipping and prevent livestock being let out. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This will commit to the reinstatement of any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction to maintain the boundary.</li> <li>2. In any event, it is not appropriate to suggest that Highways England or its contractors are responsible for theft of fly tipping.</li> <li>3. Section 6 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] sets out the training requirements for all construction site staff including their environmental responsibilities and the training will include domestic waste management and communication with the public. In addition, the Outline CEMP (reference S-L6) confirms that construction sites will be kept tidy and free from litter and debris.</li> <li>4. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments to confirm that any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-38 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Robert John Fenwick Thorp and Nina Mickleborough – RR-039**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.38.1	<p>This representation is made on behalf of Robert Thorp and Nina Mickleborough. Robert owns property adjacent to the A1 including []. Nina (Roberts daughter) is the proprietor of []n which is a glamping pod business located on []. Access is taken through the main drive from []. The proposals are to acquire permanent rights to install bat mitigation boxes. The proposals are vague and unclear, and we require further information to be able to understand the impact and loss of amenity within the woodland.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. [REDACTED] is located approximately 920 metres east of the A1. The land to be permanently acquired is shown in plots 16/9a, 16/9b and 16/9c on sheet 16 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. The land to be possessed temporarily is shown in plots 16/9d and 16/9e on sheet 16 of the Land Plans [APP-006].</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms that bat mitigation boxes are proposed for installation on mature trees within the Order limits and parallel with Charlton Hall Road. The Applicant proposes to take temporary possession of land in plot 16/9e to facilitate the access. The existing road will be accessed from the Scheme's East Linkhall Road, Work No.29I on sheet 16 of the Works Plan [APP-007].</li> <li>3. The bat boxes form part of the compensation strategy of a bat European Protected Species (EPS) licence, which will be obtained from Natural England. In accordance with the programme presented in Table 2-7 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of the ES [APP-037], it is anticipated that a licence application would be made in Autumn 2021. Only upon receipt of an EPS licence from Natural England can the relocation of bat boxes be undertaken, which will be restricted to during the active bat season, but outwith the maternity season (April to mid-May and mid-July to October, inclusive). Permanent rights are required to permit the visual inspection and monitoring of the bat mitigation boxes, a requirement of the EPS licence. Monitoring would be undertaken for a period of at least 5 years post-construction of the Scheme (to be confirmed with Natural England). It is currently proposed that monitoring would include two inspection visits between May and August during the first, third and fifth years post-construction (2024, 2026 and 2028). It is also proposed that trees will be safeguarded from felling, or other works with the potential to disturb the bat boxes, for a minimum period of 30 years post-construction; the final duration will be confirmed by Natural England as a condition of the EPS licence when granted.</li> <li>4. The Applicant has discussed and clarified the requirement for access and mitigation for bat boxes with the land agents representing Mr Thorp on 08/12/20 and agreement has been reached in principle. Liaison with the landowner's representative will continue.</li> </ol>
1.38.2	<p>We are concerned that the current access to the property and the holiday glamping pods will be lost as it is directly onto the A1.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant can confirm that the existing access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety following completion of the Scheme. The proposed East Linkhall Access Road will provide access from Charlton Mires Junction to the properties and agricultural land to the east of the existing A1. The East Linkhall Access Road will be a two-lane carriageway which will accommodate agricultural traffic. The design is to be developed during detailed design to consider the future development plans at Charlton Hall and will be undertaken through ongoing liaison with NCC..</li> <li>2. The Applicant's draft DCO [APP-014] seeks powers to replace and update verge signage as a result of the Scheme. Strategic positioning of new road verge signs has been accounted for within the Order limits for the Scheme. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.</li> </ol>
1.38.3	<p>We require that any new road access is maintainable at the public expenses and adopted by the local authority. The road needs to be wide enough and have enough passing spaces to allow traffic to flow both ways.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed East Linkhall Access Road will provide access from Charlton Mires junction to the property. The East Linkhall Access Road will be a two-lane carriageway which will accommodate two way traffic. The design is to be developed during detailed design to consider the future development plans at Charlton Hall and will be undertaken through ongoing liaison with NCC.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has agreed in principle with NCC that East Linkhall Road is adopted by NCC, once the detailed design modifications to the access road are completed, and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		and link roads will be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.
1.38.4	We are concerned that the current vegetation that provides screening and noise reduction to West Lodge will be lost and we require details of the proposed mitigation to reduce the impact of the new carriageway getting closer to West Lodge.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figure 7.11 Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145] shows the loss of vegetation between the hedge and wall along the minor road which runs parallel to and east of the A1 and provides access to the property. On completion of construction, the area will be replanted with a "woodland edge" mix of trees and shrubs, as shown on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014].</li> <li>The assessment of visual effects (as outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 15, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]) identifies that during construction and in Year 1, the effect at this property would be moderate adverse, arising as a result of the removal of the existing woodland block. By Year 15 the visual effect is anticipated to reduce to slight adverse (non-significant).</li> <li>However, this will be reviewed at detailed design stage and, should it be determined that some of the trees could be retained through construction techniques, the Applicant may seek to retain some of the trees. This approach is secured through S-L2 of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>To achieve acoustic attenuation from trees and vegetation, they would need to be densely planted and evergreen, and would also need to cover a wide area. The vegetation which is to be lost in this locality as a result of the Scheme is not considered to be dense or covering a deep / wide area. Consequently, the removal of vegetation would have little or no effect on the noise levels present at West Lodge.</li> <li>The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Therefore, no mitigation applicable to operational road traffic noise has been proposed within the vicinity of West Lodge.</li> </ol>
1.38.5	We need to ensure that during construction access is maintained at all times to the glamping business to ensure that no disruption occurs to the business.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The outline CEMP (reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include Charlton Hall.</li> <li>The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that the mitigation for diversions at Charlton Hall will include advanced warning to residents to minimise disruption to their daily routines and ongoing dialogue to understand the operations of the business and ensure an understanding of the measures needed to mitigate disruption.</li> </ol>

Table 1-39 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Robin Tuer – RR-040

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.39.1	We are the owners of the [], our current access to the property is directly from the A1 at the []. We understand that the proposals are to block up this access road and provide a new access from the North through Rock Estate. We are concerned about the new	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property is a residential dwelling, [REDACTED], located approximately 800 metres east of the A1. The existing access to the property is approximately 2.1km south of the proposed Charlton Mires Junction and consists of a single lane road. There is no direct land take from the property however the access to the property is affected by the Scheme. The Applicant can confirm that</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	road and require this to be fully adopted and maintained at the public expenses. We will object if this is to be a private road	<p>the existing access onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety as a result of the Scheme. A replacement road will be constructed to Rock Midstead and onto the B6347, where access to the A1 would be via the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires.</p> <p>2. It is agreed in principle with NCC that as the existing road to Rock South Farm is adopted by NCC, the replacement road (Work No 30B) will therefore also be adopted by NCC and this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [APP-014]. Section 5.2.2 of the outline CEMP [APP-346] confirms that side roads and link roads are proposed to be adopted by NCC. Pending adoption, the Applicant will operate and maintain the road.</p>
1.39.2	The road needs to be sufficient to allow traffic to pass safely and not have to pull onto soft verges.	<p>1. The new access road will be single lane but will permit two-way traffic movements through the provision of regular passing bays to ensure that damage to verges is minimised. The Applicant considers that a single lane access road with passing places is sufficient and represents an improvement on the highway provision in situ at the present because of the provision of passing bays. This design will allow traffic to pass safely, with the straight alignment of the proposed access road providing good visibility of oncoming and allowing passing bays to be utilised. It should be noted that absent the Scheme it was not proposed to upgrade the road.</p>
1.39.3	We require confirmation that the bin service will continue to [] and all other serves will continue as normal.	<p>1. While the Applicant is not responsible for refuse collection there is no reason to believe that NCC would not continue to collect refuse during construction of the Scheme and after completion of the Scheme. Similarly, while the Applicant is not responsible for the provision of any other services which utilise the existing access road the Applicant is not aware of any reasons why these services could not utilise the replacement access road.</p> <p>2. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. As part of the current design a new turning head will be provided at the eastern end of the existing Rock South Farm access road and will cater for refuse vehicles once the Scheme has been completed.</p>
1.39.4	We are concerned that people and delivery drivers may not know how to access the road and will need clear directions to [].	<p>1. Detailed design of strategic destinations for Advance Directional Signs (ADS) and other approved signs are to be confirmed in the Signage Strategy. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] (references S-PH3 and S-PH5) confirms that appropriate signage for the Scheme will be implemented to avoid creating route uncertainty and that during construction temporary signage and layout will be clear to avoid creating route uncertainty. The outline CEMP (reference S-PH5) also confirms that any diversions or closures during construction will be advertised and any diversion routes will be clearly signposted and not lead to uncertainty.</p>
1.39.5	We are concerned that our travel journeys to the south will increase significantly as a result of these proposals.	<p>1. The Applicant acknowledges that the residents of the property will have a greater distance to travel to access the A1; heading south this will be 4km. However, it is not anticipated that journey times will increase significantly. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken as described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP344]. Section 4.8 of Chapter 4 details the forecast improvements to average journey times as a result of the Scheme, which will help to offset any increase in journey time for drivers accessing the A1 from the property. Drivers will also benefit from using the new grade separated junction at Charlton Mires which will enable safer access through avoiding right turn traffic movements and reduced delays compared with the current at grade junction.</p>
1.39.6	We require the new access to Rock South to be installed before the current access is stopped up during construction.	<p>1. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 4 confirms that existing accesses and egresses onto the A1 will only be stopped up once temporary or permanent alternative accesses are in place. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-347] Table 6 confirms that vehicular access for Rock South Farm will be maintained at all times. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed, which will include topics such as: communication; site establishment; access; traffic management; working hours; and the outline construction programme (this list is not exhaustive). The outline CEMP</p>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		(reference S-PH1) confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements for residential and commercial properties which would include Rock South Farm.

**Table 1-40 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of Shaun Robinson – RR-043**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.40.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There is concern over the general disruption to the property and business as a result of the scheme</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property is a residential dwelling, called Rock Lodge, which includes grazing land, approximately 3400 sqm in size, located approximately 30 metres west of the A1.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on private property, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. The property is considered under the group of properties at Rock Lodge, denoted as location number 6 on Figure 12.3 Properties and Commercial Facilities Part B [APP-183], and in Table 12-25 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055].</li> <li>3. As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health of the ES [APP-055], the Scheme would retain the existing standard access arrangements to the residential property. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to residential properties and private land holdings (particular measures are outlined within the CTMP [APP-347]). In this case, access to the property would remain from the B6341, but there would be some temporary disruption during works if travelling from the north on the B6347.</li> <li>4. The required temporary possession and use of land parcels associated with the residential property (Plot No. 14/2a, 15/19b, 15/21b and 15/20a) would result in a temporary, significant adverse effect. Mitigation measures included in the Outline CEMP [App-346] include the reinstatement of temporarily acquired land (Ref. S-PH10 and S-PH12).</li> <li>5. During operation of the scheme permanent land-take is required from the residential property (Plot Nos. 15/21a, 15/21c and 15/19a) which would result in a permanent, non-significant impact to the property.</li> <li>6. Mitigation measures for use during construction are outlined within Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the CTMP [APP-347] and Tables 3.1 and 3.3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-347]. Mitigation measures identified in the CTMP include the provision of advanced warning to residents to minimise disruption (as detailed within Table 6 of the CTMP [APP-347]).</li> <li>7. Disruption to visual amenity have been addressed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 6, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect (significant) during construction, extending to the winter of Year 1, however, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising a linear belt of shrubs and trees to the north of the receptor that would reinforce the existing vegetation to the north of the property, set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], the effect would reduce to moderate adverse (significant).</li> <li>8. Detailed responses as to the other forms of disruption alleged in the Relevant Representation are provided under 1.40.2-17, below.</li> </ol>
1.40.2	'2.2 Land Plans' released show on page 15 show a permanent land take from the property. The land take is significant within the relative context of the property size	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 15 of the Land Plans [APP-006] shows the permanent acquisition of land in respect of plots 15/21a and 15/21c, and temporary acquisition of land in respect of plot 15/21b. Page 14 and 15 of the Land Plans also show the permanent acquisition of land in respect of plot 15/19a and the temporary acquisition of land in respect of plots 14/2a, 15/19b and 15/20a.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Applicant is seeking the permanent acquisition of land as shown pink at Plot No 15/21a on the Land Plans [APP-006]. This is required for the new earthworks associated with the proposed realignment of the B6341 side road. Similarly, the Applicant is seeking the permanent acquisition of land as shown pink at Plot No15/21c on the Land Plans [APP-006] which is required for the new earthworks associated with the proposed realignment of the existing A1 carriageway as part of the upgrade to dual carriageway. The earthworks are required as the proposed road level is higher than the existing roads being realigned and both plots are the minimum required to construct, operate, maintain and mitigate the Scheme. In addition, Plot 15/21b as shown green on the Land Plans [APP-006] is required for temporary access to facilitate the construction works set out above and represents the remainder of the field to the north of the property which is not being permanently acquired. As this is only required temporarily the land will be handed back to the landowner following completion of the Scheme.</li> <li>3. The Applicant is seeking the permanent acquisition of land at Plot 15/19a and the temporary acquisition of land in respect of plots 14/2a, 15/19b and 15/20a in connection with the realignment of the B6341 and verges. The landowners interest in these plots comprises the sub-soil rights out to half the width of the highway. The permanent acquisition of plot 15/19a is required for the re-alignment of the B6341.</li> </ol>
1.40.3	The land being taken is used for the grazing of livestock – it is the only field. There is concern about the housing of this stock within the grazing window	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property has not been identified and assessed as an agricultural land holding within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], as the Applicant was unaware that the parcel of land was being used for grazing livestock, although it is understood that the landowner keeps chickens on a small scale. A formal assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on this receptor as an agricultural assessment is being carried out and will be submitted at Deadline 2 in line with Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] of the ES.</li> <li>2. Plot 15/21b shown on Land Plans [APP-006] is proposed to be acquired for the temporary access to adjacent works. Plot 15/21a and Plot 15/21c are to be permanently acquired as part of the Scheme for the purposes set out in response to 1.40.2 above.</li> <li>3. If the landowner was temporarily unable to continue operating the business due to any localised construction works, a claim for compensation could be submitted, which may be able to account for any demonstrated losses incurred and which would need to be agreed with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.40.4	There is concern over the temporary land take of the balance of the grassland field at the property – as mentioned above this is required for livestock	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plot 15-21b shown on Land Plans [APP-006] is proposed to be acquired for the temporary access to adjacent works. The specific works to be supported by the temporary possession are the works to re-align the B6341 on the west side of the land parcel and the works to construct the northbound carriageway of the A1 on the east side of the parcel.</li> <li>2. If the field was temporarily unavailable due to any localised construction works, a claim for compensation could be submitted, which may be able to account for any demonstrated losses incurred and which would need to be agreed with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> <li>3. The property has not been identified and assessed as an agricultural land holding within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055], as the Applicant was unaware that the parcel of land was being used for grazing livestock, although it is understood that the landowner keeps chickens on a small scale. A formal assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on this receptor as an agricultural assessment is being carried out and will be submitted at Deadline 2 in line with Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] of the ES.</li> </ol>
1.40.5	Stock fencing and hedges adjacent to the existing A1 will be removed. The farm is currently heavily stocked with cattle and sheep. There are concerns over the quality of new fencing and the	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant is not aware that this property is heavily stocked with cattle and sheep.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	interim period during works where boundaries will be removed. There are also concerns over the future maintenance of these boundaries.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging Requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014], including the detailed design and specification in relation to fencing.</li> <li>3. The form of fencing will be in accordance with Requirement 13 contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [APP-014] which stipulates fencing should be constructed and installed in line with Volume 1, Series 0300 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works.</li> <li>4. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also confirms that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated on a like for like basis such that new stockproof fencing is provided to replace existing stockproof fencing where required.</li> <li>5. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES.</li> <li>6. Responsibilities for ongoing maintenance of any re-positioned boundary fence will be as per existing arrangements. Ongoing maintenance of accommodation works fencing will be the responsibility of the landowner.</li> </ol>
1.40.6	Drainage schemes have not been made available to demonstrate impacts and plans/procedures to make good the existing schemes post works.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The drainage strategy for the Scheme in this location is set out within section 4.3.4 in Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES. For the realigned section of the B6341 the proposed drainage would be the same as the existing arrangement that is over the edge drainage with infiltration to existing land.</li> <li>2. Further, highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1-year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). The runoff from the developed areas will be controlled at the detention features to ensure that the runoff rate to existing watercourses is no greater than the current Greenfield Runoff Rates. The detailed design and specification for the drainage of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014].</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that surface drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good.</li> </ol>
1.40.7	There are concerns over the ingress of weeds from HE contractors and from the highway verge. Currently the verge is infested with Ragwort and is never dealt with by HE.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A pre-commencement walkover survey will be undertaken to confirm the presence or absence of invasive non-native species (INNS). Should invasive species be recorded within the construction area, this will be addressed through implementation of the Biosecurity Method Statement, refer to S-B8 and S-B13 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. to be developed at detailed design.</li> <li>2. S-B13 confirms that the Method Statement will detail the extent and location of any invasive or biosecurity concerns and the measures to control or eradicate the species from an area, measures to prevent the spread of the species and good site hygiene practices such as Check, Clean Dry.</li> <li>3. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES. Item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The 3000 specification includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within acceptable levels, and it will be delivered as part of the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan as required in S-B19 of the Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		[APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.
1.40.8	There is concern over the disruption to the existing holiday cottage business being run from the property and loss of income as a result of the works	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on private and commercial property, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6.</li> <li>2. As outlined within Section 12.9 Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055] the Scheme would either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements to residential properties. During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to residential properties and private land holdings (particular measures are outlined within Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the CTMP [APP-347]). In the case of this property, access will remain from the B6341 and during construction provision of advanced warning to residents (as detailed within Table 6 of the CTMP [APP-347]) will be given to minimise disruption.</li> <li>3. Although this property has been assessed in terms of a private dwelling, a holiday cottage in this location was not identified within the Population and Human Health Assessment and no assessment was made of likely effects on a commercial property in this location. A formal assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on this receptor is being carried out and will be submitted at Deadline 2 in line with Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] of the ES. In the interim, a consideration of the potential for impacts is set out below.</li> <li>4. Based on the assessment on the impact of other commercial properties within the Order Limits there may be some temporary reduction in the amenity of users of the holiday cottage during the construction period due to the presence of the construction plant and construction works. As outlined within the Outline CEMP [APP-346], standard working hours would be from 7:00 am until 7:00 pm, Monday to Friday. However, extended hours including night time, weekend and Bank and Public Holiday working would be required for some construction operations and would be subject to approval in advance by NCC. It is not anticipated that any temporary reduction in amenity would be permanently detrimental to the business. However, if the business was temporarily unable operate due to any localised construction works, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached. There may also be the opportunity to let the property during construction of the Scheme to construction workers if that was acceptable to the property owner.</li> <li>5. Disruption to visual amenity has been addressed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 6, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect during construction, extending to the winter of Year 1, however, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising a linear belt of shrubs and trees, set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], the effect would reduce to moderate adverse (significant).</li> <li>6. Mitigation measures during construction are outlined within Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the CTMP [APP-347] and the Tables 3-1 and 3-3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> </ol>
1.40.9	There is concern over noise, dust and light pollution caused as a result of the works	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is approximately 7m from the Scheme and 6m from the boundary of construction activity.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> <li>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>6. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</li> </ol> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors of the ES [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 of the ES [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</li> <li>2. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> </ol> <p><u>Light Pollution</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As outlined in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the ES [APP-045], should task specific construction lighting be required, it is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect, including at this property. This would be achieved through appropriate mitigation measures, including working hours that avoid the need for unnecessary night-time lighting, directional lights to reduce light spill and switching lights off when not required, as set out in paragraphs 1.2.16, 1.2.23, and item SG-5 and SB-16 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. In addition, no operational lighting is proposed with the Scheme. As such, the assessment of night time effects was scoped out of the LVIA. Additional information relating to the potential effects is set out in 7.10.24 – 7.10-26 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual of the ES [APP-045]. In addition, the planting proposals as set out in Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] require that a continuous belt of planting would be provided between the property and the main carriageways. This planting would screen the Scheme for the occupants in views, reducing awareness of the Scheme beyond, which in turn will reduce the light pollution from passing vehicles.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.40.10	There is concern over the amount of land take which will impact on the running and profitability of the farm business	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relevant land parcels to this property are 14/2a, 15/19a, 15/19b, 15/20a and parcels 15/21a, 15/21b and 15/21c for the realignment work to the B6341 and boundary works to the western verge off the A1.</li> <li>2. The required temporary possession and use of land parcels associated with the residential property (Plot No. 14/2a, 15/19b, 15/21b and 15/20a) would result in a temporary, significant adverse effect. Mitigation measures included in the Outline CEMP [App-346] include the reinstatement of temporarily required land (Ref. S-PH10 and S-PH12).</li> <li>3. During operation of the scheme permanent land-take is required from the residential property (Plot Nos. 15/21a, 15/21c and 15/19a) which would result in a permanent, non-significant impact to the property.</li> <li>4. The property has not been identified and assessed as an agricultural land holding within Chapter 12, although it is understood that the landowner keeps chickens on a small scale. As stated in the response for 1.40.3 and 1.40.4, a formal assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on this receptor as an agricultural assessment is being carried out and will be submitted at Deadline 2 in line with Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055] of the ES. If the business was temporarily unable operate due to any localised construction works, a claim for compensation could be submitted, which may be able to account for any demonstrated losses incurred and which would need to be agreed with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant.</li> </ol>
1.40.11	There is concern over the visual impact of the over bridge from the residential property	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that the new bridge for the Charlton Mires junction would have a significant adverse effect on the visual amenity for this receptor, where views exist. The visual amenity has been addressed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 6, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect (significant) during construction, extending to the winter of Year 1, however, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising a linear belt of shrubs and trees to the north of the receptor that would reinforce the existing vegetation to the north of the property, set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014], the effect would reduce to moderate adverse (significant).</li> <li>2. This is set out at pp 4 to 5 at Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B of the ES [APP-287] pp 4-5). The residential property is to a large degree screened by trees that are immediately adjacent, limiting potential views of the new structure and junction. This would be reinforced by the creation of additional woodland, as set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144], which would reduce potential effects over time as the mitigation planting matures.</li> </ol>
1.40.12	The diversion of public footpaths through the farm is a concern – there has been very little information from HE in this respect	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing PRow ref 129/024 shown on Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] is outside the southern boundary of the landowners interests and will be stopped up. A new footway will be established adjacent to the re-profiled local highway, B6341. There are no diversions proposed through the property.</li> </ol>
1.40.13	There is concern over the reduction in value of the residual property as a result of the loss of amenity ground	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed acquisition of land at this property is set out at 1.40.2 to 1.40.4 above. Pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.40.14	There has been no consultation over the temporary use of the balance of the agricultural grass field. This is causing significant concern.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that there has been limited consultation on the temporary use of the grass field. Plot 15/21b shown on Land Plans [APP-006] is proposed to be acquired for the temporary access to adjacent works as set out in 1.40.2 above. Liaison as to this plot is ongoing with the landowner's</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		representative. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.
1.40.15	There is concern over the exact extent of land take immediately in front of the residential property – there are old stone walls which look as if they may be taken – this has not been made clear by HE	1. Land immediately in front of the residential property, Plots 15/19a, 15/19b, 15/20a and 14/2a are required for the improvement works on the B6341. This land is within the existing highway Boundary. It is not envisaged that the stone walls would be affected by the proposed works. Further, as set out within B-PH4(f) of the Outline CEMP [APP-346], any boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction will be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also confirms that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated on a like for like basis.
1.40.16	There is concern over public rights of way being adjusted and moved	1. The existing PRow ref 129/024 shown on Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] is outside the southern boundary of the landowners' interests and will be stopped up. A new footway will be established adjacent to the re-profiled local highway, B6341. There are no diversions proposed through the property.
1.40.17	There is concern over the speed of traffic moving in front of the property on the adjacent highway having just left the newly constructed off ramp	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the existing B6341 is being re-aligned from just south of the landowners property up to the Charlton Mires Junction. The existing junction between the B6341 and A1 will be stopped up as set out in the draft DCO [APP-014]. Vehicular speeds on the local road from traffic exiting the northbound A1 at Charlton Mires will be controlled to some extent by the proposed roundabout as the property is approximately 500m south of the roundabout.</li> <li>2. The Applicant acknowledges that vehicle speeds will likely be greater along the B6341 in front of the property concerned compared to the existing situation, due to the relocation of the junction with the A1. However, the realigned B6341 has been designed in accordance with the DMRB TD 9/93 and its visibility requirements. Vehicles travelling along the B6341 will have good visibility of any vehicles exiting the property concerned, and likewise, vehicles exiting the property concerned will have good visibility in both directions when joining the B6341. Therefore, the proposed road layout will still be safe despite the likely increase in vehicle speeds in front of the property.</li> <li>3. The preliminary design which has been undertaken to date was subject to a Stage 1 road safety audit in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (standard HD19/15) and no safety concerns were identified with regards to the B6341.</li> <li>4. The Applicant will undertake the detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design to discharge Requirement 3 of the dDCO [APP-014] including the detailed design of the re-alignment of the B6341. This will include undertaking a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit in accordance with the DMRB. In addition, a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit of the completed works will be undertaken prior to the new road becoming operational.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-41 - Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of William David Purvis – RR-044**

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.41.1	Mr Purvis is the owner of [] on the [] of the A1. From the farm is also run [] owned by Mr Purvis and operates a large number of HGV's from the site, including the site office and compound. The traffic movements from the farm are significant. We are concerned that the	1. This is a commercial and residential property, [REDACTED] located approximately 270 metres west of the A1. The Applicant proposes to permanently acquire the land in plots 15/9b, 15/10c, 15/10d, 15/10e, 15/11b and 15/15a for the realignment and resurfacing of the B6341 as well as the realignment and resurfacing of the access to the property. The Applicant also proposes to take temporary possession of

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>access to and from the property will be constrained and require confirmation that a suitable access to and from the public carriageway will be installed to enable safe passage for HGV's.</p> <p>we are concerned about the speed of traffic coming along the old A1 from Alnwick if the road is straightened out and the conflict with HGV's crossing over and taking access to []</p>	<p>the land in plots 15/9a, 15/10a, 15/10b and 15/11a to facilitate the works to the access. This is set out in the Book of Reference [APP-020], the Land Plans [APP-006], and the Statement of Reasons [APP-018]The Applicant acknowledges that there are a significant number of HGV and other vehicle movements into and out of the farm and that the re-alignment of the B6341 will lead to increased speeds in passing the entrance to the property.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. However, the proposed realignment of the B6341 and B6347 side roads leading to the new Charlton Mires junction have been designed for standard HGV movements. The access into [REDACTED] has been designed for the turning movements of HGV's. The realigned B6341 has been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges TD 9/93 Highway Link Design and in particular to the visibility requirements therein. As such, vehicles travelling along the B6341 will have good visibility of any vehicles exiting [REDACTED] and likewise, vehicles exiting [REDACTED] will have good visibility in both directions when joining the B6341.</li> <li>3. The preliminary design which has been undertaken to date was subject to a Stage 1 road safety audit in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (standard HD19/15) and no safety concerns were identified with regards to the B6341.</li> <li>4. The Applicant will undertake the detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design to discharge Requirement 3 of the dDCO [APP-014] including the detailed design of the re-alignment of the B6341 and the entrance into the property. This will include undertaking a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit in accordance with the DMRB. In addition, a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit of the completed works will be undertaken prior to the new road becoming operational.</li> </ol>
1.41.2	<p>We are concerned about the increase noise, dust and vibration from the additional carriageways and the busier road from Alnwick to South Charlton with the traffic taking a new access to the A1 at Charlton Mires.</p>	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property is located within the Part B construction and operational stage noise and vibration assessment study areas as defined within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043]. The property is approximately 155m from the Scheme and 145m from the boundary of construction activity.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise and vibration associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are presented within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] and Appendix 6.9 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part B [APP-284].</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> <li>4. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>5. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [App-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> <li>6. The Applicant has, within Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment considers the potential impacts of traffic taking a new access to the A1 at Charlton Mires. However, other than the short section between the existing access to the A1 at Charlton Mires and the new Charlton Mires Junction (which contributes less noise than the A1 to the overall level at this property), traffic data for the B6341 does not show this route to be busier as a result</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>of the Scheme. The noise assessment, concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted during the operational stage of the Scheme within the Part B study area, including at this property. Mitigation is therefore not required.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality and comprises the identification of a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors of the ES [APP-126], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part B of the ES [APP-041]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 of the ES [APP-041] with the application of the mitigation measures, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme at this property.</li> <li>2. An Outline CEMP [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the air quality mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> </ol>
1.41.3	We are concerned about the loss of agricultural land from the farm business.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant proposes to permanently acquire the land in plots 15/9b, 15/10c, 15/10d, 15/10e, 15/11b and 15/15a for the realignment and resurfacing of the B6341 as well as the realignment and resurfacing of the access to the property. The Applicant also proposes to take temporary possession of the land in plots 15/9a, 15/10a, 15/10b and 15/11a to facilitate the works to the access.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the likely effects on this land at [REDACTED].</li> <li>3. During construction it is predicted that there would be a loss of 0.52ha (of which 0.22ha would be permanent) of land with temporary disruption to the access of [REDACTED] during construction, which is the only access to the property from the B6347. Potential impacts to soil and land drains were also predicted, with some reduction in viability of the enterprise predicted (low magnitude).</li> <li>4. Permanent effects to the land holding were predicted as being a loss of 0.22ha of land resulting in a slight reduction in the viability of the enterprise. It is reported in Chapter 12 that a slight adverse effect (not significant) is predicted on the agricultural land holding for both construction and operation periods.</li> <li>5. The design of the Scheme has been developed to minimise land-take by reusing the current alignment of the B6341 wherever possible. As outlined in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required.</li> <li>6. Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached</li> </ol>
1.41.4	We are concerned about the lack of details surrounding field drainage. The farmland is already low lying and we have real concerns that the new carriageway will mean the flooding of the farmland. We will require proper field drainage to be installed and the	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has submitted a proposed drainage strategy for Part B which can be found at Appendix 10.4, Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314]. Section 4.3 of the strategy confirms that as the existing drainage on the B6341 comprises over the edge drainage with infiltration to existing land, the proposed drainage for the re-aligned section of the B6341 will also be over the edge drainage with infiltration to existing land. In general, the strategy proposes that the runoff from the new works on the</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	culvert under the A1 to be maintained by HE in the future to allow the passage of water to the east which is the natural flow.	<p>A1 will be collected and discharged to local watercourses so that the flow in watercourses will be no greater than the greenfield run off rates which will therefore not present an increased risk of flooding to the farm land. There are no plans to alter the existing culvert under the B6341 immediately to the north of the property which will maintain the water in a natural flow to the east. The Applicant confirms the existing culvert would continue to be maintained by NCC.</p> <p>2. Drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to the drains will be made good. This commitment is set out at REAC B-PH4.e in the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</p>
1.41.5	We are concerned about the lack of screening and loss of hedges that our client currently enjoys to protect the impact of the A1 on their property.	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that hedges along the B6347 between the property and the A1 would be lost due to the realignment of the B6347. The realigned B6347 would be on a slight embankment between [REDACTED] and the A1 which would provide a degree of immediate screening. The assessment of visual amenity has been addressed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], and specifically outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287], refer to Receptor 7, identified on Figure 7.2 Visual Receptors Plan Part B [APP-136]. The assessment identified that the occupants of the receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect (significant) during construction, extending to the winter of Year 1. However, upon the establishment of mitigation proposals comprising a block of woodland to the east of the receptor adjacent to the A1, and replacement of hedgerows along the B6347, to the south of the access point, as set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] and secured through Requirement 5 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014], the effect would reduce to moderate adverse (significant).</p>

Table 1-42 - Mark Hawes on behalf of residents of Northgate Farm – RR-045

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.42.1	As the homeowner of [], I am writing to highlight the detrimental impact that the A1 scheme will have on my family home and the local environment that we have enjoyed for over 25 years. As our family home sits adjacent to the A1 at the [] of the scheme, the plans directly impact upon the household in a number of different ways which includes compulsory procurement, loss of access rights, loss of key benefits and damage to the local environment. Although we are realistic in recognising that a project of this scale is inevitably going to have some negative impact, we have been disappointed by the scale and the detrimental nature of the planned changes. Our main frustrations stem from knowing that there are good cost-effective alternatives that do not have such a negative impact but still fulfil the end objectives of the scheme.	<p>1. The Applicant does not accept that the Scheme will have an unacceptable adverse effect on the Hawes's property. Furthermore, the "alternatives" to which Mr Hawes refers relate to detailed design matters that are premature in light of the stage of design that the Scheme has reached.</p> <p>2. The property is situated at the southern end of Part A at [REDACTED]. Plots 1/8a and 1/8b on Sheet 1 of Land Plans [APP-006] Permanent Acquisition of Rights Over Land would be used to create the shared private means of access to the property as the scheme will remove the direct access from the A1.</p> <p>3. It is not accepted that there will be a particularly detrimental impact on the property in question. Rather, in some ways this location will benefit as a result of the Scheme. As a local residence, Northgate Farm will be positively influenced by the immediate and longer term wider scheme benefits for those living in the area of the Scheme in fulfilling planning policy to improve journey time, capacity and resilience on this stretch of the A1. The specific beneficial impact for the residents of Northgate Farm is the significant safety benefit for access and egress to and from their property.</p> <p>4. The Applicant confirms that Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives [APP-038] presents a description of the reasonable alternatives that have been studied and indicates the main reasons for selecting the chosen option for Part A. However, it is understood that Mr Hawes's primary concern relates to the interventions to be carried out at and in the vicinity of the property. These have been discussed with Mr Hawes and account has been taken of his representations and discussions with him. It is considered that the solutions proposed are appropriate in the circumstances.</p> <p>5. Detailed responses as to the specific concerns detailed in the Relevant Representation are provided under 1.42.2-5, below.</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.42.2	<p>Having been actively involved in the consultation process from day one, we were optimistic that our early engagement would help shape the plans to mitigate the worse of the impact. Unfortunately, we have not been successful in this endeavour and in responding to this Examination stage there is a sense of frustration that the plans have been imposed upon us rather than with us. This frustration is further fuelled by our not understanding the reason behind some of the planning decisions. At the time of writing we are waiting on feedback to the PIER consultation submission in May 2020 and the Land Take submission made in July 2020. Both raised key concerns and highlighted specific shortcomings with the plans documented at the time. Although we have a number of specific concerns, too numerous to detail here, I thought it useful to share a couple of the simpler examples as illustration.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant does not accept that it has failed to mitigate impacts of the Scheme, or that there are shortcomings in the Scheme.</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms receipt of the PEIR consultation response (May 2020) to which the Applicant issued a holding response letter to the Hawes due to the nature of the queries. The queries raised were predominantly related to the detailed design of the scheme in the vicinity of [REDACTED], which would be addressed during the detailed design stage following the making of a DCO. Detailed design meetings are being arranged with the Hawes for January 2021 to discuss outstanding design queries, but these will be on a without prejudice basis as the finalised design is yet to be prepared.</li> </ol>
1.42.3	<p>In our last meeting with WSP on the 2nd August 2019 we were informed that the latest plans had been revised to include the provision for an operational depot and soil dump to be established directly west of the property. In addition to our concerns on dust, light and noise of a depot the plans included the construction of additional access roads, removal of a pathway and the felling of a large number of deciduous trees in a pleasant wooded area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As is plain from the Application as submitted, there is no proposal for an operational depot immediately west of Northgate Farm and the plans have not been revised. There is also no pathway at this location.</li> <li>2. The DCO application includes to the west of the existing A1, at Northgate House, a proposed temporary soil storage area which has been assessed as part of the ES. Refer to paragraphs 2.8.38 to 2.8.40 of Chapter 2: The Scheme of the ES [APP-037] and Figure 2.5 Temporary Construction Works Part A [APP-070]. The temporary soil storage area is not a soil dump and will be subject to appropriate careful establishment and management. It is a relatively low-impact temporary land use, consisting of the establishment of the storage area, the delivery of soil for storage, its treatment to ensure it is properly stored including grassing the mound and then its removal when required. It is not expected that the storage area would be used every day or even frequently. It is an activity more in common with agricultural than engineering activity.</li> <li>3. A summary of the assessment of the proposed temporary soil storage area, which was assessed as part of the ES, is provided below: <u>Noise and Vibration</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has, in Section 6.8 Potential Impacts of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], and Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331] predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the construction of the Scheme. Construction mitigation measures are set out within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] and Appendix 6.8 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part A [APP-213].</li> <li>2. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346] has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>3. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> <li>4. The Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [APP-343] concludes that none of the statutory nuisances identified in Section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection 1990 Act are predicted to arise as a result of the Scheme.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>5. The operational noise impacts of the Scheme on Northgate Farm are discussed in greater detail below in Response 1.42.5.6.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>1. The assessment of likely effects from construction dust has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Environmental Assessment Techniques Part 1 HA207/07 Air Quality and comprises the identification of: a) potentially affected receptors within 200m of potential works, including this property; and b) appropriate mitigation measures to prevent significant effects at these receptors. The potentially affected receptors are set out in Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors Part A [APP-078], and the mitigation measures in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040]. The mitigation measures cover all aspects of site management, planning, and activities, and construction traffic relevant to the control of dust from construction works. As set out in paragraph 5.10.1, Section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality Part A [APP-040] with the application of the mitigation measures (see references S-A1 to S-A4 in Table 1-3: Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]), no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p><u>Light Pollution</u></p> <p>1. There is no proposal to provide illumination at the soil storage area. As outlined in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A of the ES [APP-045], construction lighting is not anticipated to give rise to a significant effect at the property. This would be achieved through appropriate mitigation measures, including working hours that avoid the need for unnecessary night-time lighting, directional lights to reduce light spill and switching lights off when not required, as set out in paragraphs 1.2.16, 1.2.23, and item SG-5 and SB-16 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. In addition, no new operational lighting is proposed with the Scheme and the assessment of night-time effects has concluded that there would be no significant effects. The assessment of potential night-time effects is set out in 7.10.49 – 7.10.57 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A of the ES [APP-044].</p> <p><u>Woodland</u></p> <p>1. No woodland is required to be removed to accommodate the proposed temporary soil storage area itself. However, several mature trees would be removed at the boundary of North Gate House to provide access.</p> <p>2. With regard to the removal of deciduous trees, it is necessary to remove some trees to the west of the property. However, as indicated on Figure 7.9 Vegetation Clearance Plans Part A [APP-096] the Applicant has sought to retain woodland in the foreground of the view from the property and when viewed from the east.</p> <p>3. A relatively small number of trees on the north east corner of the plot is required to screen the proposed access road. The Applicant has within the assessment of visual effects in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044] and in Appendix 7. 3 Residential Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-218] concluded that the effects would not be significant following construction (refer to 1.42.54 below).</p>
1.42.4	When we asked why the depot was being placed near a cluster of houses and not further up the road at one of the over passes in the scheme there was no explanation available. Similarly, in June 2020 we received our first indication of the compulsory Land Take required to complete the works which prompted us to highlight 24	<p>1. No depot is proposed in the vicinity of the Hawes's property, which has verbally been clarified to the landowner. The temporary soil storage area is located to the north of Northgate House, on the western side of the A1 as indicated by plot 1/4a on sheet 1 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. The applicant will take temporary possession of this land, the location of which fits with the overall earthwork strategy for managing materials at the southern extent of the Scheme.</p>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	different concerns in writing. If our interpretation is correct then the scale of the compulsory purchase and the level of incursion is far greater than we were led to believe in previous consultations and will undoubtedly have a further negative impact on the property and its integrity.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant can confirm that there is no proposal for any operational depot immediately west of Northgate Farm and the land sought to be acquired in respect of the storage area has not changed from those presented in June 2018 and subsequently presented in May 2020 as part of the statutory consultation on the combined Scheme.</li> <li>The soil storage area will not result in increased compulsory acquisition (its location has been constant since June 2018), will not result in incursions onto the Hawes's property, which is on the opposite side of the A1, will not increase negative impacts and will not affect the integrity of the Hawes's property. All of this is readily apparent from a reading of the application documents.</li> </ol>
1.42.5.1	<p>Other planning decisions which we do not understand but which have a better alternative, include:</p> <p>The placement of a layby close to the property.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nearest layby to the property is the layby located approximately 200 m north of the property on the northbound carriageway, which is the carriageway furthest from the properties. The location and maximum spacing of laybys on the new trunk road has been determined using the relevant DMRB design standard which is td 69. The Location of Laybys and Rest Areas. Two existing bus stop laybys close to the Property are proposed to be removed as part of the Scheme.</li> <li>As such, although it is correct that a layby is formed, and although it is not accepted that a layby would be detrimental to the Hawes's property in any way, there is a net reduction in layby provision in the vicinity of the property.</li> </ol>
1.42.5.2	The plans include unnecessary public purse spend to construct a tarmac road to the local woods when only farm access is required.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's proposal comprised in Work No. 5B is for an access to the residential properties at Northgate Farm and Capri Lodge and the adjacent agricultural/forestry land to be constructed using bound material rather than with tarmac. This access will be terminated in plot 1/9b on sheet 1 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. From this point and along plot 1/6c (also on sheet 1) the proposed Work No. 5D track will be a field access track specification of compacted stone.</li> </ol>
1.42.5.3	The position of the new entrance to our property is less than optimal and creates a number of problems and constraints.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing access from the property onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety following completion of the Scheme.</li> <li>A replacement private means of access road (Work No. 5B ) will be constructed to gain access to the property via West View as shown on Sheet 1 of the General Arrangement Plans [APP-008]. The provision of the PMA will represent an improvement over the existing "left in/left out" access to the Hawes's property, providing a safer access with enhanced amenity. The Applicant has through consultation amended the configuration of the residential access via West View to minimise the impact to [REDACTED] properties via plots 1/6a, 1/6c, 1/7a, 1/8a, 1/8b, 1/9a and 1/9b, as set out in the Land Plans [APP-006]. The previous configuration was for the access road to be provided through the courtyard immediately to the east of the [REDACTED] properties. The road providing access to the south of the properties was also amended to avoid the demolition of a garage. Mr Hawes does not specify the reasons why the new, safer access is "less than optimal" or the "problems and constraints".</li> </ol>
1.42.5.4	The plans have an unnecessary negative impact on the local woodland when other options are available.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Scheme does not have an unnecessary negative impact on woodland in the vicinity of the Hawes's property (See item 1.42.5. above or in general). The Scheme is a nationally significant infrastructure project and is part of the UK Government's Roads Investment Strategy.</li> <li>As part of the Scheme design to date, consideration has been given to the avoidance of woodland removal to reduce the effect of the Scheme, including in the vicinity of the property.</li> <li>The Applicant confirms that the current design includes some vegetation removal at the north east corner of the property in relation to the private means of access road from West View to Capri Lodge and Northgate Farm. This is shown on the Vegetation Clearance Plans [APP-013]. Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] indicates where woodland and replacement trees would be provided.</li> <li>The Applicant confirms that the current proposed alignment of the private means of access road sits centrally between the Order limits either side of the road and that within the Order limits there is some flexibility to enable an alignment of the track to be agreed with the Hawes to further reduce negative</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>impacts to existing trees. S-B10 of the Outline CEMP [APP346] commits the Applicant to minimising vegetation clearance and tree felling, particularly within temporary works, which will be identified within a works plan and agreed with the Environmental Clerk of Works (ECoW).</p>
1.42.5.5	The decision to build two separate access roads to serve a cluster of houses.	<p>1. The Applicant's proposal comprised in Work No. 5B is for an access to the residential properties at Northgate Farm and Capri Lodge. Work No. 5C spurs off to permit access for the residents of [REDACTED], Warreners Barns and Warreners Cottages via the existing courtyard.</p> <p>2. The Property owner requested that the Applicant explore a proposed option to allow the purchase of Northgate Farm, with a view to demolishing part of the property to make way for a track through the Warreners Cottages area. The Applicant undertook a review of the proposed option and identified the following impacts:</p> <p>Stakeholder:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant discussed the proposed alternative access arrangements with the surrounding property owners who would be impacted by the demolition of Northgate Farm and construction of a new access road. Feedback from the Warreners residents included:</li> <li>2. Concern expressed regarding how the alternative proposal will likely impact the quality of life for residents and their properties. It was suggested this would be much greater than that of the original proposal.</li> <li>3. Concern expressed over the likely Health and Safety implications of having the Warreners cul-de-sac become a Permanent Means of Access (PMA). Specific concerns were raised about moving vehicles (e.g. dustbin lorries, delivery trucks), security and air quality.</li> <li>4. This option would involve additional land to be purchased from third parties, easements over third party land and would be difficult to establish a compelling case in the public interest for doing so.</li> </ol> <p>Environmental Impact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No specific environmental impact assessments have been undertaken for the alternative proposal, however a review of the Environmental Statement undertaken for the scheme, indicated the following likely impacts of the option proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt: The alternative proposal is likely to result in less Greenbelt land take since the PMA will be through the Warreners' existing cul-de-sac and the current Northcote Farm as opposed to a 4.8m track through existing farm land.</li> <li>• Location: Constructing the PMA through the Warreners cul-de-sac would mean residents having roads on both sides of the properties with the access road in close proximity to their front doors.</li> <li>• Health, Safety &amp; Wellbeing: All residents expressed a preference for the cul-de-sac courtyard they have now. The cul-de-sac is perceived as being considerably safer than having a PMA access road which would mean vehicles moving through the area.</li> <li>• Landscape: There will be a permanent change to the views of all residents due to the part demolition of Northgate Farm which will impact the existing character.</li> <li>• Amenity: Since the alternative proposal will result in a single access track for all the properties in on the site, more vehicles would be going past the Warreners' dwellings</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The Property owner also put forward an additional proposal which would require the Applicant to purchase Northgate Farm and a second nearby property (Capri Lodge), thereby removing the need for the easterly track and the track to the northern tree belt. This option was assessed and concluded not to be viable given: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Property owner of Capri Lodge is happy with the current access track proposal the scheme has designed.</li> <li>• Following construction of the scheme, the Applicant would be required to dispose of the properties by placing them on the open market for sale, in accordance with HM Treasury Managing Public Money</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		<p>Guidance. The challenge is that Capri Lodge would have no suitable residential access and the only access would be via the adjoining landowner's agricultural access. These arrangements would mean there is a considerable risk that the Applicant may not achieve an open market valuation and could be left with an unsaleable asset with considerable liabilities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. After considering the alternative options put forward by the Property owner, the Applicant is progressing with the proposed design that has been submitted within this Application which is to close direct vehicular access and replace with a new 4.8 m wide access track. The intention is users will follow the existing arrangements for the residents of West View, accessing the A1 at St Leonards Junction via Morpeth Bypass. The proposed access track would also connect with Northgate Farm and Capri Lodge and extend further north to allow field access.</li> <li>4. The decision is to proceed with the current DCO Scheme proposals, which do not include the purchase and demolition of Northgate Farm.</li> </ol>
1.42.5.6	The plans only include provision for a short sound barrier leaving large parts of the property exposed to the new dual carriageway.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The noise barrier proposed in this location is designed to reduce road traffic noise levels resulting from the Scheme at properties in the area of Northgate Farm in line with national noise policy (see paragraph 2 below for further details of proposed mitigation). It is predicted by detailed expert assessment to achieve this objective. A longer barrier was considered at this location, but was found to be less effective overall compared to the shorter barrier, as described below.</li> <li>2. Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A of the ES [APP-042] presents the rationale for the inclusion of a 70m long noise barrier, proposed noise barrier (PNB) 1, alongside the A1 carriageway at Northgate Farm. The purpose of this barrier is to reduce the noise levels predicted to affect the nearby properties as a result of the Scheme. Paragraph 6.9.33 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A of the ES [APP-042] explains:</li> <li>3. <i>"This noise barrier would reduce noise levels at these properties. Properties in this area are orientated such that this short section of noise barrier is anticipated to provide meaningful benefits to residents (i.e. the change in noise is likely to be perceived by residents). The predicted noise level reduction resulting from the barrier ranges from 1-4 dB for the four properties. The proposed barrier is also predicted to be value for money, and therefore sustainable in accordance with the NPSE (Ref. 6.10) [Noise Policy Statement for England, 2010]. It is understood that in this location, further investigation is required to determine whether there is space for the required foundations for this barrier."</i></li> <li>4. A longer noise barrier was considered but the proposed 70m long barrier was determined to be the best option in terms of providing both a meaningful benefit and value for money (therefore making the barrier sustainable as required by the NPSE). For a barrier to be considered sustainable in line with the aims of the NPSE the Scheme has adopted the requirement that the 'value for money' score should be 1 or greater based on a comparison of the monetised acoustic benefits of a barrier and the cost of installing that barrier. Further details are provided in paragraph 6.9.29 of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042].</li> <li>5. Without the noise barrier in this location, as discussed in paragraph 1.6.21 of Appendix 16.5 Noise and Vibration Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331], Northgate Farm is predicted to experience a significant adverse operational noise effect following the updated Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 Noise and Vibration guidance. If the barrier cannot be built Northgate Farm would experience a significant adverse residual operational noise effect. However, if the barrier can be built, it would provide sufficient mitigation so that the effect at Northgate Farm would be not significant.</li> </ol>
1.42.5.7	Removal of the pathway running alongside the A1.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The pathway referred to by the landowner (footway along the eastern side of the A1 from Strafford House to the southern extent of the Scheme at the tie in to the existing dual carriageway) is not being removed and it is proposed to be retained as shown on Sheet 1 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009].</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.42.5.8	In summary, we believe that there are specific elements of the current plans that are not optimum and that there are cost effective alternatives available which would mitigate the impact upon the property and the environment while still meeting the scheme objectives.	1. The specific points raised by the landowner have been addressed in the responses to points 1.42.1-5 above. The Applicant will continue to engage with Mr Hawes to address the concerns raised.

Table 1-43 - Robert Thompson – RR-046

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.43.1	<p>The below provides a brief outline of the various concerns and objections relating to the above application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>There is concern over the general disruption of the business as a result of the scheme</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Thompson has a tenancy agreement on land at Broxfield Farm which forms part of the Northumberland Estate. Broxfield Farm is located 860 metres east of the A1, north of Denwick.</li> <li>The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Tables 12-50 and 12-51 outline the likely effects on this land. The Applicant proposes to permanently acquire the land in plots 12/3l, 12/3e, 12/3r, 12/3v, 12/3w, 12/3z, 12/3dd, 13/1l and 13/1o. The Applicant proposes to acquire permanent rights over the land in plots 12-3b, 12-3d, 12-3k, 12/3n, 12-3s, 12/3t, 12-3x, 12-3y, 13-1f, 13-1k, 12/3aa, 12/3bb, 12-3hh, 12-3ii, 13/1p. The Applicant proposes to take temporary possession of the land in plots 12-3f, 12-3g, 12-3i and 12-3j as shown by the Land Plans [APP-066].</li> <li>During construction it is predicted that there would be a loss of 12.43ha of land (of which 6.04ha would be permanent) with a resulting temporary disruption to the access to the property, with one access from the A1 to be closed. However, access to the relevant land will remain possible from the east, via the unnamed track. Potential direct impact to soil (resulting in impacts such as compaction) and land drains were also predicted, with some reduction in viability of the enterprise predicted (low magnitude). As stated in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health land and surface drainage affected by the construction works would be reinstated and land restored to a functional state. Any damage to the land or surface drains would be made good. As detailed within the Outline CEMP [APP-346] (reference S-GS6), measures to the correct specification as to soil stripping, storage and replacement are outlined in the CEMP. Additionally, as detailed within the outline CEMP (reference S-GS15) following reinstatement of the temporary land take, there will be a programme of monitoring of soil conditions to identify if there are soil problems which need to be remediated.</li> <li>Permanent effects to this land holding are predicted as being a loss of 6.04ha of land and the closure of one access to the A1, as referred to above. This results in a slight reduction in the viability of the enterprise due to land loss and severance.</li> <li>The design of the Scheme has been developed to minimise land-take. As outlined in Section 12.9 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], any temporarily required land would be reinstated to its original condition following the completion of construction and appropriate access to the affected fields would be provided where required. Any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction would be reinstated to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. Mitigation measures to be implemented during construction are set out within the Tables 3.1 and 3.3 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346].</li> <li>Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>



Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
		7. Detailed responses as to the other possible forms of disruption detailed in the Relevant Representation are provided under 1.43.2-11, below.
1.43.2	'2.2 Land Plans' released show on pages 18, 13, 12 & 11 a permanent acquisition of rights over land on farm access tracks. These are deemed unnecessary for the scheme. These seem to be in place to access a retention pond at Goldenmoor Farm which is now to be accessed via the adjacent highway making these rights of access unnecessary.	<p>1. The detention basin DB22 will be accessed via a track from the adjacent highway via plots 11/1d &amp; 11/1i, which are to be permanently acquired. Plots 11/1d &amp; 11/1i do not form part of the property which is the subject of this Relevant Representation. The Applicant confirms that there are no other plots providing access rights to detention basin DB22.</p> <p>2. The following plots, shown in blue on pages 18, 13, 12 &amp; 11 of the Land Plans [APP-006] constitute existing farm access tracks and are subject to the permanent acquisition of rights: 11/1a, 12/3b, 12/3c, 12/3d, 12/3t, 12/3n, 12/3k, 12/3a, 12/1a, 12/2a, 12/2a, 13/1c, 13/1b, 13/1a, 13/1f, 13/1p.</p> <p>Of these plots:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. permanent rights over plot 13/1p and part of plot 12/3cc are required to accommodate a Byway Open to All Traffic Public Right of Way traffic over Heckley Fence Overbridge.</li> <li>2. The following plots are required for statutory undertaker easements for the extra high voltage wind farm cable: 11/1h, 12/3bb, 12/3cc (part), 12/3dd, 12/3ee, 12/3ff, 12/3gg, 12/3hh, 12/3ii, 12/3s (part), 12/3x, 12/3y (part), 18/1a, 18/2a, 18/2b, 18/3a and 18/3b.</li> </ol>
1.43.3	Drainage schemes have not been made available to demonstrate impacts and plans/procedures to make good the existing schemes post works.	1. The Applicant has set out within section 4.3 and Drainage Strategy Layout Sheets 1 and 2 of 7 in Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES the preliminary design of the drainage for the Scheme –and confirms that highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1-year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). The detailed design and specification for the drainage of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014]. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that surface drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good.
1.43.3	- Stock fencing and hedges adjacent to the existing A1 will be removed. The farm is currently heavily stocked with cattle. There are concerns over the quality of new fencing and the interim period during works where boundaries will be removed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The detailed design and specification for all aspects of the Scheme design will be undertaken in discharging Requirement 3 contained in Schedule 2 to the dDCO [APP-014], including the detailed design and specification in relation to fencing.</li> <li>2. The form of fencing will be in accordance with Requirement 13 contained in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [APP-014] which stipulates fencing should be constructed and installed in line with Volume 1, Series 0300 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works.</li> <li>3. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This will commit to the reinstatement of any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences and walls affected during construction to maintain the boundary and restore landscape and ecology features. B-PH4(f) also states that farm boundaries will generally be reinstated like for like.</li> <li>4. Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in Section 5.2 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES.</li> </ol>
1.43.4	The condition of access tracks through the farm are likely to be damaged and rutted as a result of the access rights which are being taken through the farm.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. S-PH1(a) in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] commits the Applicant to either retain the existing standard or improve access tracks through the farm.</li> <li>2. S-PH10 in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] commits the Applicant to maintaining all existing access wherever possible or creating new temporary tracks or access points.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.43.5	Part of the permanent land take includes part of a farm building and the farm steading, which is in no way linked to the road scheme and deemed unnecessary.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant is not aware of any plot granting permanent acquisition of land in relation to this property which requires the demolition of a farm building or encroaches on a farm.</li> </ol>
1.43.6	Part of the permanent acquisition of rights over land, marked 12/3dd is in the middle of an arable field and will cause a significant ongoing crop loss issue going forward	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plot 12/3dd on Sheet 12 of Lands Plans [APP-006] is located on the boundary of an existing field. Plot 12/3dd is required for potential access rights to the high voltage cable if the cable is to be located in private land. If Parameter 3, as set out in ES Chapter 2 [APP-037] is selected, then the utility will be within the highway boundary and no easements over third party land will be required. Access over Plot 12/3dd would only be required on a very infrequent basis if maintenance work were required to the cable requiring access to be taken over this plot.</li> <li>The Applicant has, within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B of the ES [APP-055], provided an assessment of the likely effects of the Scheme on agricultural land holdings, undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. Table 12-50 outlines the temporary effects on this land, including in relation to plot 12/3dd. This includes a temporary loss of 6.39ha of land, which was predicted to result in a slight reduction to the viability of the enterprise. It was assumed for the purposes of the assessment that the affected land parcel would be able to be farmed following the completion of construction. However, should access be required for maintenance purposes of the utility, resulting in crop loss, then a claim for compensation could be made to the Applicant for associated financial losses.</li> </ol>
1.43.7	Part of the permanent acquisition of rights over land, marked 11/1h is in the middle of an arable field and will cause a significant ongoing crop loss issue going forward	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plot 11/1h on Sheet 11 of Lands Plans [APP-006] is required for potential access rights to the high voltage underground cable if the cable is located in private land. If Parameter 3, as set out in ES Chapter 2 [APP-037] is taken up, then the utility will be within the highway boundary and no easements over third party land will be required.</li> <li>The Applicant acknowledges that plot 11/1h goes through the middle of a field however the plot only provides for access rights in the unlikely event that access is required to the underground cable. Given that access to the cable is likely to be very infrequent the Applicant does not accept that there will be an ongoing crop loss issue.</li> <li>Additionally, pursuant to the Compensation Code, compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land would be temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>
1.43.8	The parcel marked as 12/3w on plan 12 shows the permanent acquisition coming within meters of a stream running through the field, which all but severs the southern part of the parcel, particularly given that the field often lies wet meaning that that thin area of land will be poached and damaged significantly by livestock by more concentrated footfall.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plot 12/3w on Lands Plans [APP-006] is required for the widening of the A1, creation of the verge and statutory undertaker corridor with mitigation planting and boundary hedgerow and fence. The Applicant acknowledges that the acquisition of Plot 12/3w will reduce the remaining width between the field boundary and Denwick Burn.</li> <li>The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will further develop Action B-PH4(e), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This confirms that drainage affected by the construction works will be reinstated and any damage to drains will be made good.</li> <li>For any areas of retained land affected or severed by the Scheme where mitigation measures are not possible or unsuitable compensation could be sought by the relevant parties whose land was temporarily and permanently acquired or severed to accommodate the Scheme. This would be by agreement with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant or reference to the Upper Tribunal should agreement not be reached.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.43.9	There is concern over likely damage to soil structure and land as a result of temporary land take for working areas such as 13/1q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The temporary acquisition of plot 13/1q is required for the construction of the Heckley Fence Overbridge. As confirmed in Appendix 11.5 Soils and Agricultural Land Quality Report Part B [APP-321] this area has been classified as Subgrade 3a (good quality) and Subgrade 3b (moderate quality). The Applicant can confirm that the potential for a reduction in agricultural soil quality is recognised within Chapter 11: Geology and Soils Part B of the ES [APP-053], Section 11.8. As set out at paragraph 11.9.13 of Chapter 11, the Applicant has identified that a soil handling strategy will be produced to limit the likely damage caused in areas of temporary land take. The requirement for a soil handling strategy to minimise damage to soil structure and land within areas of temporary land take is included at Actions S-GS5 and S-GS6 of the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments within the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. The soil handling strategy would be designed in accordance with key guidance documents (including Defra (2009) Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Construction Sites and Defra (2000) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils) and would include as a minimum the requirement to strip, separate and appropriately store topsoil and subsoil from areas of temporary land take, the use of appropriate machinery and the return of topsoil and subsoil to its original source area as far as practicable.</li> </ol>
1.43.10	Broxfield Farm is organic and there is concern over contractors and HE vehicles bringing harmful injurious weeds and diseases to the farm which can not then be contained/killed with chemicals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A pre-commencement walkover survey will be undertaken to confirm the presence or absence of invasive non-native species (INNS). Should invasive species be recorded within the construction area, this will be addressed through implementation of the Biosecurity Method Statement, refer to S-B8 and S-B13 of the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. to be developed at detailed design. S-B13 confirms that the Method Statement will detail the extent and location of any invasive or biosecurity concerns and the measures to control or eradicate the species from an area, measures to prevent the spread of the species and good site hygiene practices such as Check, Clean Dry.</li> <li>Ongoing maintenance of the Applicant's assets is set out in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] and Section 2.9 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037] of the ES. Item S-L11 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346] requires the preparation of a Series 3000 specification in line with the Manual Contract for Highways Works. The 3000 specification includes, under clause 3002.1, the requirement to control injurious weeds within acceptable levels, and it will be delivered as part of the Scheme. Additionally, there is a further requirement under the same item to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Scheme to cover a period of 5 years. The Outline CEMP [APP-346] will be developed following the end of the establishment period into a Handover Environmental Management Plan as required in S-B19 of the Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, in the Outline CEMP [APP-346]. This HEMP will detail monitoring and management, including future maintenance arrangements, that must be adhered to throughout the future operation of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
1.43.11	An increased number of walkers and users of public rights of way will be able to move across the farm in a more concentrated manor as a result of the changes and diversions being made. There is concern over increased public liability risk being created as a result of walkers moving through cattle at an increased rate.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms that while a new Byway will be created to provide access to the Heckley Fence Overbridge other PRoW including 129/013 and 129/014 will be stopped up as will Byway 129/022 as shown on sheet 12 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009]. The Applicant considers that given that the overall length of PRoW/ Byway within the property will be reduced with the Scheme the public liability risk will therefore not be increased significantly.</li> </ol>

Table 1-44 - Scott Clarehugh – RR-047

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
1.44.1	I welcome and support the applicants request to the secretary of state for a DCO to progress with the design and planning of the	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant notes this response and welcomes the respondent's support of the Application.</li> </ol>

Reference	Comment from Relevant Representation	Applicant's Response
	<p>proposed highway improvements. The A1 in Northumberland greatly needs widening to accommodate the increasing volume of traffic using the road. The scheme will reduce travel time by use of slip roads and roundabouts giving better access to the highway. Road safety will also be greatly improved. The current road suffers from long delays and sadly there are still many RTA's causing loss of life. My property is directly affected by the road expansion as it is land adjoining the current highway. I am satisfied with the information provided and previous consultation work carried out by the developer. I fully support this DCO application.</p>	

© Crown copyright 2020.

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

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/)

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

**Kew, London TW9 4DU**, or email

[psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This document is also available on our website at [www.gov.uk/highways](http://www.gov.uk/highways)

If you have any enquiries about this document  
[A1inNorthumberland@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:A1inNorthumberland@highwaysengland.co.uk)

or call **0300 470 4580\***.