

<p>Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 6.7 Appendix 2.1 Lighting Assessment - Rev 1 (REP1-011)</p>	<p>Noted the reasoning behind not introducing lighting throughout the route. Notwithstanding any future reconsideration that there may yet be on safety grounds, this decision is welcomed from the point of view of emerging Local Plan Policy ENV 4 regarding the maintenance of dark skies in open countryside areas, especially within the zone of influence of the Dark Sky Park and the AONBs. Should there be any reconsideration of the lighting issue, any lighting introduced should follow lighting design guidance referred to in Policy ENV 4.</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 6.22 Noise Addendum - Rev 0 (REP1-019)</p>	<p>In Table 1-4 – Local Planning Policy Relevant to Noise, the relevant Local Plan and Core Strategy policies seem to be satisfactorily addressed.</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 6.22.1 Noise Addendum Appendix A, B and C - Rev 0 (REP1-020)</p>	<p>Noted that Local Plan and Core Strategy policies that deal with noise are addressed</p>
<p>Highways England- Deadline 1 submission – 7.3 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan - Rev 0 (REP1-023)</p>	<p>The Deadline 1 Outline CEMP has the same revision version as the Application version. Each revised version of the Outline CEMP should be provided with a unique revision number in order to support the request made by the ExA in ExQ1 DCO.1.2</p> <p>Table 3-1 S-L4 Landscape mitigation plans for Part B feature extensive stretches of ‘LE 2.4 Linear Belts of Shrubs and Trees’ and ‘LE 4.4 Native Hedgerows with Trees’. All plant stock cannot be a combination of whips and transplants as stated</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>here given that LE 4.4 description in DMRB indicates inclusion of ‘standard trees’ which is necessary so that the intended trees can be distinguished during establishment and maintenance from the intended hedgerow.</p> <p>Table 3-3 B-L2 Refers to a hedgerow that will be retained and replaced. Applicant to confirm which outcome is intended. The scale of drawing provided in Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of the ES [APP-144] not sufficiently detailed to illustrate the intention here</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.6A Statement of Common Ground with Northumberland County Council - Rev 0 (REP1-028)</p>	<p>We consider the record of correspondence and meetings included in this document to be useful background information which informs the route to agreeing matters, however we question whether it should be included in the SoCG in this form.</p> <p>This version of the document has been submitted without any baseline agreement with us and doesn’t appear to include all meetings that we have a record of.</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)</p>	<p>GEN1.8 We consider that the introduction of a footway/cycleway along the full length of the de-trunked A1 within Part A of the scheme is a key part of the scheme to provide connectivity for non-motorised users who are not well catered for both in the existing situation and in the scheme proposals. The provision of such facilities accords with the Department for Transport’s push for active travel provision. We will actively engage with the applicant in respect to Designated Funds applications, however such discussions in relation to the use of these funds was first made in a Working Group meeting on 11th April 2018 and we have seen no evidence of progress in relation to this nor is reference made to these discussions in the meetings log within the first draft of the Statement of Common Ground. Further</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	comments on this are provided in our response to the submitted document REP1-064 (Deadline 1 Submission – 7.9 Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations Rev 0.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	GEN1.31 We would concur with the Examining Authority’s remarks on the planning balance and do not feel that the applicant's response fully responds to the question asked.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	GEN1.34 We can confirm that our comments regarding the development plan status of the land in the Lionheart area (as explained in the Local Impact Report) remain unchanged.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	BIO1.4 It should be noted that weight is given to the preservation of irreplaceable habitats as part of emerging Policy ENV 1, rather than ENV 2. The quoted policies are from the emerging Local Plan. As they are the subject of unresolved objections at the ongoing Examination, they will not yet carry full weight and are likely to be subject to some modification.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	CE1.3 There seems to be some confusion regarding the relevant local plan documents. No mention is made of the Alnwick Core Strategy, published in 2007, which is the main strategic DPD for that area. It contains many references to climate change. The emerging Northumberland Local Plan has Policy STP 4 on climate change.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8	DCO1.40 Our view in relation to the response to some areas of this question differs to

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	that of the applicant when comparing responses to this question.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	LV1.12 and LV1.22 The reliance on the older definitions from DMRB is problematic as the documents referenced are no longer readily available, and the new definitions in LD.117 contain no more information than the brief descriptions provided on the Landscape Mitigation Masterplans. These brief descriptions are inadequate to ensure satisfactory mitigation and implementation. If the Applicant wishes to continue to rely on the withdrawn descriptions they should be provided as part of the application documentation so that they are available in order to ascertain suitability to achieve adequate mitigation, and to support the implementation stage. Discussions with the applicant are ongoing on this matter.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	LV1.27 The Council can confirm that Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Local Plan Policy F3 which included the Kyloe Hills and Glendale AHLV (Area of High Landscape Value) and Policy F4 which defined the Intermediate Areas of Landscape Value (IALV) and Alnwick District Policy RE17 that defined an AHLV are 'saved' development plan policies, although any AHLVs that were defined prior to the introduction of the character-based approach, carry little weight in their own right. Reference should be made to the Alnwick Landscape Character SPD and the Northumberland LCA.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	TT1.20 We note the response to the questions from the applicant. On the basis of the Preferred Route Announcement scheme NCC have no concerns over the access to and from the A1 from the current Causey Park junction with vehicles to and from the Widdrington Road approach being able to use the de-trunked and new local road connections to the dualled A1 without any

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	significant diversion over the current access as both the West Moor and Fenrother junctions are all-direction grade separated junctions.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	<p>TT1.21</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity assessment noted. 2. The current position in relation to National Speed Limit within the SoCG is noted and discussions are ongoing as outlined in that document (which was not seen by us prior to Deadline 1). 3. Response noted especially in regard to the clarification in respect to the bus far zone boundary north of Charlton Mires rather than these being bus stops.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	<p>TT1.22</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We note the assessments made using the derived peak hour flow data 2. Whilst noting the assessment of junctions on the A1 and the findings made, we have asked for wider traffic flow information to be provided in order to determine whether any impacts need to be assessed away from the A1 corridor due to reassignment of traffic. Following this issue being raised in meetings held with applicant since the submission of the DCO a discussion was held with the modelling team on 21st January 2021 and we await this information for review and potentially additional assessment. 3. The applicant’s position is noted but modelling may be required should the issue in respect to the de-trunked section be resolved/agreed.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)	<p>TT1.23</p> <p>In the applicant’s response, we do not understand why “West View” is in bold type. Notwithstanding this we are in discussion with the applicant in relation to the status of this section and we are aware that the applicant is in discussions with the landowner/developer in relation to the implications to the scheme in respect to the status of this section of the scheme.</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>The list presented in the response is generally what was expected in relation to the areas to be offered for adoption. Clarification is required in relation to Parts 15/A and 15/B as required to confirm this is NCC adoption of realigned Local Roads to cater for the Charlton Mires Junction and that they will be included in the new areas that the Local Highway Authority will be adopting. We also note that there is a gap on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (REP1-003) between the end of the future adopted highway at PA16/1 with the existing Bridleway reference 112/009 and seek clarification in respect to whether this is correct.</p> <p>We note that there is some contradictory information in relation to the DCO documentation in relation to de-trunking and the extents of adoption, for example to the south of the River Lyne Bridge. There is inconsistency in the shading in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (REP1-003) for roads to be adopted by NCC with a spotted legend used for the Part A scheme and a hatch used for the Part B elements. We have discussed these with the applicant in a meeting on 14th January 2020 and followed up by e-mail 19th January 2020.</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8.1 Principles for Good Road Design WQ GEN.1.1 - Rev 0 (REP1-033)</p>	<p>The findings are generally supported and reflect design principles set out in Policy QOP 1 in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan. Notwithstanding ongoing discussions on details, it is noted and appreciated that the document explains measures being taken · to design junctions etc to have minimal impact on the Green Belt; · to retain the historical context of the road and its surrounding environment; · to design in SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) and other water environment mitigation measures · to design in net biodiversity gains for all cases where non-irreplaceable features are affected.</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8.1 Principles for Good Road Design WQ GEN.1.1 - Rev 0 (REP1-033)</p>	<p>Document appears to accurately summarise landscape design/mitigation, as set out within the Application documents. It sets out further design rationale and relates this to relevant HE guidance.</p> <p>1.1.5-1.1.6 List identifying PRoW where safety will be improved for Part A but no equivalent for Part B– not reviewed in detail at this stage.</p> <p>1.4.2 As noted in LIR we consider that mitigation can be improved at Fenrother, Causey Bridge and West Moor. Discussions with the applicant are ongoing on this matter</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8.4 Appendix GEN.4 Justification for Significant Residual Effects (REP1-036)</p>	<p>The mitigation management mechanisms for a number of effects refer to a Landscape Management Plan which does not exist in the draft application.</p> <p>Pages 5-7 The first four entries regarding effects on landscape character misleadingly refer to ‘a single landscape character area’ being subject to significant effects and the entries regarding operational effects refer to construction effects in the justification.</p> <p>Pages 13 and 16 We do not agree that there are not opportunities to improve mitigation for residents and road users at West Moor; and believe that this can be achieved without blocking open views looking north from properties via planting in the area marked for topsoil storage to the west of the proposed junction. Discussions with the applicant are ongoing on this matter.</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8.13 Appendix LV.2 Trees to be removed and replaced at Coronation Avenue (REP1-044)	As previously reviewed and agreed
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8.20 Appendix LV.1 Summary Table (REP1-050)	The schedule of vegetation removals has not been reviewed in detail. Will be discussed with applicant as part of Statement of Common Ground discussions.
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission -7.8.21 Appendix LV.3 response to WQ LV 1.1.13 (REP1-051)	This document provides a specific response regarding potential further mitigation for significant effects on residential receptors. Several of these coincide with community receptors at West Moor (R35, R36 and R37) and Causey Park Bridge (R58 and R59) for which we have been requesting further consideration and mitigation (see above) and still consider despite the response given that improvements to mitigation could be made. Discussions with the applicant are ongoing on this matter
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission – 7.8.22 Tree Protection plan and Composite Table (REP1-052)	Improved tree removal and protection plans, not reviewed in detail, but far more informative and user-friendly than previous plans
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8.32 Appendix GEN.6 - Figure 32 WQ GEN.1.28 - Rev 0 (REP1-062)	Noted
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.9 Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations - Rev 0 (REP1-064)	1.2 LOCAL AUTHORITIES Table 1-1 - Northumberland County Council – RR-001 1.1.2 The response here sets out a comprehensive explanation of the community

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>benefits that will accrue and it can be accepted that these will contribute positively to the planning balance. We have noted elsewhere comments in certain responses, from communities or individuals, to the effect that the layouts will reduce accessibility and lengthen journeys but can accept that the optimal solution will be arrived at – e.g. in terms of bus stop locations and how communities access the A1 via the new junctions – as a result of ongoing discussions and taking all other factors into account.</p> <p>1.1.4 Whist it is acknowledged that we had dialogue with the applicant prior to the submission of the application as outlined in the response we did not have sight of the final documentation until after the submission of the application to the Planning Inspectorate. Meetings prior to submission were held with council officers in isolation and without any overall co-ordination. There were therefore several areas at the time of writing the relevant representation which had not been discussed with us. These are now being discussed with the applicant and the authority is generally satisfied that issues are moving towards agreement, but this situation could have been completely avoided.</p> <p>1.1.5 We remain dissatisfied with the position of the applicant on this matter and this point has been discussed in numerous engagements with the applicant in the run up to the DCO submission.</p> <p>1.1.5a) In relation to the specific points raised in the Applicant’s response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is agreed that this is an ongoing discussion and no agreement has been reached. 2. It is the reduction in traffic on the A1 that provides both positives

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>and negatives to sustainable transport provision on the de-trunked section. The reduction in flow has the potential to make the route more attractive for use but this reduction in flow has the potential to increase vehicle speeds on a cross section of highway that is overdesigned for these lower flows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Footway provision on the scheme is not connected with existing part-facilities being retained and not enhanced or connected, meaning the scheme has the potential to be for the benefit of vehicular traffic only and not all road users. Whilst the scheme does provide provides such a off-carriageway shared pedestrian and cyclist facility between the West Moor junction and the Brockenfields Bridge but this does not connect to any further such feature. We question why the applicant considers this to be necessary in this area but not elsewhere on the de-trunked section. We believe the proper treatment of the de-trunked section of the A1 should be within the remit of the scheme and the responsibility of the Applicant. 4. We fully support any Designated Funds bid that can be made to secure these features as part of the scheme , however, such discussions in relation to the use of these funds was first made in a Working Group meeting on 11th April 2018 and we have seen no evidence of progress in relation to this. <p>1.1.5b) We are of the opinion that the improvements to sustainable connectivity that could be gained by the Scheme cannot be delivered in a piecemeal fashion and this footway/cycleway connection around the A697 junction will does form part of the whole benefit. Changing of traffic patterns and the attractiveness of sections of connectivity may change users perceptions of routes and therefore change the potential conflicts that may occur. Whilst a</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>particular footway or footway crossing may not experience recorded incidents presently, it may do as a result of the scheme if appropriate mitigation is not provided.</p> <p>1.1.5c) It is not clear in the Rights of Way and Access Plan (REP1-003) that the footways are for safeguarded purposes and not to be delivered under the scheme and this should be made clear. It remains our position that footways provided in the scheme should connect to existing infrastructure especially if the de-trunked section of the A1 is to have increased usage due the change in traffic flows and the cross-sectional changes we are seeking to be delivered.</p> <p>1.1.5d) As stated on 1.1.5b) the improvements to sustainable connectivity can only be realised if the connection is complete and therefore any piecemeal provision will not achieve this aim.</p> <p>1.1.5e) The plans are noted and we will consider the appropriateness of the termination of new footways on the current and future Local Highway Network as the plans are refined and as part of the detailed design process.</p> <p>1.1.6 Further updates on the status of the agreements have been provided to the applicant and we are aware that they are working through the implications of the status of these. We await the result of these discussions and the implications of this on the scheme to comment upon at the appropriate time.</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>1.1.7 to 1.1.9 As per our response to TT.1.21 in the Highways England –Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)</p> <p>1.1.10 As per our response to TT.1.22 in the Highways England –Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032)</p> <p>1.1.11 As per our response to TT.1.23 in the Highways England –Deadline 1 Submission - 7.8 Applicant’s Response to ExA’s First Written Questions - Rev 0 (REP1-032) however additional comments are made over this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part B Point 5 – Whilst the principle of this is acceptable we have not agreed to the full extent to which the soft estate will form part of the handover to the Local Highway Authority and this continues to form discussions in relation to Stopping Up and the Landscaping Proposals • Part B Point 7 – The adoption of Basins DB17a and DB17b have not been agreed to be adopted by the Local Authority and therefore this statement is not agreed. <p>1.1.12 Points are noted.</p> <p>1.1.26 The applicant has responded to our point made about the effects on character with descriptions of visual effects. The point regarding effects on landscape character has not been addressed.</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>1.1.27 These comments on the inadequate assessment of landscape effects relate to the assessment of Part B. Although our representation does not make this distinction its clearly set out in the Local Impact report. The applicant's response provides examples form solely Part A in the respect of the assessment of landscape character and does not adequately address this issue.</p> <p>1.1.31 We do not agree that Chapter 12 has assessed the impacts of the scheme on communities fully. The impacts on communities play an important part of the economic benefits of the scheme on the tourism economy in the county of which walking and cycling forms a significant part as well as the contributing to health benefits to local communities. We do not agree that this impact should have been scoped out of the Population and Health chapter of the ES.</p> <p>1.1.65 We are considering the statements made in relation to drainage and will comment upon these once confirmed.</p>
Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.9 Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations - Rev 0 (REP1-064)	<p>1.5 NON-STATUTORY ORGANISATIONS</p> <p>Table 1-11 - Northumberland Estates – RR-011</p> <p>1.11.1 In terms of planning policy, we note HE’s response to this relevant representation and would request that further consideration is given to safeguarded mineral resources (in accordance with emerging Local Plan Policy MIN 4)</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	<p>1.11.2 and 1.11.3 We adhere to views regarding Lionheart set out in the Local Impact Report and note the applicant's willingness to adjust the compound area and safeguard infrastructure to allow for planned future development.</p>
<p>Highways England – Deadline 1 Submission - 7.9 Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations - Rev 0 (REP1-064)</p>	<p>1.6 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND BUSINESSES</p> <p>Table 1-13 Transport Action Network – RR-013 The Council supports the road scheme – see emerging Local Plan Policy TRA 3 – but continues to urge the design and construction to take full account of the need to minimise emissions, (relates to emerging Local Plan Policy STP 4).</p> <p>Table 1-14 Woodland Trust RR-014 It is noted that the Woodland Trust give strong emphasis to the irreplaceability of ancient woodland. The Council notes their call for a much greater ratio of compensatory planting than is being offered but has no policy on ratios of replacement. In terms of planning policy, the Council draws attention to emerging Local Plan Policy ENV 1, which emphasises protecting irreplaceable natural assets; and Policy ENV 2, which seeks to secure a net gain for biodiversity to reflect latest Government policy. The council notes Highways England's response and is broadly in agreement with the approach taken. HE has been discussing the loss of ancient woodland and the mitigation with NCC throughout the process and agrees that there are exceptional circumstances and there is no practical alternative to delivering the scheme.</p> <p>Table 1-42 Mark Hawes on behalf of residents of Northgate Farm - RR-045 The Council notes HE's response but would be request that all necessary steps are being taken to minimise, or preferably avoid, losses of residential</p>

Document and Applicants Reference (Examination Library Reference)	Comment
	amenity, (in accordance with emerging Local Plan Policy QOP 2).
Environment Agency – Deadline 1 Submission - Responses to The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) issued on 19 November 2020 (REP1-074)	BIO.1.7 Wrongly refers to Policies QOP1 and ENV2 being from the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan, whereas they are from the emerging Northumberland Local Plan. The latter quoted policy promotes the concept of net gain and NCC Planning Policy therefore supports the EA's comment.