

A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham

Scheme Number: TR010059

7.13 Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions

Rule 8(1)(c)

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Planning Act 2008

February 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules
2010**

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

Development Consent Order 20[xx]

Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions

Rule Reference:	8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010059
Document Reference:	7.13
Author:	A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	February 2021	Deadline 3

CONTENTS

1	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 2 SUBMISSIONS	1
1.1	PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT	1

TABLES

Table 1-1 – Historic England	2
Table 1-2 – Millhouse Developments	2
Table 1-3 – Northumberland County Council	4

1 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 2 SUBMISSIONS

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 submissions made at Deadline 2 by Interested Parties that were not Written Representations.

Table 1-1 – Historic England

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	Comments on responses for Deadline 1	
	<p>Historic England notes, and welcomes, the submission of document 'Appendix B Working Area Around West Linkhall Scheduled Monument and North Charlton Scheduled Monument'.</p> <p>The stated intention of Highways England was to avoid any direct impacts on these scheduled monuments, which we welcomed. However, the concern was that the plans previously provided did not show the DCO boundary and boundary of the scheduled monuments at a scale which allowed this to be confirmed.</p> <p>The submitted document referred to above allows confirmation on this issue - the boundary of the DCO does not extend into the scheduled monument. This provides us with reassurance on this key issue.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that the Order limits do not extend into the Scheduled Monuments and notes that Historic England agrees with this position.</p>
	Comments on responses to ExQ1;	
	Having been through the heritage-related issues mentioned in Highways England's response, we would comment as follows:	
DCO 1.74	Historic England welcomes the change made in the revised DCO, which corrects the earlier use of English Heritage, where the appropriate body for further engagement was ourselves.	<p>1. The Applicant notes Historic England's agreement to the change to the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-005 and 006].</p>
HE. 1.15	Historic England welcomes the suggested change to replace the reference to English Heritage with Historic England	<p>1. The Applicant notes Historic England's agreement to the change to the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-005 and 006].</p>

Table 1-2 – Millhouse Developments

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
1	We are writing on behalf of our client 'Millhouse Developments', with regards their land interests at Burgham as cited in the evidence submitted a part of the Examination including page 9 CA.1 Compulsory Acquisition Schedule WQCA.1.1 submitted by the Highways Agency in response to Deadline 1 for the Examination Written Questions (EXQ1) issued on 19th November.	<p>1. The affected land constitutes two agricultural fields, one is approximately 300 metres to the west of the A1 and another approximately 10 metres to the west of the A1. The land to be permanently acquired is shown in plots 7-3a, 7-4b, 7-4c, 7-4e, 7-7a, 8-9c, 8-9a, on sheets 7 and 8 of the Land Plans [APP-006]. This land is required to provide an outfall into Longdyke Burn. The land to be possessed temporarily is shown in plots 7-4a, 7-4d, 7-4f, 7-4g, 7-7b, 7-7c, 8-9b, on sheets 7 and 8 of the Land Plans [APP-006], which is also required on a permanent basis for the physical widening of the existing A1.</p>

		2. The Compulsory Acquisition Schedule [REP2-017 and 018] submitted at Deadline 2 refers to the affected land on page 7.
2	Our client is aware that EXQ1 CA.1.1 to CA.1.18 related directly to the Compulsory Acquisition/Temporary Possession procedures in respect of the A1 in Northumberland - Morpeth to Ellingham. Whilst we understand that it is not possible to submit representations specific to the any Compulsory Acquisition case with regards a piece of land or building it is appropriate to raise matters of process. In this regard ExQ1 CA.1.1 requested that the applicant completes the annexed Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule (Annex A) to make entries it believes to be appropriate.	1. The Compulsory Acquisition Schedule [REP2-017 and 018] was produced in response to ExQ1 CA.1.1 [PD-007]. Updated versions of the document will be submitted throughout the Examination. The version submitted at Deadline 3 refers to the affected land on page 7.
3	The Highways Agency has now completed this schedule and submitted in advance of Deadline 1 as referenced above. The reference to our client 'Milhouse Developments' land interest as noted in this schedule at page 9 confirmed that a meeting has been arranged with the agent of the 20th January 2021 and land take figures were issued on the 7th January 2021. The comments note that this is to be the commencement of land take negotiations.	1. The Compulsory Acquisition Schedule [REP2-017 and 018] submitted at Deadline 3 refers to the affected land on page 7. Further details as to the 7 January and 20 January 2021 engagement are provided below.
4	Our client has sought to negotiate with the Highways Agency's representatives on this issue for a number of months but has not had the opportunity to do so until now. Given the advanced stage of the application process, with the Examination process now commenced, this approach to ourselves as our client's agents to be somewhat delayed.	1. Consultation with the landowner regarding the Scheme has been ongoing since 25/01/2018. Meetings have been held with the landowner and their representatives on a number of occasions in 2018 and 2019 to understand the use and planning status of the affected land.
5	It should also be highlighted that the initial proposals put forward by the Highways Agency made no access provisions for any purpose to the land that is owned by our client but not required for the dualling works to the A1. A contrived access arrangement is now proposed through neighbouring land which is to be restricted for agricultural use only. This is inadequate for our client's purposes, particularly in view of the currently unrestricted access to their site from the A1 and the historic planning consent for 'Roadside service incorporating petrol filling station and shop' (reference CM/00/D/337 and CM/04/D.550)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant's proposal for future access to the agricultural plot 8/9c was included in the Statutory Consultation for Part A in 2018. As such, it is not accepted that access was not provided for in the Applicant's proposals. The replacement access will be from the new grade-separated West Moor junction on Part A via the Bywell Road extension. This replacement access will not be restricted for agricultural use only, and represents the most direct practicable point of access following the closure of all direct access from the A1 on safety grounds. As such, it is not accepted that the replacement access constitutes a contrived arrangement. Further, the Application has made provision for field access, Work No.16A shown on sheet 8 of the Works Plans [APP-007]. 2. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP1-025 and 026] 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 [REP1-023 and 024] secures this and reference S-PH1 confirms that the Scheme will either retain an existing standard or improve access arrangements. 3. The planning permissions to which the respondent refers is indeed historic and has expired without lawful implementation. Consequently, it should be afforded little if any weight as a consideration in relation to the Scheme. Indeed, given that the planning permission was originally granted almost two decades ago, it cannot even be concluded that a replacement permission would be granted as matters stand today. Should a fresh application be made by the respondent, then it would need to take account of the Scheme, as opposed to the other way around.

Table 1-3 – Northumberland County Council

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
REP1-011 Appendix 2.1 Lighting Assessment -	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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Northumberland County Council (NCC) has commented on the Lighting Assessment [REP1-011] document as a whole. 2. The current design Scheme does not include lighting. The introduction of lighting would require the consent of the Secretary of State in terms of Requirement 3(1) and NCC would be consulted on this. These provisions would ensure that, in the unlikely event of a change in approach to lighting, such a change would receive appropriate scrutiny.
REP1-019 Noise Addendum	In Table 1-4 – Local Planning Policy Relevant to Noise, the relevant Local Plan and Core Strategy policies seem to be satisfactorily addressed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Table 1-4 in the Noise Addendum [REP1-019] summarises the local planning policy relevant to noise and the Applicant notes that NCC is satisfied that local plan policies on noise are satisfactorily addressed.
REP1-020 Noise Addendum Appendix A, B and C	Noted that Local Plan and Core Strategy policies that deal with noise are addressed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appendix A [REP1-020] summarises how the Scheme complies with local planning policies and the Applicant notes that NCC is satisfied that local plan and core strategy policies on noise are addressed.
REP1-023 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Clean)	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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-023 and REP1-024] was Revision 1. The previous version submitted with the DCO application was Revision 0. Please note an updated version (Revision 2) is submitted at Deadline 3.
	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 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] states that plant stock will be planted using a combination of whips and transplants which NCC does not agree with. The Applicant has therefore updated the Outline CEMP to include provision (refer to S-L5 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme) for the inclusion of standard and feathered trees within the detailed landscape design, and is submitted at Deadline 3.
	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The hedgerow referred to in B-L2 in the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] is the existing hedgerow to the west of Rock South Farm access track and the Applicant confirms it would be retained. Vegetation to be cleared is shown on Vegetation Clearance Plans [APP-013] and reflects the worst-case requirements for vegetation clearance in order to construct the

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>Scheme. The avoidance of vegetation removal is a key consideration of the design along with its replacement, and this is secured through item S-L2 (a – e) of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme in the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3). The identification of vegetation to be removed on site will be under the responsibility of the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW), and in line with the REAC S-B10 of the Outline CEMP (REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) where vegetation clearance and tree felling is to be kept to a minimum, as far as reasonably practicable. The ECoW will agree the area or feature identified to be protected within a specific works plan for the area or feature in question. Therefore, the hedgerow west of the Rock South Farm access track would be retained in the first instance, however should any sections require replacement this would be carried out in order to ensure the hedgerow is continuous.</p>
<p>REP1-028</p> <p>Statement of Common Ground with Northumberland County Council -</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. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant considers that the record of meetings and correspondence included in the SoCG with NCC [REP1-028] provides useful context for the SoCG, and will continue to liaise with NCC to update this record as the DCO Examination progresses. If the Council have records of additional meetings, then the Applicant is content to include these. The SOCG is a draft and is a live document which will be developed in full consultation with NCC during the examination. The ExA set out the issues that the SoCG should address in Annex E of their Rule 6 Letter [PD-006] dated 19 November 2020. The issues identified by the ExA form the baseline for the draft SoCG.
<p>GEN1.8</p> <p>REP1-032</p> <p>Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions</p>	<p>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 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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ExA's written question GEN 1.8 asks how the footway/cycleway proposed is secured and how it links to the wider walking and cycling networks. The Applicant confirmed it is secured in the DCO [REP2-004 and 005] by Work No.s 16I, J and L as set in the Works Plans [APP-007]. The Applicant also confirmed it would continue to work with NCC to identify possible enhancements for which Designated Funds can be applied for. 2. The Scheme Objectives were determined at the inception stage of the scheme, to ensure that the solution addresses the problems identified and that the scheme will deliver the desired outcomes whilst addressing those problems. The Objectives determined for the Scheme were identified as a result of the A1 North of Newcastle Feasibility Study (the Study) undertaken in 2015. In addition, the Objectives must align with the Roads Investment Strategy (RIS). The RIS description for the Scheme states that is for "upgrading multiple sections of the A1 to dual carriageway to provide continuous high quality dual carriageway from Newcastle to Ellingham, north of Alnwick". 3. The Scheme Objectives also align with local, regional, national policy and the Applicants Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), to ensure the Scheme addresses the RIS and the agreed problems are set out below:

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improving the resilience of the network. - Improving journey times. - Improving accessibility. - Improving safety. - Facilitating economic growth and development. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The intent of the project is to create two lengths of dual carriageway to address the known issues on the existing single carriageway sections of the A1 at this location. With regard to the offline section, the intent is that all the through traffic remains on the new length of dual carriageway, with the existing length of the A1 de-trunked to only service the local community. It is expected, therefore, that this local road would be suitable for cyclists to use the carriageway as the vast majority of the existing traffic using the A1 will be removed from the de-trunked section and it doesn't warrant the specific creation of a separate cycle track. The provision of a segregated cycle track, therefore, is not a requirement of the project. 5. The Applicant has explained to Northumberland County Council that if there is a desire to a create separate cycle track then that would be over and above the requirements of the project, so other funding routes would have to be explored. From the Applicant's perspective, the only funding option would be through Designated Funds, which the Applicant is currently pursuing. 6. The Applicant will continue to work with NCC to build the best-case possible to bid for and secure Designated Funds funding although the Applicant has been clear that this funding is not guaranteed. 7. The Applicant has made significant progress on the design of one designated funds project which is the A697 cycleway, NCC has been involved in this. 8. It must be noted that the delivery of any designated funds scheme sits outside of the Applicant's DCO application and such works are not required to mitigate the impacts of the proposed Scheme.
GEN1.31 REP1-032 Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions	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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant notes that NCC concurs with the ExA's remarks in written questions GEN.1.31. The remarks queried how Green House Gases and the impacts of the Scheme on Ancient Woodland have been considered in the planning balance: 'No mention is made of the impact on Greenhouse Gas Emissions or the loss of ancient woodland. The Applicant is asked to review its summary of adverse impacts and the conclusions on the planning balance.' [PD-007]. 2. The Applicant reiterates the view that there are some negative environmental impacts of the Scheme. These include on the Ancient Woodland around the River Coquet and also from additional Green House Gases. These are acknowledged and accepted in the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] and assessed in the ES, particularly Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>A [APP-048] and Chapter 14: Climate Part A [APP-058] and Part B [APP-059].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant considers that the approach to compensating for the impacts on Ancient Woodland set out in Appendix 9.21 Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247] will help to compensate for these impacts. A negative impact of the Scheme from Greenhouse Gas Emissions is also acknowledged. The Applicant however highlights the guidance at paragraph 5.16 of the NPS NN that: 'the impact of road development on aggregate levels of emissions is likely to be very small' and that emission reductions will be delivered through a system of five-year carbon budgets rather than through decisions on individual schemes.' The Applicant's view remains that the merits of the Scheme outweigh these impacts and that the planning balance remains well in favour of approving the Scheme.
<p>GEN1.34 REP1-032</p> <p>Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions</p>	<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant notes that Paragraph 5.32 of the LIR [REP1-071] confirms that the available employment land to serve Alnwick and its surroundings is allocated through Policy E2 of the Alnwick and Denwick Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites allocated through Policy E2 will be occupied by the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound. This summary is accepted by the Applicant. The Applicant notes the discussion of the impacts of the Scheme on the Lionheart Enterprise Park at paragraph 5.34 – 5.36 of the LIR [REP1-071], and that NCC concludes at Paragraph 5.35 of the LIR that these impacts: 'can be accepted in principle' and that the Scheme is compatible with Alnwick Core Strategy Policy S9 (Paragraph 5.36). The Applicant also reiterates that the ES was undertaken on a worst case basis for land take within the Lionheart Enterprise Park, and that that the Applicant has confirmed to the landowner (as stated in the response to written question GEN1.34 of the Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions [REP1-032] to occupy 40,000m² of the plot.
<p>BIO1.4 REP1-032</p> <p>Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions</p>	<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The ExA's written question BIO.1.4 asked why woodland was excluded from the biodiversity no net loss assessment [REP2-009] in the context of Policy ENV2. The Applicant explained in the response to the written question [REP1-032] that it is not possible to offset loss of irreplaceable habitats and therefore it is excluded from the assessment but that the Applicant considers the Scheme is compliant with this policy. The Applicant acknowledges the weight given to the preservation of irreplaceable habitats as part of emerging Policy ENV 1 is reduced. The Applicant also acknowledges that the quoted policies are from the emerging Local Plan and that they are likely to be subject to some modification as they are the subject of unresolved objections at the ongoing Examination. Nonetheless, for the purpose of policy compliance for the Scheme, an

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>assessment has been made against the existing wording presented in the Northumberland Draft Local Plan (Publication Draft Plan (Regulation 19), January 2019).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Emerging Policy ENV 2 also states that “development proposals affecting biodiversity ... will minimise their impact ... by: a. Avoiding significant harm through location and/ or design. Where significant harm cannot be avoided, applicants will be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts will be adequately mitigated or, as a last resort compensated for.” 4. The Applicant has applied the mitigation hierarchy by first seeking to avoid the impacts to ancient woodland. The Scheme would pass through the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (designate ancient woodland) and the Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS) (not designated but treated as ancient woodland within the assessment, as detailed in paragraph 9.10.3, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A [APP-048], for the purpose of mitigation and compensation). This is required to create a new bridge over the River Coquet adjacent to the existing road bridge (which carries the existing A1 carriageway). 5. As detailed in paragraph 3.3.8 of Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives [APP-038], alternative routes were considered but would not avoid crossing the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI and would still require an entirely new bridge crossing to be constructed. Furthermore, other options to avoid the Coquet River Felton Park LWS would have required a significant length of additional dual carriageway (between 4 and 5 miles). As a result, no alignments to this effect were considered and the option of a new bridge crossing the SSSI and LWS adjacent to the existing A1 road bridge was taken forward. The Applicant also notes the Council's comment in paragraph 5.73 of the LIR which states that “the council is fully aware that all practicable options for the line of the road have been thoroughly assessed and is satisfied that the choice of the line has been sufficiently justified.” Every effort has been taken to minimise the land required to construct the Scheme within the SSSI, whilst enabling the River Coquet Bridge to be constructed safely. 6. As the impacts are unavoidable, a suitable mitigation and compensation strategy has been developed in consultation with Natural England; Appendix 9.1: Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247]. The Ancient Woodland Strategy addresses the impacts to the woodland habitat within the SSSI and LWS and proposes appropriate mitigation and compensation for the loss of ancient woodland. 7. Mitigation measures are “methods, processes and actions put in place to reduce and/or minimise the potential impacts of the Scheme on ancient woodland, which in turn would result in retention of ancient woodland where possible.” A summary of mitigation measures is presented in paragraphs 3.2.6 to 3.2.15 of the Ancient Woodland Strategy [APP-247] and includes,

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>as examples, excavation protection zones around retained ancient woodland, installation of temporary protective fencing and salvage of materials from within the impacted areas of ancient woodland.</p> <p>8. Compensation measures are “physical measures that would be carried out to address potential impacts associated with the direct loss of ancient woodland or temporary and permanent indirect impacts that would have a significant impact on ancient woodland.” A summary of compensation measures is presented in paragraphs 3.2.16 to 3.2.18 of the Ancient Woodland Strategy [APP-247] and comprises woodland planting within a “Woodland Creation Area” at a ratio of 12:1 (creation:loss).</p> <p>9. The Applicant notes that the Council welcomes Appendix 9.21: Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247], as detailed in paragraph 6.7.10 of the Local Impact Report [REP1-071].</p>
<p>CE1.3 REP1-032</p> <p>Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. The Written Question asked whether the policies of the Castle Morpeth Local Plan should have been considered Table 14.3 of the ES. The response to the Written Question in Table 1-4 of the Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions [REP1-032] was to add this information in relation to the Castle Morpeth Local Plan.</p> <p>2. The policies of the Alnwick Core Strategy were not mentioned in the response as they are already referred to in Table 14.3 of the ES. Likewise, the policies of the emerging Northumberland Local Plan are also referred to in the original Table. All relevant development plan policies on climate change have therefore been referred to in the ES.</p>
<p>DCO1.40 REP1-032</p> <p>Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions</p>	<p>Our view in relation to the response to some areas of this question differs to that of the applicant when comparing responses to this question.</p>	<p>1. NCC has not specified the way in which their view differs from that of the Applicant on this matter and the Applicant cannot therefore respond.</p>
<p>LV1.12 and LV1.22 REP1-032</p> <p>Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. For reference, a copy of the former DMRB documents (DMRB Volume 10, Section 0, Parts 2 and 3) have been provided at Deadline 2 [REP2-022]. Whilst these have been replaced by LD117, the former documents provide greater clarity on the nature, form and management of the landscape elements, and as such have been used for the purpose of providing a suitable level of information.</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
LV1.27 REP1-032 Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions	The Council can confirm that Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Local Plan Policy F3 which included the Kylee 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant notes NCC's comments with reference to the policies relating to AHLV and IALV, and their status as saved development plan policies which carry little weight. 2. The approach to landscape character assessment taken in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [APP-045] is a character-based approach and reference has been made to the landscape character areas defined within Alnwick Landscape Character SPD and the Northumberland LCA, as evidenced in paragraph 7.4.19 (ai) and (c) of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045].
TT1.20 REP1-032 Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions	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 significant diversion over the current access as both the West Moor and Fenrother junctions are all-direction grade separated junctions.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ExA's Written Question TT.1.20 asks for evidence as to why access to Causey Park Bridge is reduced in favour of Fenrother Junction and the Applicant responded that the location of the junction was based on traffic model forecasts showing more vehicles using this junction. It is noted that NCC are satisfied with the proposed junction arrangements at West Moor and Fenrother.
TT1.21 REP1-032 Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity assessment noted. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response required.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ExA's Written Question TT,1,21 asks about concerns NCC raised in their Relevant Representation [RR-001] about the Charlton Mires Junction including the speed limit. The Applicant confirmed in the response to this written question [REP1-032] that traffic calming measures are agreed in principle and this is recorded in the SoCG [REP1-028]. The development of the highways aspects of the SoCG are continuing between the Applicant and the local highway authority.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response required.
TT1.22 REP1-032	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We note the assessments made using the derived peak hour flow data 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response required.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions		
	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. The information requested by NCC at the meeting on 21st January was supplied to NCC by email on 31st January 2021 and 1st February 2021. The Applicant will continue to liaise closely with NCC and respond promptly to requests for additional information or clarification.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. In the response to Written Question TT.1.22, paragraph 3, the Applicant states 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. If funding were made available, any such works on the de-trunked section is not required to address the impact of the Scheme. Therefore, further modelling of the detrunked section is not be required within the DCO Examination.</p>
<p>TT1.23 REP1-032</p> <p>Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ExA and NCC were seeking clarification in respect of the extent of the highway adoption in relation to the de-trunked A1 and the new local highway network, in particular the section of the Scheme at the southern extent of Part A. 2. No emphasis with the use of bold type was intended. 3. The Applicant is liaising with the private developer on the existing section 38 agreement for West View with the local highway authority and establishing an agreement for access over this private road until such times as it is adopted.
	<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant can confirm that the realigned local roads southwest of Charlton Mires Junction labelled as 15/A and 15/B on the Traffic Regulations Measures Plan [APP-010], also denoted as Work No.29A on the Works Plans [APP-007] are also to be adopted by the Local Highway Authority. 2. The 'gap' referred to between point PA 16/1 and Bridleway 112/009 on the Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-003] is an existing section of adopted road for which NCC is responsible which is to remain as such following construction of the Scheme.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<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>1. The hatches used for the Rights of Way and Access Plans are meant to differentiate between types of roads, not maintenance responsibilities, though most of the time these will coincide. The area south of the River Lyne Bridge has been amended at Deadline 2 on the Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-003], to correct the point where the public highway is to be stopped up (3/d) at the end of the turning head.</p>
<p>GEN.1.1 REP1-033 Appendix GEN.4 Justification for Significant Residual Effects</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>	<p>1. Response not required to the points raised in the Appendix to the First Written Questions GEN1.1 Principles of Good Road Design</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. Response not required</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. The bulleted list of detailed improvements under 1.1.5 started the list for Part A but also includes Part B for similar improvements. The format meant they were included in 1.1.5 rather than in 1.1.6, but they are listed</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>1. The Applicant continues to liaise with NCC on the detailed design aspects of the junction provisions.</p>
<p>Appendix GEN.4 REP1-036 Appendix GEN.4 Justification for Significant Residual Effects</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>1. Reference to a Landscape Management Plan is referred to as a future delivery mechanism for the proposed mitigation within Appendix GEN.4 [REP1-036]. Reference ExA S-L100 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] has been updated and submitted at Deadline 3 to include a commitment for a Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) (and its contents) for each Part to be prepared during the detailed design stage of the Scheme and prior to the start of construction of Part A or Part B as appropriate.</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>1. In Table 1 of the Summary of Significant Effects [REP1-036] NCC is correct in that the reference to the single landscape character area is incorrect, however, the impacted landscape character areas are correctly identified in the first column of Description of Effects in Table 1 - Part A: Summary of Significant Effects of Appendix GEN.4 [REP1-036].</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>2. NCC is correct in noting that reference has been made to the mitigation of construction effects in describing the potential measures for the further mitigation for effects on landscape character in the winter of Year 1 (operation). Nevertheless, the comments remain that temporary fencing (whilst planting establishes) is not considered an appropriate mitigation measure within the scale and nature of the landscape, these being absent within the landscape, and their presence potentially leading to an increased adverse impact and significance of effect.</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>	<p>1. The Applicant has continued discussion with NCC regarding the mitigation measures at the West Moor Junction in response to the concerns raised. The Applicant has, as was set out in LV.1.13, Table 1-9 of Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions [REP1-032], considered how additional planting would provide screening to those receptors that lie close to the West Moor Junction, with north facing views (R35-R37, including new recently constructed dwellings) as identified on Figure 7.6 Visual Effects Drawings Residential Properties Part A [APP-093]. The Applicant continues to consider that extending the planting would substantially reduce the open aspect to the north that R35 currently enjoys.</p> <p>2. NCC has previously identified an area on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] which it believes could be used for a block of woodland planting, however this land is to be taken for temporary purposes only to facilitate the construction of the West Moor Junction. Should this additional block of woodland be provided, the Applicant is concerned that there would be an adverse effect on R35 as a result of the loss of the open aspect, currently afforded to views from the north facing elevation, and it for this reason that the Applicant does not consider that such provision is appropriate. Nevertheless, the Applicant has, within the permanent highway boundary, indicated that a greater density of trees should be planted within the proposed hedgerow that ties the realigned West Moor Road with the link road to the overbridge, which has been accepted as an alternative by NCC, as evidenced in the SoCG submitted at Deadline 3. The effect of this would be to reinforce the planting as it ties with the woodland planting on the embankment slope, such that approaches from the west, along West Moor Road would benefit from enhanced screening, and in views to the junction from R35, whilst the open aspect to the north would not be entirely lost to the adjacent receptors (R35 – R37). An updated Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] is submitted at Deadline 3, and has been agreed with NCC as evidenced within the revised SoCG submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
<p>Appendix LV.2 REP1-044</p>	<p>As previously reviewed and agreed.</p>	<p>1. It is noted that NCC are in agreement with Appendix LV.2 [REP1-044] which sets out the proposed approach to replacing trees at Coronation Avenue.</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
Appendix LV.2 Trees to be Removed and Replaced at Coronation Avenue		
Appendix LV.1 REP1-050 Appendix LV.1 Summary Table WQ LV.1.7	The schedule of vegetation removals has not been reviewed in detail. Will be discussed with applicant as part of Statement of Common Ground discussions.	1. It is noted that the Council has still to carry out a detailed review of Appendix LV.1 [REP1-050].
Appendix LV.3 response to WQ LV 1.1.13 REP1-051 Appendix LV.3 Response to WQ LV.1.13 - Rev 0	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant has continued discussion with NCC regarding the mitigation measures at the West Moor Junction and Causey Park Bridge. Further to these discussions, an updated Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [APP-095] has been submitted at Deadline 3, and this has been agreed with NCC as evidenced within the revised SoCG submitted at Deadline 3. This updated plan, indicates that a greater density of trees should be planted within the proposed hedgerow that ties the realigned West Moor Road with the link road to the overbridge. The effect of this would be to reinforce the planting as it ties with the woodland planting on the embankment slope, such that approaches from the west, along West Moor Road would benefit from enhanced screening, whilst the open aspect to the north would not be entirely lost to the adjacent receptors. 2. With reference to Causey Park Bridge, and in discussion with NCC, a requirement for further tree planting within the proposed hedgerow running along the toe of the embankment slope to the east of the alignment, and further scrub planting on the embankment slope itself, would in combination with tree planting within the area of the drainage feature provide greater interruption to views of the embankment slopes, and proposed noise barrier. This is also outlined on the updated Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] that has been submitted at Deadline 3, and has been agreed with NCC as evidenced within the revised SoCG submitted at Deadline 3.
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	1. It is noted that NCC has not reviewed the Tree Protection Plan and related table in detail but considers them to be improved.
GEN.1.28 REP1-062	Noted	

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
GEN.6 - Figure 32 WQ GEN.1.28		
REP1-064 Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations	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 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.	1. The Applicant notes that NCC considers that the proposed road layouts achieve the optimal solution in terms of accessibility and journey times.
	1.1.4 Whilst 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>1. NCC's Relevant Representation [RR-001] raises issues on the provision of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists along the length of Part A.</p> <p>2. The Applicant notes the acknowledgement of the extensive dialogue with NCC here, notably via the regular undertaken working group meetings with NCC since 2018. Since then, the applications have been merged as one however the overall Scheme has remained the same in the detail extensively engaged with NCC upon, from which their inputs have been taken on board throughout that process to submission and on a continuing basis.</p> <p>3. The Applicant is currently liaising with NCC and it is considered that good progress is being made. The Applicant is happy to commit to continuing to liaise with NCC as the DCO progresses.</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>1. The Applicant notes that NCC is dissatisfied with the Applicant's position in relation to pedestrian and cycle connectivity in Part A of the Scheme.</p> <p>2. The Applicant has responded in paragraph 2 and 3 of the response to GEN 1.8 above setting out the Scheme Objectives and clearly stating that funding for a separate cycleway along the section of the A1 to be de-trunked is not considered as part of the scope of the Scheme.</p>
	1.1.5a) In relation to the specific points raised in the Applicant's response: 1. It is agreed that this is an ongoing discussion and no agreement has been reached.	1. The Applicant confirms that the subject of de-trunking of the A1 is subject to ongoing discussions as part of the SoCG development.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>2. It is the reduction in traffic on the A1 that provides both positives 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>	<p>1. The Applicant acknowledges that the de-trunked carriageway consists of wide carriageways, wide verges, hatching within the centre and long sweeping horizontal curves and that when de-trunked traffic speeds could increase through reduced traffic volumes and thereby a reduction in queues and convoys. However, the national speed limit would presumably still apply, the reduced traffic volumes should reduce the need for overtaking manoeuvres and reduce the potential conflicts with right turn movements and there should generally be a much greater proportion of local traffic using the de-trunked section who are familiar with the road layout. The Applicant therefore does not consider that additional measures are required on the de-trunked A1 as a result of the Scheme.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that a new shared pedestrian and cyclist facility is being provided on the new link road between West Moor Junction and Brockenfield Bridge. This new link road is required as a consequence of the Scheme i.e. it connects the northern end of the de-trunked section of the A1 to the local road network at West Moor Junction. The Applicant, in consultation with NCC, has agreed to provide the shared pedestrian and cyclist facility as part of the new link road to future proof this new section of infrastructure i.e. to avoid having to undertake further works at some point in the future. However, given that the forecast traffic volumes on this link road and the de-trunked A1 following the opening of the Scheme will be significantly reduced it is considered that the link road and de-trunked A1 would be suitable for cyclists to use the carriageway and it does not warrant the specific creation of a separate cycle track.</p> <p>2. The Applicant liaised directly with NCC on 28/01/2021 to clearly state that funding for a separate cycleway along the section of the A1 to be de-trunked is not considered as part of the scope of the Scheme. This is because the Scheme Objectives were determined as a result of the A1 North of Newcastle Feasibility Study and to align with the Roads Investment Strategy (RIS). The intent of the project is to create two lengths of dual carriageway to address the known issues on the single carriageway. The provision of a segregated cycle track on the de-trunked A1 is not a specific requirement of the project and is not required on the basis of traffic flows.</p>
	<p>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>	<p>1. The Applicant has explained to Northumberland County Council that if there is a desire to a create separate cycle track then that would be over and above the requirements of the project, so other funding routes would have to be explored. From the Applicant's perspective, the only funding option would be through Designated Funds, which the Applicant is currently pursuing.</p> <p>2. The Applicant will continue to work with NCC to build the best-case possible to bid for and secure Designated Funds funding although the Applicant has been clear that this funding is not guaranteed.</p> <p>3. The Applicant has made significant progress on the design of one designated funds project which is the A697 cycleway, NCC has been involved in this.</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>4. It must be noted that the delivery of any designated funds scheme sits outside of the Applicant's DCO application and such works are not required to mitigate the impacts of the proposed Scheme.</p>
	<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 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. As stated in paragraph 4 of the response to GEN1.8 above, it is not the responsibility of the Applicant, as the body responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of the strategic road network, to provide enhancement outside of the Scope of the Scheme. 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.</p> <p>2. The Applicant, in consultation with NCC, has agreed to provide the shared pedestrian and cyclist facility as part of the new link road to future proof this new section of infrastructure i.e. to avoid having to undertake further works at some point in the future.</p> <p>3. However, given that the projected traffic volumes on the local road network following the opening of the Scheme both in the opening year and 15 years thereafter are forecast to be significantly reduced it is considered that there is no aspect on the A693 that warrants the specific creation of a separate footway at the A697 junction.</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. The Roads Investment Strategy (RIS) description for the Scheme states that is for "upgrading multiple sections of the A1 to dual carriageway to provide continuous high quality dual carriageway from Newcastle to Ellingham, north of Alnwick". The intent of the project is to create two lengths of dual carriageway to address the known issues on the existing single carriageway sections of the A1 at this location and mitigate for the assessed impacts.</p> <p>2. The updated Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-003] and associated Schedules in the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] indicate proposed footways as part of the Scheme for mitigation and futureproofing. 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 Plans (which the Scheme does tie-in to). The provision of additional footways along the existing local road network is not necessary to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. There is therefore no justification for providing these facilities as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>3. As stated previously in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-064], Table 1-1, if there is a desire to a create additional lengths of footways beyond the newly constructed dualled trunk road, then that would be over and above the Scope of the Scheme, so other funding routes, such as Designated Funds would have to be explored.</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. It is not the responsibility of the Applicant, as the body responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of the strategic road network, to provide enhancement outside of the Scope of the Scheme.</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>2. The Applicant, in consultation with NCC, has agreed to provide the shared pedestrian and cyclist facility as part of the new link road to future proof this new section of infrastructure i.e. to avoid having to undertake further works at some point in the future.</p> <p>3. However given that the projected traffic volumes on the link road and the de-trunked A1 following the opening of the Scheme both in the opening year and 15 years thereafter are forecast to be significantly reduced it is considered that the link road and de-trunked A1 would be suitable for cyclists to use the carriageway and it does not warrant the specific creation of a separate cycle track.</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. The Applicant considers that the extent of the footways provided by the Scheme are appropriate, with the rationale set out in addressing 1.1.5c) above. The Applicant will confirm the final termination points with NCC during detailed design.</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>	<p>1. The Applicant continues to liaise with the landowner, Taylor Wimpey plc. (whose access is enabled by an existing Section 38 agreement under the Highways Act 1980) to provide the necessary land access rights for the properties at Northgate Farm through the Northgate Hospital site to the public highway. Updates to NCC will be provided when agreements are finalised.</p>
	<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. Noted</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. Noted</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> <p>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</p> <p>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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical Notes for adoption for both parts A and B were accepted by NCC and were submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1 [REP1-049]. 2. Regarding Part B Point 5, which states that critical infrastructure relating to the new trunk road and its supporting earthworks and soft estate will remain under the maintenance of the Applicant, the Applicant is, at this stage, unable to provide precise details surrounding the exact extents of soft estate to be adopted. Such details are to be decided by the Applicant prior to handover to NCC. 3. The Applicant has discussed the drainage strategy and adoption of Basins DB17a and b with NCC's Drainage Officer. Although the adoption was not expressly agreed between the specialists, the principles of the detention basins has been agreed. The adoption strategy will form part of the ongoing development of the Statement of Common Ground with NCC [REP1-049] to be submitted at subsequent deadlines.
	<p>1.1.12 Points are noted.</p>	<p>1. No response required</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<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>	<p>1. NCC considers 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. However, NCC does not provide an indication as to what level of significance they consider would arise or on which landscape character area (as outlined in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044]). As NCC refer to the effects being greater than neutral, the Applicant assumes that this would relate to 38b (1) Lowland Rolling Farmland - Hub of Recreational Activity, which in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044] is identified as being subject to a neutral effect, and the Applicant's response focuses on this character area.</p> <p>2. The West Moor Junction lies on the boundary of two character areas, namely LCA 38b Lowland Rolling Farmland – Longhorsley and 38b (1) Lowland Rolling Farmland - Hub of Recreational Activity. It is this latter character area which Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044] identifies the effects at winter Year 1 and summer Year 15 as being of negligible magnitude and as a result of the low sensitivity to change, a neutral effect. The conclusions of the assessment were based on the fact that, with the exception of the West Moor Junction, the Scheme was predominantly an online widening, and substantially associated with the transition between LCA 38b Lowland Rolling Farmland – Longhorsley and 38b (1) Lowland Rolling Farmland - Hub of Recreational Activity. Within the assessment of effects, refer to Appendix 7.1 Landscape Effects Schedule Part A [APP216], localised effects are noted. Within the context of the West Moor Junction these would comprise the realignment of the existing local roads that currently join the existing A1 to form a new roundabout at grade, and the formation of the new overbridge. The relatively flat nature of the landscape limiting the degree to which the wider dual carriageway would be perceived. As a result, the overall magnitude of impact was considered to be negligible, and as such the effect would be neutral. Should, the formation of the bridge and associated embankment be considered to have a greater magnitude of impact i.e. minor, the resulting significance of effects in winter Year 1 and summer Year 15 would be slight adverse, which are considered not-significant.</p>
	<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. As detailed in paragraph 1.1.27 of the response to NCC's Relevant Representation [REP1-064], the assessment of landscape effects as detailed in both Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] is sufficiently detailed and robust. This position is reiterated in the Applicant's response to the LIR (see paragraphs 6.5.11 – 6.5.14, 6.5.20 – 6.5.23) submitted at Deadline 3. In responding to NCC's opposite comment, the Applicant has not duplicated the responses to the specific issues raised in the LIR [REP1-075].</p> <p>2. The assessment of landscape character for both Part A and Part B was undertaken in accordance with Interim Advice Note (IAN) 135/10, and sensitivity has been determined using descriptions set out in Annex 2 Table 1 Visual Sensitivity and Typical Descriptors. The Applicant carried out a sensitivity test as provided in Appendix 4.5 DMRB Sensitivity Test [APP-197], which concluded that</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>adopting the LA107 methodology would not change the overall findings of the assessment.</p> <p>3. In line with IAN 135/10 the approach to landscape sensitivity is primarily focused on quality and value, alongside the capacity of the landscape features to be substituted or replaced. Nevertheless, the Applicant has provided an indication of the susceptibility within the assessment, and the approach to incorporating susceptibility into the assessment has been outlined in paragraph 7.4.36 – 7.4.37 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-045] and 7.3.35 – 7.3.36 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045]. Susceptibility for the landscape character areas is identified, alongside quality and value in Table 7-1 – Appendix 7.3: Landscape Effects Schedule Part B [APP-288]. Nevertheless, the emphasis remains on quality and value in determining landscape sensitivity, as these are the primary considerations in undertaking an assessment in line with IAN 135/10.</p> <p>4. The identified effects on landscape character have considered the effect of the Scheme, within the context of the defined character areas, in line with guidance provided in IAN 135/10. The assessment of landscape character effects for Part B are outlined in Appendix 7.3 Landscape Effects Schedule Part B [APP-288]. The Applicant considers that these are proportionate in the level of detail provided against the nature of the proposals. This is particularly relevant for Part B as an online widening, whereby the existing A1 is an existing feature of the landscape.</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. The Applicant does not agree that the impact on communities have not been assessed fully or scoped out of the assessment. The Population and Human Health assessment was completed in accordance with DMRB guidance and in line with the Scoping Opinion Part A [APP-340] and Part B [APP-341]. The Applicant considers that the scope of the assessment was appropriate for the nature of the type and location of the Scheme. Assessment of the economic benefits to the tourism industry is not a requirement of a Population and Human Health assessment in accordance with DMRB guidance, and therefore is not reported in the Population and Human Health assessment, The scope of the assessment of impacts on communities, the economy and employment is detailed below.</p> <p>2. The Population and Human Health chapters (Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054] and Part B [APP-055]) have assessed the impact on communities (from community severance and journey amenity for walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH)), on physical assets and land use (on private, commercial, community and recreational property and facilities) in accordance with DMRB guidance (formerly Volume 11 Section 3 Part 6: Land Use, Part 8: Pedestrians, Equestrians, Cyclists and Community Effects, and Part 9: Vehicle Travellers, which is now superseded by LA 112: Population and Human Health).</p> <p>3. Assessment of the impact on the economy and employment (from indirect and induced employment, during construction only) is not required under DMRB guidance, but this was also included in the assessment due to the potential for significant effects on the economy from direct and indirect employment during construction, and to comply with Planning Policy Guidance.</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>4. It was agreed within the Scoping Opinion Part A [APP-340] and Part B [APP-341]) that effects on economy and employment during operation are not likely to be significant and assessment was therefore scoped of the assessments of the Scheme. The Economic Case for the Scheme is also presented in the Case for the Scheme [APP-344], and provides details of the anticipated monetised benefits of the Scheme.</p> <p>5. Impacts on WCH and communities within an appropriate study area have been assessed. Some identified receptors (for example holiday accommodation, a museum, recreational assets and cafes), within this assessment are likely to contribute to the local tourism economy. These have been assessed as appropriate as either a commercial, recreational or community receptor. The majority of these facilities are not directly affected by the Scheme, and impact is limited to disruption of access during the construction period. One temporary significant adverse effect is anticipated for users of the River Coquet, as outlined in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054]. Further details are provided in section 12.10 for both Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054] and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part B [APP-055]. Additionally, the Scheme has sought to include facilities to encourage walking and cycling where possible including the provision of grade-separated crossings of the A1 to ensure safety of WCH.</p>
	1.1.65 We are considering the statements made in relation to drainage and will comment upon these once confirmed.	1. It is noted that NCC are considering the terms of the statements in relation to drainage.
REP1-064 Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations	1.5 Non-Statutory Organisations	
	Table 1-11 - Northumberland Estates – RR-011 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).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant accepts that the Scheme may result in the sterilisation of some mineral resource. 2. Emerging Local Plan Policy MIN 4 sets out NCC's policy towards safeguarding mineral resources. Recognising that non minerals development may result in the sterilisation of safeguarded minerals, this policy sets out the circumstances in which this will be allowed to happen. 3. These circumstances include where the overall social and economic benefits of a proposed development clearly outweigh any sterilisation of mineral resource. 4. The Applicant considers that the social and economic benefits of the Scheme, identified in the Case for the Scheme [APP-344], clearly outweigh any sterilisation of mineral resources, and as such the Scheme is considered to be consistent with emerging Local Plan Policy MIN 4.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant notes that Paragraph 5.32 of the LIR [REP1-071] confirms that the available employment land to serve Alwick and its surroundings is allocated through Policy E2 of the Alwick and Denwick Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites allocated through Policy E2 will be occupied by the Lionheart Enterprise Park Compound. This summary is accepted by the Applicant. 2. The Applicant notes the discussion of the impacts of the Scheme on the Lionheart Enterprise Park at paragraph 5.34 – 5.36 of the LIR [REP1-071], and that NCC concludes at Paragraph 5.35 of the LIR that these impacts: 'can be accepted in principle' and that the Scheme is compatible with Alwick Core Strategy Policy S9 (Paragraph 5.36). 3. The Applicant also reiterates that the ES was undertaken on a worst case basis for land take within the Lionheart Enterprise Park, and that that the Applicant has confirmed to the landowner (as stated in Table GEN1.34 of the Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions [REP1-032] to occupy 40,000m² of the plot.
<p>REP1-064</p> <p>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations</p>	<p>1.6 Members of the Public and Business</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is noted that NCC supports the Scheme. In relation to emissions, and as detailed in the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3), measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions during design and construction would be adopted. These include measures such as re-use of existing structures, selection of sustainable and low carbon options where feasible, use of pre-fabricated elements, incorporation of material resource efficiency and waste minimisation through implementation of a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and Materials Management Plan (MMP). 2. The Applicant's supply chain is responsible for providing monthly or quarterly carbon data returns using the Highways England Carbon Tool. As such, during the construction phase, data would be collected for materials and fuel / electricity consumption, which would enable embedded Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and emissions from energy to be monitored. Any noteworthy increases in GHG emissions associated with the outturn data in comparison with the GHG emissions estimates reported in Chapter 14: Climate Part A [APP-058] and Chapter 14: Climate Part B [APP-059] would be managed and mitigated accordingly through measures outlined in the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3).

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant acknowledges the Woodland Trust's emphasis on the irreplaceability of ancient woodland and has continued to appreciate and consider their position on this whilst formulating the Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247]. 2. The Applicant has considered their call for a much greater ratio of compensatory planting. However, the Applicant considers the ratio that has been proposed (12:1; creation:loss) to be appropriate for the Scheme. The Applicant concurs that there is no set ratio or policy for compensating for an irreplaceable habitat. This ratio has been identified and agreed in consultation with Natural England, as detailed within Natural England's response to BIO.1.5 and BIO.1.28 of the Examining Authority's first written questions [REP2-020]. As stated by Natural England, "the provision of a compensation ratio for the loss of Ancient woodland of 12:1 (planting to loss) was the result of detailed negotiation with [the Applicant] in 2018. The figure was a negotiated metric based on site specific factors such as proximity to the existing semi-natural woodland /site of special scientific interest and desired planting type." 3. Regarding emerging Local Plan Policy ENV 1 and ENV 2 and irreplaceable habitats, the Applicant has provided a response above within the response to item 'BIO1.4 REP1-032'. 4. Emerging Policy ENV 2 also details "securing net biodiversity gains and/or wider ecological enhancements through new development." 5. Net gains are identified as a result of a quantitative assessment. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) there is no legal requirement to achieve no net loss or net gains for biodiversity. Nevertheless, the Applicant has completed a Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report for the Scheme [REP2-009] in response to the Highways England Biodiversity Action Plan and national and local policies and strategies, such as the Road Improvement Strategy 2 (RIS2) and the National Planning Statement for National Networks (NPS NN). Net gain cannot be claimed for the Scheme as a whole due to the loss the ancient woodland associated with Part A, an irreplaceable habitat. However, the Scheme contributes to net gains for biodiversity (outside of ancient woodland) by achieving a net gain for priority habitat woodland and wetlands (see Biodiversity No Net Loss for the Scheme [REP2-009]). 6. Regarding securing ecological enhancement, the Scheme proposes opportunities for biodiversity (ecological) enhancement as required by Policy ENV2; see paragraph 9.9.11 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A [APP-048] and paragraph 9.9.9 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part B [APP-049]. The Applicant has committed to develop a strategy of biodiversity enhancement, based on the opportunities identified within paragraph 9.9.11 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A [APP-048] and 9.9.9 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part B [APP-049]. The strategy will be developed in consultation with relevant

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>stakeholders. This is identified in S-B20 of the updated Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3).</p> <p>7. The Applicant concurs with the Council's statement that there are exceptional circumstances (as detailed in the Applicant's response to BIO.1.7, Table 1.1 [REP2-020]) 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 amenity, (in accordance with emerging Local Plan Policy QOP 2).</p>	<p>1. As stated in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-064], Table 1-42, The Applicant does not accept that the Scheme will have an unacceptable adverse effect on the Hawes's property, and therefore it's residential amenity. The Applicant considers that the Scheme incorporates all the measures that are reasonably required to minimise and mitigate the impacts of the Scheme of residential amenity, including at Northgate Farm. It is noted that NCC has not set out any specific additional measures which it considers are necessary at Northgate Farm although the Applicant is willing to give consideration to any proportionate measures that arise through the DCO process.</p>
<p>BIO.1.7 REP1-074</p> <p>Environment Agency Deadline 1 Submission - Responses to The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) issued on 19 November 2020</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant notes the correction to policies quoted by the Environment Agency relating to net gains for biodiversity, and reiterates that there is no legal requirement for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), such as the Scheme, to achieve no net loss or net gains in biodiversity</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/

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

Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email

psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

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

If you have any enquiries about this document
A1inNorthumberland@highwaysengland.co.uk

or call **0300 470 4580***.