

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

**Scheme Number: TR010059**

## **7.15 Applicant's Responses to Written Representations**

Rule 8(1)(c)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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 Responses to Written Representations**

---

<b>Rule Reference:</b>	8(1)(c)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:</b>	TR010059
<b>Document Reference:</b>	7.15
<b>Author:</b>	A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham Project Team, Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 0	February 2021	Deadline 3

# CONTENTS

---

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

---

### **1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT 1**

---

#### ***TABLES***

Table 1-1 – Historic England	2
Table 1-2 – Natural England	2
Table 1-3 – National Grid Gas	7
Table 1-4 – Royal Mail	10
Table 1-5 – Colin Moor and Gareth Moor	15
Table 1-6 – Mark Hawes	27
Table 1-7 – Brockthorpe Consultancy	54

---

# 1 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

---

## 1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

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

**Table 1-1 – Historic England**

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	This scheme has been the subject of extensive, and positive, discussions between Historic England and Highways England and their consultants at pre-application stage.	1. The Applicant welcomes the positive discussions with Historic England.
	This process allowed the scheme to be developed in a way that largely avoids harm to those elements of the Historic Environment where Historic England has a statutory remit. Where we do not have such a remit, we have deferred to the specialist conservation and archaeology advisors at Northumberland County Council, whose local experience and knowledge best equips them to provide expert comment.	1. The Applicant's responses to Northumberland Country Council's submissions with respect to Cultural Heritage can be found in the responses to the Local Impact Report (document reference 7.14) submitted at Deadline 3.
	For assets within our statutory remit, we believe that direct harmful impacts will be avoided or, in the case of listed milestones to be moved, this impact can be addressed by their relocation. Further, although the development will change the appearance of this part of Northumberland to a degree and be visible from a number of heritage assets within our remit, the degree of change and the current context of a major A road means that this change would not be harmful to the settings of these assets.	1. The Applicant notes that Historic England agrees that direct harmful impacts would be avoided or addressed and that the change resulting from the Scheme would not be harmful to setting.
	The remaining issue for us, discussed above, was to ensure that the DCO boundary did not include any part of the two scheduled monuments (NHL 1018499 and NHL1018348) which lie close to or adjacent to this boundary. The further information submitted by the applicant confirms this to be the case, and that no part of the DCO area intrudes into these scheduled monuments. This is welcomed.	1. The Applicant confirms that the Order limits do not extend into the scheduled monuments and notes that Historic England agrees with this position.
	This advice is clearly given in relation to the application as it has been submitted. We do understand that there may be changes or additions proposed to this, potentially connected with drainage issues. We are, of course, happy to discuss any such proposal, and to provide further advice to the ExA on them.	1. Discussions relating to the proposed changes described in the Summary of Proposed Changes to Application [PDA-003] submitted at Procedural Deadline A are ongoing between Historic England and the Applicant.

**Table 1-2 – Natural England**

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
1.1	Natural England's advice in these relevant representations is based on information submitted by Highways England in support of its application for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') in relation to A1 in Northumberland – Morpeth to Ellingham (the project). (update Draft DCO January 2021).	1. The Applicant notes that Natural England's written representation [REP2-029] remains similar to their initial Relevant Representation [RR-008]. The Applicant provided responses to Natural England's Relevant Representation at Deadline 1 [REP1-064] and has expanded on these responses, as necessary, below.
1.2	Natural England's advice in these relevant representations is based on information submitted by Highways England in support of its application for a Development	1. The Applicant is continuing to engage with Natural England. A further version of the draft Statement of Common Ground with Natural England [REP1-029] is submitted at Deadline 3.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>Consent Order ('DCO') in relation to A1 in Northumberland – Morpeth to Ellingham (the project). (update Draft DCO January 2021). impacts on the SSSI from the construction of the southern pier. Discussions have also taken place regarding protected species impacts, and the information required to enable Letters of No Impediment to be issued. Progress has been made on a Statement of Common Ground for Part A of the project. Further work is required to agree a Statement of Common Ground for Part B.</p>	
1.3	<p>These relevant representations contain a summary of what Natural England considers the main nature conservation issues<sup>1</sup> to be in relation to the DCO application and indicate the principal submissions that it wishes to make at this point. Natural England will develop these points further as appropriate during the examination process. It may have further or additional points to make, particularly if further information about the project becomes available</p>	1. Noted.
1.4	<p>Part I of these representations provides an overview of the issues and a summary of Natural England's advice. Section 2 identifies the natural features relevant to this application. Section 3 summarises Natural England's overall view of the application and the main issues which it considers need to be addressed by the Secretary of State.</p>	1. Noted.
1.5	<p>Part II of these representations sets out all the significant issues which remain outstanding, and which Natural England advises should be addressed by Highways England and the Examining Authority as part of the examination process in order to ensure that the project can properly be consented. These are primarily issues on which further information would be required in order to allow the Examining Authority properly to undertake its task or where further work is required to agree on the potential impacts of the development on designated sites and to provide a sufficient degree of confidence as to their efficacy.</p>	1. Noted.
1.6	<p>Natural England will continue discussions with Highways England to seek to resolve these concerns and agree outstanding matters in a statement of common ground. Failing satisfactory agreement, Natural England advises that the matters set out in sections 4 to 7 will require consideration by the Examining Authority as part of the examination process.</p>	1. The Applicant welcomes further discussions with Natural England to resolve any concerns and agree outstanding matters. A further version of the draft Statement of Common Ground with Natural England [REP1-029] is submitted at Deadline 3.
1.7	<p>The Examining Authority may wish to ensure that the matters set out in these relevant representations are addressed as part of the Examining Authority's first set of questions to ensure the provision of information early in the examination process.</p>	1. Noted.
<b>2</b>	<b>The natural features potentially affected by this application</b>	
2.1	The designated sites relevant to this application are:	

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
2.1.1	The River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	1. The Applicant agrees with the statement made by Natural England.
2.2	The following European and Nationally protected species may be affected by the proposed project: Bats – Common pipistrelle; Soprano pipistrelle, Noctule and Natterer's; Great Crested Newts; Badgers.	1. The Applicant agrees with the list of European (Internationally) and Nationally protected species that may be affected by the Scheme, as stated by Natural England.
2.3	The following areas of non-designated but valuable and sensitive habitat are affected: – Ancient semi- natural woodland; – Lowland meadows; – Ponds; – Lowland mixed deciduous woodland; – Hedgerows; – Rivers, and – Arable field margins, all of which are habitats of principle importance.	1. The Applicant agrees with the list of sensitive habitats that may be affected by the Scheme, as stated by Natural England.
2.4.1	The main issues raised by this application are: The proposal will result in the loss of SSSI habitat from the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI as a result of the new bridge to be constructed – these impacts will be both temporary during construction, and permanent from the presence of new infrastructure, and increased shadowing of vegetation. This will include the loss of irreplaceable ancient semi-natural woodland from within the SSSI;	1. This is agreed by the Applicant. Further details regarding the loss of ancient woodland habitat from within the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI is presented below in relation to item 3.2.2.
2.4.2	The proposal will result in the permanent loss of Habitats of Principal Importance including lowland mixed deciduous woodland, lowland meadows, hedgerows, ponds, rivers and arable field margins;	1. This is agreed by the Applicant.
2.4.3	The proposals will directly and indirectly impact habitats and structures that support European and nationally protected species.	1. This is agreed by the Applicant.
<b>3</b>	<b>Planning Inspectorate Reference: TR010059</b>	
3.1	a) Natural England's advice is that in relation to identified nature conservation issues within its remit there is no fundamental reason of principle why the project should not be permitted but further discussions with Highways England and their consultants in	1. As stated within the Applicant's response to statement 'a' at Deadline 1 [REP1-064], the Applicant and Natural England continue to discuss the impacts of the Scheme on these receptors and the Applicant notes that Natural England does not consider there to be a reason of principle why the Scheme should not receive development consent. 2. Regarding statement 'b', this is noted by the Applicant.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>relation to the air quality impact assessment on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI are required.</p> <p>b) It should be noted that should further alterations to the development be proposed, Natural England reserve the right to change this view should this be the case.</p>	
3.2	Natural England's headline points are that on the basis of the information submitted:	
3.2.1	Natural England is satisfied that the proposal will not be likely to have a significant effect on European designated sites, as we have confirmed directly with the applicants and their consultants previously and included as Appendices C and F of the submitted Habitats Regulations Assessment. This was subsequently confirmed again in our response to the Examiner's first round of questions, which was submitted on 12 January 2021	1. The Applicant notes that Natural England is satisfied with the impact assessment in relation to European designated sites, which is also captured within the draft Statement of Common Ground with Natural England [REP1-029].
3.2.2	Natural England is satisfied that while the proposals will directly impact on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest both permanently and temporarily, acceptable compensation for the loss of irreplaceable habitats has been identified and will be delivered through the scheme.	1. The Applicant notes that Natural England is satisfied with the impact assessment for the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI and the compensation afforded within the Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247].
3.2.3	Natural England is also satisfied that impacts on protected species have been identified, and sufficient information which has enabled Letters of No Impediment to be issued.	1. The Applicant notes that Natural England is satisfied with the impact assessment for protected species. The Applicant and Natural England continue to discuss the update of Letters of No Impediment regarding the correction of the Scheme name. The Applicant has sought from Natural England a timeline for the matter to be resolved.
3.2.4	Natural England and Highways England do not agree on the approach to air quality assessment detailed in the updated DMRB, and so will continue discussions to reach agreement on the air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI.	1. Discussions between Natural England and the Applicant to reach agreement on the air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI as a result of the DMRB sensitivity test are ongoing. Engagement and subsequent agreement will be documented within the Statement of Common Ground.
3.2.5	Natural England advises that, if approved, the project must be subject to all necessary and appropriate requirements which ensure that unacceptable environmental impacts either do not occur or are significantly mitigated.	1. Mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of the Scheme are secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [REP1-023 and 034] (and as updated at Deadline 3) and the Requirements outlined Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP2-004 and 005]. The Applicant also acknowledges the statement made by Natural England (item 6.2 below) confirming their satisfaction that the requirements of the DCO will ensure that habitats and species are given due consideration during works, and that appropriate measures are in place to ensure no harm or damage to protected sites and species occurs.
3.3	Natural England's advice is that the potential impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI from air quality as a result of increased traffic movement require further discussion during the Examination process with Highways England and their consultants. These impacts require agreement before	1. Whilst the Applicant and Natural England continue to discuss the impacts of the Scheme on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI as a result of operational air quality, the Applicant notes that Natural England does not consider there to be a reason of principle why the Scheme should not receive development consent (as detailed at 3.1(a), above). The Applicant agrees that this matter is capable of being overcome.



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	development consent can be granted. However, Natural England's advice is that this matter is capable of being overcome.	
3.4	Natural England is satisfied that all other environmental impacts arising from the proposal have been adequately identified and suitable mitigation and compensation identified to minimise these impacts as far as possible.	1. This is noted by the Applicant.
<b>4</b>	<b>Further details about the project in order to enable assessment</b>	
4.1	Natural England intends to continue discussions with Highways England to reach agreement on the approach to air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI, and to agree a Statement of Common Ground for Part B of the Scheme.	1. The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England to discuss and seek agreement for the approach to air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI (DMRB sensitivity) and to agree a Statement of Common Ground for the Scheme.
4.2	Natural England are aware that potential changes have been submitted and have concerns about the impact on the SSSI should they be accepted. Natural England reserve the right to provide further comments and change our view in light of this.	1. The Applicant confirms that discussions with Natural England are ongoing regarding Natural England's concerns about the impact on the SSSI relating to the proposed changes issued to the Examining Authority in December 2020 [AS-018].
<b>5</b>	<b>Matters that must be secured by requirements in the DCO</b>	
5.1	The DCO must ensure that a detailed CEMP, which includes all necessary mitigation and compensation measures is completed and agreed prior to works starting.	1. The Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) collates mitigation and compensation developed to date. Paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 to the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] states that " <i>No part of the authorised development is to commence until a CEMP, substantially in accordance with the outline CEMP, for that part has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority to the extent that it relates to matters relevant to its function.</i> " This addresses Natural England's request.
<b>6</b>	<b>Comments on the draft DCO</b>	
6.1	Natural England notes the updated draft DCO now correctly references the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).	1. This is noted by the Applicant.
6.2	Natural England is satisfied that the requirements of the DCO will ensure that habitats and species are given due consideration during works, and that appropriate measures are in place to ensure no harm or damage to protected sites and species occurs.	1. This is noted by the Applicant.

**Table 1-3 – National Grid Gas**

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	
1.1	National Grid Plc made a relevant representation in this matter on 27 October 2020 in order to protect apparatus owned by National Grid Gas Plc ("NGG").	1. The Applicant's response to NGG's relevant representation was submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-064].
1.2	NGG does not object in principle to the development proposed by Highways England (the "Promoter") and as defined as the "Authorised Development" in the draft Development Consent Order (the "Draft Order").	1. The Applicant notes that NGG does not object in principle to the Scheme.
1.3	NGG does however, object to the Authorised Development being carried out in close proximity to its apparatus in the area unless and until suitable protective provisions and related agreements have been secured to their satisfaction, to which see further at Paragraph 5.	1. The Applicant notes that removal of NGG's objection is subject to protective provisions and related agreements being secured. 2. As recorded in the draft statement of common ground with NGG submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-013], the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] includes protective provisions for gas undertakers in Part 1 of Schedule 10. The Applicant is also working with NGG to reach agreement on protective provisions and will submit progress of this throughout the Examination.
1.4	NGG also objects to any compulsory acquisition powers for land or rights or other related powers to acquire land temporarily, override or otherwise interfere with easements or rights or stop up public or private rights of access being invoked which would affect its land interests, rights, apparatus, or right to access and maintain its apparatus. This is unless and until suitable protective provisions and any other necessary and related amendments have been agreed and included in the Draft Order.	1. The Applicant notes that removal of NGG's objection is subject to protective provisions and related agreements being secured. 2. Please see 1.3, above, in relation to protective provisions. 3. NGG's affected land interests, rights and apparatus are limited to the High Pressure Gas Transmission Pipeline (Feeder 13) at Causey Park. The works to this apparatus form part of the advance works referred to at paragraphs 2.5.172-178 of Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-037] and shown in Appendix 2.2: Technical Drawings [APP-188]. These works have been completed and NGG are currently agreeing revised land rights with the landowner.
1.5	NGG owns, manages and operates the national gas transmission infrastructure in Great Britain. NGG has a statutory duty (under Section 9 of the Gas Act 1986) to develop, maintain, and operate economic and efficient networks and to facilitate competition in the supply of gas in Great Britain.	1. No response required.
<b>2</b>	<b>NGG Assets</b>	
2.1	NGG owns and operates a High Pressure Gas Transmission Pipeline (Feeder 13) and associated apparatus ("Feeder 13") which is located within the current Order Limits.	1. The Applicant can confirm that Gas Feeder Pipeline No.13 is located within the Order limits, as described at Work No 12a in the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005]. As detailed at 1.4, above, this gas main, located at Causey Park, has now been diverted to accommodate the Scheme.
2.2	In respect of Feeder 13 (and any other NGG infrastructure located within the current Order Limits, or in close proximity to the Authorised Development and associated works), NGG will require protective provisions to be put in place to ensure:	1. The dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] includes protective provisions for gas undertakers in Part 1 of Schedule 10. The protective provisions within the dDCO of relevance to the points raised by NGG are outlined under 2.2a and 2.2b, below. 2. Nonetheless, the Applicant is also working with NGG to reach agreement on any necessary additional or alternative protective provisions and will submit updates on progress of this throughout the Examination.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
2.2a	that all NGG interests and rights, including rights of access to Feeder 13, are unaffected by the powers of compulsory acquisition, temporary possession, and the grant and/or extinguishment of rights as set out in the Draft Order; and	1. Paragraph 6 of Schedule 10 to the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] provides that apparatus may not be acquired other than by agreement. Further, paragraph 9 would require the submission to NGG of a plan of any works in, on or under any land purchased, held, appropriated or used under the Scheme that are near to, or will or may affect, any apparatus. Following submission of such a plan NGG would be able to seek the inclusion of reasonable requirements for the alteration or otherwise for the protection of the apparatus, or for securing access to it.
2.2b	that appropriate protection for Feeder 13 and any other retained apparatus is maintained during and after construction of the Authorised Development in accordance with both the Protective Provisions and the relevant safety standards as set out in Paragraphs 3 and 5.	1. As detailed above, paragraph 9 of Schedule 10 to the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] would require the submission to NGG of a plan of any works in, on or under any land purchased, held, appropriated or used under the Scheme that are near to, or will or may affect, any apparatus. Following submission of such a plan NGG would be able to request reasonable requirements for the alteration or otherwise for the protection of the apparatus, or for securing access to it.
<b>3</b>	<b>NGG Regulatory Protection Framework</b>	
3.1	Relevant guidance in respect of standards and protocols for working in the vicinity of high pressure gas pipelines applies in the form of National Grid Guidance for Safe Working in the vicinity of High Pressure Pipelines T/SP/SSW/22 which is aimed at parties carrying out work in the vicinity of high pressure gas pipelines and associated installations and is provided to ensure that those planning and undertaking work take appropriate measures to prevent damage.	1. All works completed in the advance diversion of the High Pressure Gas Transmission Pipeline (Feeder 13) at Causey Park have been carried out by NGG through their own appointed contractor and have been carried out in compliance with National Grid Guidance for Safe Working in the vicinity of High Pressure Pipelines T/SP/SSW/22. The DIP contractor has also been issued with this document to allow future compliance and is already in dialogue with NGG as the detailed design for Part A is developed.
3.2	The requirements in T/SP/SSW/22 are also in line with the IGE (Institution of Gas Engineers) recommendations in IGE/SE/18 Edition 2 – Safe Working Practices to Ensure the Integrity of Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations and HSE's guidance document HS (G) 47 Avoiding Danger from Underground Services.	1. All works completed in the advance diversion of the High Pressure Gas Transmission Pipeline (Feeder 13) at Causey Park have been carried out by NGG through their own appointed contractor and have been carried out in compliance with National Grid Guidance for Safe Working in the vicinity of High Pressure Pipelines T/SP/SSW/22 and with the IGE (Institution of Gas Engineers) recommendations in IGE/SE/18 Edition 2 – Safe Working Practices to Ensure the Integrity of Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations and HSE's guidance document HS (G) 47 Avoiding Danger from Underground Services. The DIP contractor has also been issued with this former document to allow future compliance and is already in dialogue with NGG as the detailed design for Part A is developed.
3.3	NGG requires specific protective provisions to be put in place to provide for an appropriate level of control and protection for all retained assets (including Feeder 13) and assurance that industry standards will be complied with in connection with works to and in the vicinity of the same.	1. As detailed above, paragraph 9 of Schedule 10 to the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] would require the submission to NGG of a plan of any works in, on or under any land purchased, held, appropriated or used under the Scheme that are near to, or will or may affect, any apparatus. Following submission of such a plan NGG would be able to seek the inclusion of reasonable requirements for the alteration or otherwise for the protection of the apparatus, or for securing access to it. 2. Should NGG seek additional and specific provisions, the Applicant will consider its proposals.
<b>4</b>	<b>Property Issues</b>	

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
4.1	NGG asserts that maintaining appropriate property rights to support its assets and protecting these from compulsory acquisition and related powers in the Draft Order is a fundamental safety issue.	1. The dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] includes protective provisions for gas undertakers in Part 1 of Schedule 10. The Applicant is also working with NGG to reach agreement on protective provisions and will submit progress of this throughout the Examination. The protective provisions addressing the points referred to by NGG are addressed under section 5, below, and address the points raised by NGG under 4.2.
4.2	Insufficient property rights would have the following safety implications:	
4.2a	inability for qualified personnel to access apparatus for its maintenance, repair and inspection;	
4.2b	risk of strike to buried assets if development occurs within the easement zone which seeks to protect the such buried assets; and	
4.3c	risk of inappropriate development within the vicinity of the assets, thereby increasing the risk of damage to the asset and to the integrity of the gas transmission network.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Protective Provisions</b>	
5.1	NGG seeks to protect its statutory undertaking, and insists that in respect of connections and work in close proximity to its apparatus (including Feeder 13) as part of the Authorised Development the following procedures are complied with by the Promoter:	1. The dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] includes protective provisions for gas undertakers in Part 1 of Schedule 10. The protective provisions within the dDCO of relevance to the points raised by NGG are outlined below. 2. Nonetheless, the Applicant is also working with NGG to reach agreement on protective provisions and will submit progress of this throughout the Examination.
5.1a	NGG is in control of the plans, methodology and specification for works within 15 metres of any retained Apparatus;	1. As detailed above, paragraph 9 of Schedule 10 to the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] would require the submission to NGG of a plan of any works in, on or under any land purchased, held, appropriated or used under the Scheme that are near to, or will or may affect, any apparatus. Following submission of such a plan NGG would be able to seek the inclusion of reasonable requirements for the alteration or otherwise for the protection of the apparatus, or for securing access to it.
5.1b	works within the vicinity of NGG's apparatus are not authorised or commenced unless protective provisions are in place preventing compulsory acquisition of NGG's land or rights or the overriding or interference of the same. Any acquisition of rights must be subject to NGG's existing interests and rights and not contradict with or cut across such rights; and	1. Paragraph 6 of Schedule 10 to the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] provides that apparatus may not be acquired other than by agreement. Further, paragraph 9 would require the submission to NGG of a plan of any works in, on or under any land purchased, held, appropriated or used under the Scheme that are near to, or will or may affect, any apparatus. Following submission of such a plan NGG would be able to seek the inclusions of reasonable requirements for the alteration or otherwise for the protection of the apparatus, or for securing access to it.
5.1c	appropriate surety and insurance provisions are in place to back up an uncapped indemnity to protect NGG from any damage, losses or claims arising from the Authorised Development.	1. Paragraph 10 of Schedule 10 to the dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] provides (subject to the detailed provisions of that paragraph) for the payment by the Applicant of expenses incurred in, or in connection with, the inspection, removal, alteration or protection of apparatus. Further paragraph 11 includes (subject to the detailed provisions of that paragraph) an indemnity in relation to any

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		damage caused to any apparatus or alternative apparatus or property of a utility undertaker, or any interruption in any service provided, or in the supply of any goods.
5.2	Despite preliminary discussions with the Promoter relating to the same, the Draft Order does not yet contain agreed protective provisions expressed to be for the protection of NGG to NGG's satisfaction, making it currently deficient from NGG's perspective.	1. The dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] includes protective provisions for gas undertakers in Part 1 of Schedule 10. The Applicant is also working with NGG to reach agreement on protective provisions and will submit updates on progress of this throughout the Examination.
5.3	Should it not be possible to reach agreement with the Promoter, NGG reserves the right to attend a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing or Issue Specific Hearing to address the required format of the Protective Provisions and any necessary amendments to the Draft Order.	1. The Applicant notes that NGG reserves the right to attend a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing or Issue Specific Hearing. However, the Applicant is working with NGG to reach agreement on protective provisions and will submit progress of this throughout the Examination.
5.4	If this is necessary NGG reserves the right to provide the Examining Authority with further written information in advance in support of any detailed issues remaining in dispute between the parties at that stage.	1. The Applicant will continue to engage with NGG throughout the Examination and will provide responses to any further formal submissions provided to the Examining Authority by NGG.

**Table 1-4 – Royal Mail**

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	
	Royal Mail supports this road upgrade scheme which, once complete, will be beneficial to Royal Mail and other major road users.	1. The Applicant notes that Royal Mail are supportive of the Scheme and confirms that the Scheme will result in benefits to users including reduced travel duration.
	However, Royal Mail is concerned about the scheme's potential construction phase impacts on its road based operations which could interfere with Royal Mail's ability to meet its service delivery targets as a provider of the Universal Postal Service under the Postal Services Act 2011 and possibly result in financial penalties.	1. The Applicant does not believe that the operation of Royal Mail's service will be adversely affected by construction of the Scheme and therefore do not agree with Royal Mail's position on this matter.
	In order to address this risk, Royal Mail requested in its Relevant Representation at Interested Party registration on 30 October 2020 that: "The DCO includes specific requirements that during the construction phase Royal Mail is consulted by Highways England or its contractors at least one month in advance on any proposed road closures / diversions / alternative access arrangements, hours of working, and the content of the final CTMP, and	1. The final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is secured by the CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] at Section 1.2. The revision of the Outline CTMP [REP1-025 and 026] submitted at Deadline 3 will include the commitment for the Applicant to liaise with Royal Mail at least two weeks in advance of key phases in the traffic management. This approach has been found to be acceptable on other schemes.
	The final CTMP includes a mechanism to inform major road users (including Royal Mail) about works affecting the local highways network (with particular regard to Royal Mail's distribution facilities near the DCO application boundary)."	1. The revision of the Outline CTMP [REP1-025 and 026] submitted at Deadline 3 will also include the commitment for the Applicant to liaise with Royal Mail on aspects of the traffic management regime which may impact their local distribution facilities.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	Advance consultation and notification by Highways England would enable Royal Mail to plan its operations so as to minimise impact on its business and ability to meet its Universal Service Obligations.	1. The Applicant does not believe that the operation of Royal Mail's service or any of its existing sites will be adversely affected by construction or operation of the Scheme, but liaison with Royal Mail will continue. It is noted that Royal Mail has given no indication whatsoever of what impact may actually occur or the likelihood of this occurring.
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Statutory and operational information about Royal Mail</b>	
	Under section 35 of the Postal Services Act 2011 (the "Act"), Royal Mail has been designated by Ofcom as a provider of the Universal Postal Service. Royal Mail is the only such provider in the United Kingdom. The Act provides that Ofcom's primary regulatory duty is to secure the provision of the Universal Postal Service. Ofcom discharges this duty by imposing regulatory conditions on Royal Mail, requiring it to provide the Universal Postal Service.	1. No response required
	The Act includes a set of minimum standards for Universal Service Providers, which Ofcom must secure. The conditions imposed by Ofcom reflect those standards. Royal Mail is under some of the highest specification performance obligations for quality of service in Europe. Its performance of the Universal Service Provider obligations is in the public interest and this should not be affected detrimentally by any statutorily authorised project.	1. No response required
	The Government imposes financial penalties on Royal Mail if its Universal Service Obligation service delivery targets are not met. These penalties relate to time targets for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collections, .</li> <li>• Clearance through plant, and</li> <li>• Delivery.</li> </ul>	1. No response required
	Royal Mail's postal sorting and delivery operations rely heavily on road communications. Royal Mail's ability to provide efficient mail collection, sorting and delivery to the public is sensitive to changes in the capacity of the highway network.	1. No response required
	Royal Mail is a major road user nationally. Disruption to the highway network and traffic delays can have direct consequences on Royal Mail's operations, its ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation and comply with the regulatory regime for postal services thereby presenting a significant risk to Royal Mail's business.	1. The Applicant does not believe that the operation of Royal Mail's service or any of its existing sites will be adversely affected by construction or operation of the Scheme. It is the role of the Applicant to maintain its network and that will take place both during the works and after their completion.
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Relevant Royal Mail Operational Information</b>	
	In exercising its statutory duties Royal Mail vehicles use on a daily basis all of the local roads that may potentially be affected by the construction of this proposed road upgrade to the A1.	1. No response required

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:																																													
	<p>Royal Mail has eight operational facilities within 20 miles of the affected section of the A1:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>BE No.</th> <th>Site Name</th> <th>Street</th> <th>Postcode</th> <th>Distance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2752</td> <td>MORPETH DO</td> <td>18-22 OLDGATE</td> <td>NE61 1AA</td> <td>1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2756</td> <td>ALNWICK DO</td> <td>GREENSFIELD ESTATE</td> <td>NE66 2DD</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2768</td> <td>CRAMLINGTON DO</td> <td>CROWHALL LANE</td> <td>NE23 1DJ</td> <td>9.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2762</td> <td>BLYTH DO</td> <td>21 BRIDGE STREET</td> <td>NE24 1AA</td> <td>11.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2755</td> <td>ASHINGTON DO</td> <td>4 ARMSTRONG WAY</td> <td>NE63 0LA</td> <td>12.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2837</td> <td>GOSFORTH DO</td> <td>JUBILEE ROAD</td> <td>NE3 3UA</td> <td>13.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2769</td> <td>NEWCASTLE DO/OFF/PRO</td> <td>FORTH STREET</td> <td>NE1 1AD</td> <td>15.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2772</td> <td>TYNESIDE MC/RTW/MED/OFF</td> <td>LINDISFARNE HOUSE EARLSWAY</td> <td>NE11 0YY</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	BE No.	Site Name	Street	Postcode	Distance	2752	MORPETH DO	18-22 OLDGATE	NE61 1AA	1.9	2756	ALNWICK DO	GREENSFIELD ESTATE	NE66 2DD	2	2768	CRAMLINGTON DO	CROWHALL LANE	NE23 1DJ	9.4	2762	BLYTH DO	21 BRIDGE STREET	NE24 1AA	11.9	2755	ASHINGTON DO	4 ARMSTRONG WAY	NE63 0LA	12.1	2837	GOSFORTH DO	JUBILEE ROAD	NE3 3UA	13.7	2769	NEWCASTLE DO/OFF/PRO	FORTH STREET	NE1 1AD	15.8	2772	TYNESIDE MC/RTW/MED/OFF	LINDISFARNE HOUSE EARLSWAY	NE11 0YY	20	<p>1. The plan produced clearly indicates the availability of alternative routes to each facility.</p>
BE No.	Site Name	Street	Postcode	Distance																																											
2752	MORPETH DO	18-22 OLDGATE	NE61 1AA	1.9																																											
2756	ALNWICK DO	GREENSFIELD ESTATE	NE66 2DD	2																																											
2768	CRAMLINGTON DO	CROWHALL LANE	NE23 1DJ	9.4																																											
2762	BLYTH DO	21 BRIDGE STREET	NE24 1AA	11.9																																											
2755	ASHINGTON DO	4 ARMSTRONG WAY	NE63 0LA	12.1																																											
2837	GOSFORTH DO	JUBILEE ROAD	NE3 3UA	13.7																																											
2769	NEWCASTLE DO/OFF/PRO	FORTH STREET	NE1 1AD	15.8																																											
2772	TYNESIDE MC/RTW/MED/OFF	LINDISFARNE HOUSE EARLSWAY	NE11 0YY	20																																											

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>The A1 is of high strategic importance to Royal Mail's operations. National, regional and local mail distribution services use it.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The A1 is strategically important to numerous consultees and the consultation commitments provided in the Outline CTMP [REP1-025 and 026] already take account of the importance of the A1 as a major route for organisations like Royal Mail.</li> </ol>
	<p>The location, nature and scale of the proposed works could present risk of construction phase impact / delays to Royal Mail's road based operations on the surrounding road network.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant does not believe that the operation of Royal Mail's service or any of its existing sites will be adversely affected by construction or operation of the Scheme. The proximity of Royal Mail sites to proposed works does not presuppose a material impact or delays.</li> <li>As described in the Case for the Scheme [APP-345], traffic modelling of the construction scenario was undertaken using the SATURN model, in order to calculate the monetised disbenefits associated with delays during the construction works. The model forecasts that the majority of A1 traffic (around 90%) will remain on the A1 during the construction works, with a small forecast increase in traffic flows along the local roads, of typically less than two vehicles per minute.</li> <li>As with all major highway schemes, mitigation has been included which is proportionate to the potential impact resulting from the works. There is nothing unique to the scheme – or Royal Mail - which would necessitate the inclusion of more concentrated measures.</li> </ol>
	<p>The key concerns to Royal Mail's operations will be the impact to collection mail coming from Alnwick DO and Berwick DO (30 miles north of the scheme), en route to Tyneside Mail Centre for processing, as well as potential for impacts on inward mail deliveries from Tyneside to Alnwick DO.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken to forecast the impact of the Scheme as described in sections 4.5 to 4.9 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344]. This includes a forecast of traffic flows and speeds during the construction period. The impact on individual journeys made during the construction period will vary by time of day and depend upon the route taken. However, the modelling forecasts that the increase in delays will be very small across the majority of links in the network, whether on the A1 itself or on the surrounding local road network.</li> </ol>
	<p>Royal Mail's Operational planners have indicated that any traffic delays during the construction of Highways England's proposed upgrade to this section of the A1 have potential to affect Royal Mail services.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant does not believe that the operation of Royal Mail's service or any of its existing sites will be adversely affected by construction or operation of the Scheme.</li> <li>Detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken to forecast the impact of the Scheme as described in sections 4.5 to 4.9 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344]. This includes a forecast of traffic flows and speeds during the construction period. The impact on individual journeys made during the construction period will vary by time of day and depend upon the route taken. However, the modelling forecasts that the increase in journey time due to construction will be around 3 minutes on the journey time between Berwick and Tyneside, which currently takes over an hour. For the journey between Alnwick and Tyneside, there is a forecast increase of around a minute on this journey which typically takes around forty minutes.</li> <li>Royal Mail have not provided any evidence of what these impacts are likely to be and as a result the Applicant cannot compare these findings with its own assessment, which as stated above shows a very small impact. As matters stand, this is an unsupported assertion.</li> </ol>
	<p>Once complete, Highways England's proposed upgrade to the Morpeth to Ellingham section of the A1 will undoubtedly improve traffic conditions on it and the surrounding highway network, so Royal Mail does not wish to prevent it from going ahead. However, Royal Mail wishes to protect of its future ability to provide an efficient mail sorting and delivery service to the public in accordance with its statutory obligations which may potentially be adversely affected by the construction of this proposed scheme.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant notes the response from Royal Mail in respect of maintaining an efficient sorting and delivery service and confirms that the Scheme will result in benefits to users including reduced travel duration. There are no adverse effects identified that will impact on Royal Mail's service as a result of the Scheme.</li> </ol>



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
3.0	<b>Summary of Royal Mail's position at Procedural Deadline 2</b>	
	Royal Mail is seeking to take all reasonable steps to protect its operational interests as a provider of the Universal Postal Service under the Postal Services Act 2011 with the resources that are available to it to do so.	1. No response required
	<p>Royal Mail's preference to provide certainty of advanced consultation and notification of road works affecting the highways network by Highways England is by means of a DCO requirement similar to Schedule 2 paragraph 9 (1) of the 12 November 2020 DCO for A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down:</p> <p>"Traffic management</p> <p>9.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a traffic management plan which makes provision for traffic management proposals required to facilitate the construction of that part and which is substantially in accordance with the OEMP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the local highway authority and the Royal Mail Group Limited."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is entirely disproportionate to the current scheme to seek the inclusion of a requirement in circumstances where the risk and potential for impact has been assessed as being very small, Royal Mail have only indicated that there is the potential for any impact and have not substantiated its position with evidence of its own assessment or had regard to where mitigation will be provided in the Outline CTMP [REP1-025 and 026]. The Applicant will be required to comply with the mitigation secured in the Outline CTMP [REP1-025 and 026] and as such it is inappropriate to seek further commitments by drawing comparisons with other schemes, which reached different conclusions on the level of impact and the extent of mitigation required.</li> <li>2. Notably, the applicant's approach has recently been supported in this region in relation to the A1 Birtley to Coal House Improvement scheme.</li> </ol>
	<p>The two requests made in Royal Mail's Relevant Representation remain unchanged, namely:</p> <p>the DCO includes specific requirements that during the construction phase Royal Mail is consulted by Highways England or its contractors at least one month in advance on any proposed road closures / diversions / alternative access arrangements, hours of working, and the content of the final CTMP, and</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As stated, Royal Mail has failed to demonstrate any material impact as a result of the scheme that is otherwise capable of being managed in the usual way, which the Applicant has already undertaken to comply with. A requirement would be both unnecessary and disproportionate to the extent of potential interruption to Royal Mail's operation.</li> </ol>
	The final CTMP includes a mechanism to inform major road users (including Royal Mail) about works affecting the local highways network (with particular regard to Royal Mail's distribution facilities near the DCO application boundary as identified above).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The revision of the outline CTMP [REP1-025 and 026] as submitted at Deadline 3 will include the commitment as a specific notification.</li> </ol>
	<p>It is relevant to note that, in similar circumstances, amendments to paragraph 2.8.1 of the draft Construction Traffic Management Plan for A1 Birtley to Coal House Improvement Scheme were agreed between Highways England and Royal Mail in June 2020 during the Examination into that DCO application:</p> <p>"Advanced notifications of programmed diversions and closures will be issued to major road users in the vicinity of the scheme including Royal Mail. This will include providing major road users with not less than 7 working days' notice of any road closures, diversions or alternative access arrangements that may affect travel on those routes and (if available) in all cases the agreed hours of working. This will form part of a wider communications plan associated with the scheme. The method of communication will be agreed as part of the final CTMP. Highways England will consult with Royal Mail on the content of the final CTMP."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The revision of the outline CTMP [REP1-025 and 026] as submitted at Deadline 3 will include the commitment. It is also important to note that no requirement was imposed on the A1 Birtley to Coal House Improvement Scheme, which as Royal Mail indicates, were was a scheme with very similar circumstances to the current scheme.</li> <li>2. This further demonstrates the absence of need for any requirement to be imposed since the use of the CTMP is sufficient.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	Following the granting of the DCO for the A1 Birtley to Coal House scheme on 19 January 2021, Royal Mail is awaiting contact from Highways England to finalise the CTMP for this scheme.	1. No response required
	As Royal Mail has finite resources it will not be appearing at the Examination and requests that the Examining Authority relies on this written representation (and Royal Mail's Relevant Representation) for decision making purposes. However, Royal Mail wishes to remain an Interested Party in order that it can have full visibility of the Examination and reserves the right to submit further written representations if considered necessary.	1. No response required
	Should Highways England or the Examining Authority have specific questions arising from this representation then Royal Mail will be pleased to respond in writing.	1. No response required

**Table 1-5 – Colin Moor and Gareth Moor**

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
1.71.1	Point 1 refers to the grounds of the Old Northgate Site which implies that the hospital is no longer in existence or affected by this proposal. This is incorrect as these proposals impact not only on West View in particular but also on the access to the hospital (which is still operational and currently expanding) this road is also access for the residents of the current housing development and the proposed future development.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. West View is a residential development located in the grounds of the old Northgate Hospital site to the east of the A1 at Morpeth. Plots 1/5a and 1/5b on Sheet 1 of Land Plans [APP-006] are required to upgrade the existing road and to also provide access to properties at Warreners House and Northgate Farm.</li> <li>2. The Applicant acknowledges that Northgate Hospital is still operational, the response at paragraph 1.17.1 to Relevant Representations at Deadline 1 [REP1-064] related to the grounds of the hospital and not the hospital itself. The Applicant also acknowledges that the road providing access to West View also provides access to the hospital and the adjacent housing development and confirms that it has taken account of this in the development of the proposals.</li> </ol>
	Point 2 Whilst I have no information as to the developer's intention to upgrade the road to adoptable standards, I have been informed of a conversation between another residents with NCC where NCC have stated they have no intention to adopt this section of road therefore I have no definitive indication of the developers intention and NCC position.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that it has liaised with the developer and the local highway authority. The aspect of future adoption of West View will be subject to a Section 38 as part of the developer's planning application resulting in the eventual adoption of the access to the overall housing development.</li> </ol>
	Point 3 The residents have been told the highway will be widened and footpath will be provided to the West side of the road however the only confirmation of this I can obtain is in the form of a very basic drawing in the housing development planning application, which details the overall width of the proposed highway which when checked against the actual present road indicates that the proposed road and foot path width is the current road plus the width of a standard 2.M footpath.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the current upgrade proposal includes widening the existing carriageway to 5.4m and the addition of a new footway 1.8m wide, along the eastern side, between the carriageway and the existing West View properties. A layby for on street parking has also been provided to the west of the widened West View road. This is shown in the General Arrangement Plans [APP-008] and described in draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] as Work No. 5A.</li> <li>2. The proposed Order limits allow for the design to be further refined at detailed design stage.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>The applicant has stated that they are proposing to undertake these works as part of the application and have further stated they will provide additional parking bays. That been the case then it would appear that the application is to upgrade the existing road to adoptable standard provide a footpath to the western side of the road and install a couple of parking bays, therefore other than increasing the width of the overall carriageway by the inclusion of the footpath the existing road is not intended to be increased in width. I have been unable to find anything within the documentation to indicate an increase to a two carriageway road on West View to accommodate the increase in traffic volume and the size of the Vehicle and type of vehicle using the road. We had been told previously that the road would be widened to two lanes This documentation would suggest it will only be single lane. Please advise what the intention are.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the existing road is proposed to be upgraded to two lanes, by increasing its width to 5.4m. In addition to this, a 1.8m footway is proposed along the eastern side, between the carriageway and the existing West View properties. This is shown in the General Arrangement Plans [APP-008] and described in draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] as Work No. 5A. The proposed design exceeds the guidelines within the "Residential Roads and Footpaths in Northumberland" manual produced by Northumberland County Council for a cul-de-sac serving less than 20 properties.</li> </ol>
	<p>Point 4 I disagree in the strongest possible terms with the statement from H E "that it is incorrect that the proposals do not adhere to the CDM regulations 2015 " Whilst they clearly state the preliminary design of the scheme is in accordance with the CDM regulations they have referred to risk assessments having been undertaken but they have not produced them as part of their evidence to substantiate this statement</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the preliminary design across the Scheme has been undertaken in accordance with the CDM Regulations 2015. The Applicant also confirms that the general principles of prevention as set out in Regulation 11 for the duties of the Principal Designer have been complied with to ensure that, so far as far as is reasonably practicable, the project is carried out without risk to health and safety.</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms that the Construction Phase Plan will be developed as part of detailed design in accordance with Regulation 12 of the CDM Regs 2015 and that this plan will record the arrangements for managing the health and safety risks associated with the construction phase of the project.</li> </ol>
	<p>I have previously explained in depth to HE representatives during the Statutory Consultation 16th April to 14th May 2020 (appendix A) my reasons for stating that they have not complied with the CDM regulation in short, The CDM regulations state that the designers should avoid the risks they have not done so. I contend they have designed risk into this proposal. Likewise, the HSE Risk assessment documentation describes the hierarchy of control and states the first control as Elimination – (redesign the job, or substitute a substance, so a hazard is removed or eliminated.) This has clearly not been done. Had it been executed it would have shown that the by choosing an alternative route as described in (Appendix A) The dangers to the residents in West View During the construction phase and when the road is in use would have been eliminated in this area of the works The Alternative route i have alluded to eliminates the works in West View (Currently a cost bourn by the housing developer not HE) takes away all H E construction works in West View, eliminates additional traffic in particular large farm machinery from West View The hospital main entrance road and away from the increasing number of residents within the complex.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that an alternative off-network access was proposed by the respondent and was considered and discounted by the Applicant.</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms that the alternative to Work No.5A in the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] proposed by the respondent was for a new private means of access (PMA) to Warreners House to be accessed off Hebron Road, to the east of the proposed Highlaws junction. The alternative PMA would follow field boundaries as a southern extension of Work No 8J, avoiding woodland to tie into the northern extent of Work No. 5B. The Applicant confirms that for this alternative the majority of Work No. 5B would still be required to reach Work No. 5C to permit access for all residents at Warreners House and the adjacent agricultural plots.</li> <li>3. The Applicant confirms that the alternative PMA would result in an increase in the overall length of PMA required to provide access to the resident of Warreners House and the adjacent fields. Given that the extent of the construction works required to construct the alternative PMA would therefore be greater and have adverse impacts on biodiversity, heritage, landscape and flooding, the Applicant considers that the alternative PMA would not reduce health and safety risks during construction.</li> <li>4. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme will result in additional traffic using West View but does not accept that the design results in substantial dangers to the residents.</li> <li>5. The Applicant confirms that the alterations to West View will provide a two lane carriageway, nine parking bays and a 1.8m footpath on the east side of the road which provides for separation between vehicles and pedestrians and thereby provides for safe usage during operation.</li> <li>6. The Applicant notes that the agreement between the housing developer and NCC requires that the works to upgrade West View be undertaken regardless of whether the Scheme proceeds or not and therefore the health and safety risks associated with these works will not be</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>increased by these works being undertaken as part of the Scheme. As the Applicant's proposals involve moving the footway to the east and between the houses and the upgraded road the Applicant would contend that this change will improve safety in undertaking these works.</p>
	<p>To summarise the applicant has missed an opportunity to eliminate all of the works associated with West View thus eliminating the dangers during construction and when the proposal would be brought into use.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the alternative PMA would result in an increase in the overall length of PMA required to provide access to the resident of Warreners House and the adjacent fields. Given that the extent of the construction works required to construct the alternative PMA would therefore be greater the Applicant considers that the alternative PMA would not reduce health and safety risks during construction.</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms that the alterations to West View will provide a two lane carriageway, nine parking bays and a 1.8m footpath on the east side of the road which provides for separation between vehicles and pedestrians and thereby provides for safe usage during operation.</li> <li>3. The Applicant notes that the agreement between the housing developer and NCC requires that the works to upgrade West View be undertaken regardless of whether the Scheme proceeds or not and therefore the health and safety risks associated with these works will not be increased by these works being undertaken as part of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
	<p>I cannot agree to the statement that after completion of the scheme there will be no additional dangers because there will only be a small number of additional Vehicles using West View. The reality is that there will be a large increase in volume compared to the present use, at present there are 12 houses in West View with a total of 16 residents cars, I have looked at satellite pictures of the dwellings that are proposed to be using West View and there are some 14 cars on view Whilst I accept that that is just a snap shot in time it is an indication that not counting deliveries etc the traffic level will increase at least some 85%.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that there is a total of seven properties at Warreners House which will utilise West View following completion of the Scheme. The Applicant acknowledges that this will result in an increase in the number of vehicles using West View but this does not mean this increase in use will create additional danger as contended. West View will remain as a cul-de-sac serving fewer than 20 properties and the proposed alterations to West View exceed the minimum design requirements for that category of access road in the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual referenced in response to point 3 above. One of the key purposes for having design guidance for roads is to ensure that they are safe for the intended level of usage. The Applicant therefore considers that the proposed alterations therefore provide for safe usage of West View in operation.</li> </ol>
	<p>The applicant goes on to state During construction , the principal contractor will plan and manage the construction phase in accordance with the CDM regulations and will ensure that the works are carried out without risk to health and safety including the safety of residents.  This Statement to my mind highlights the concerns I have.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that in accordance with Regulation 4 of the CDM Regulations construction works are capable of being and will be carried out, so far as it is reasonably practicable, without risk to the health and safety of any person affected by the project.</li> </ol>
	<p>The whole purpose of the CDM regulations was to place specific duties on all parties within a construction project with a view to ensuring that all parties contribute to delivering a project safely in this case the designers had a golden opportunity to rise to the challenges, comply with his duties under the regulations eliminate or reduce the risks then include the residue risks within the pretender information At present the opportunity to design out substantial dangers not just during the construction phase but during future maintenance, use, of the project and ultimately it end of life removal has been missed It is I consider a breach of duties not to design out risks and pass those residue risks on to the Principal contractor when the designer could and should have eliminated</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme will result in additional traffic using West View but does not accept that the preliminary design results in substantial dangers. As explained above, the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual provides design guidance for roads, taking safety into account.</li> <li>2. The Applicant considers that it has fully complied with the CDM Regulations and confirms that it has appointed the relevant duty holders under the regulations. The Applicant confirms that the preliminary design has been undertaken in accordance with the CDM Regulations, that the proposed alterations to West View demonstrate that due consideration has been given to safety, that the proposed alterations exceed the design requirements for an access road serving 20 properties and that these alterations provide for safe usage of West View in operation.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>them at the design stage. The statement in bold clearly demonstrates that the designer anticipates the principal Contractor to comply with the regulations whilst they do not.</p>	
	<p>I would also add that there has not been a response to my statutory consultation letter referred to above.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that a response was issued to the respondent on 20/05/2020 advising that the points raised would be considered during the detailed design stage (please see Appendix A to this document).</li> </ol>
<p>Ref 1.17.2</p>	<p>Point 1 I have previously brought to the attention of the design team a current concern regarding flooding in the area adjacent to no 11 and 12 West View and have supplied photographs to the designers of previous incidents where flooding from the fields North of West View over spills and runs down like a river past the properties on West View A visual look at the field shows the land falls from the North Southwards and from the East to the West the lowest point been adjacent to no 11&amp;12 West View. The surface water fills up a ditch which is located behind the gas Pumping house and the hedgerow which segregates West View from the fields to the North.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that any drainage affected by the construction works, such as the ditch located behind the pumping house, will be reinstated and adapted to the proposed access track and any damage will be made good. This commitment is set out at A-PH3 c in the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3).</li> <li>2. The proposal to upgrade West View includes upgrading the associated drainage network as required by the increased carriageway area and as confirmed in the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005].The upgraded drainage system would resolve any issues with the existing system in terms of blockages etc. The Applicant confirms that the details of the alterations to the drainage network are to be developed at detailed design.</li> </ol>
	<p>The proposal to open up the area at the point where the pumping station will be removed for the proposed road will then divert the flood water down on to West View.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) (reference S-W5) confirms that the new drainage infrastructure including the new drainage system in West View will be installed to accommodate increased runoff rates and volumes from the increase in impermeable area. Therefore, if water finds its way onto West View the drainage system will be designed to cater for it.</li> </ol>
	<p>My garage door has level access with the road and my front door step is only some 50/70 mm high therefore the proposal increases the risk of my property been flooded. I would add that the first road gully in the road is outside number 9 West View At present after heavy rain the water in the afore mentioned ditch percolates out of the adjacent land on to my drive and on to the road this gradual draining of the land above this can last for several weeks after the rain has occurred therefore the road and my drive is continually wet most of the time and runs water heavily at peak times.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal to upgrade West View includes upgrading the associated drainage network to accommodate increased runoff rates and volumes from the increase in impermeable area. The upgraded system would be free from blockages and other issues which could affect the capacity of the system.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has set out the strategy for the drainage design of the Scheme within Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] of the ES and confirms that highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1-year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change).</li> </ol>
	<p>My concern is not the Hydraulic modelling referred to, it is the fact that a containment area will be breached by this proposal therefore mine and other properties put at increased risk of flooding.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant would refer to the response to Ref 1.17.2 above.</li> <li>2. The Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) (reference S-W5) confirms that the new drainage infrastructure including the new drainage system in West View will be designed and installed to accommodate increased runoff rates and volumes from the increase in impermeable area. Therefore, if water finds its way onto West View the drainage system will be designed to cater for it and there will be no increased risk of flooding to the properties in West View as a result of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
	<p>This problem is well known about by the Hospital estate management team as they have previously attempted to resolve the situation by installing a field drain South of the hedgerow running parallel with the dividing hedgerow between West View and the fields to the North as the fields still collect large quantities of water i can only presume the drain has had little effect.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant would refer to the response to the point above whereby the new drainage infrastructure including the new drainage system in West View will be designed and installed to accommodate increased runoff rates and volumes from the increase in impermeable area. The Applicant confirms that advanced drainage surveys will be undertaken of the existing drainage arrangements prior to undertaking the detailed design as set out in the Outline CEMP [REP1-</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) (reference S-W5) so that issues with the existing drainage can be identified and resolved through the design of the upgraded drainage.
	In conclusion the applicant's response has not answered my concerns.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has set out in the foregoing responses that the drainage system in West View will be upgraded to accommodate increased runoff rates and volumes from the increase in impermeable area and there will be no increased risk of flooding to the properties in West View as a result of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
Ref 1.17.3	<p>Point 1 Acknowledges that there will be a band of trees and hedge row removed but it has to remember that there also will be the removal of the gas pumping station also. Therefore, at the point where the road will enter the fields to the North there are currently 3 layers of noise protection at this point namely the gas pumping station the hedgerow and the trees after the hedgerow.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 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 Construction Environmental Management Plan (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 identify with the Environmental Manager and Contract Manager, the area or feature to be protected within a works plan that would be agreed with the NCC representative.</li> <li>Whilst the presence of vegetation can reduce the perception of noise, by visually screening the source of the noise, vegetation in itself does not substantially reduce physical noise levels themselves. Therefore, whilst limited vegetation loss at the northern end of West View might marginally increase awareness of the source of the noise, the noise levels themselves are not anticipated to substantially change.</li> <li>Noise propagation is dependent on line of sight and so, given the location of the pumping station and its small dimensions, it would only screen a small proportion of the available line of sight to the A1 at this property and would therefore provide minimal screening to noise from the A1. The removal of this structure would not materially influence noise levels predicted at properties on West View.</li> <li>To achieve notable noise reduction from trees and vegetation, they would need to be densely planted and evergreen, and would also need to cover a wide area. The vegetation which would be lost in this locality as a result of the Scheme is considered not to be dense or covering a deep / wide area. Consequently, the removal of vegetation would have little or no effect on noise levels predicted or measured at West View.</li> <li>The Applicant has, within Deadline 1 submission - 6.22 Noise Addendum [REP1-019], predicted the potential impacts resulting from noise associated with the operation of the Scheme. The noise assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are predicted at West View during the operational stage of the Scheme. Therefore, no mitigation applicable to operational road traffic noise has been proposed within the vicinity of West View.</li> </ol>
	To achieve this entrance, all of these three lines of sound defence would have to be removed at the entrance point for the width of the road and working space either side of the road this will provide a significant gap at a point almost touching the A1 and the slip	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The acoustic properties of remaining vegetation are such that noise would pass through the vegetation rather than being channelled around it. A funnelling effect at this opening in vegetation would therefore not occur.</li> </ol>



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	road from the A.697... This opening has the potential to act as a funnelling effect directing the noise down West View	
	I would further add that there appears to be no consideration given to the possible future use of the fields These could be used for cattle which would require a cattle grid at the field entrance to stop wandering cattle or other life stock entering West View this would also be a loud source of noise and vibration in close location to my house.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant is currently unaware of any plans to install a cattle grid on the access road nor of any identified need for one. It is therefore not appropriate at this stage to consider noise or vibration associated with the placing of a cattle grid.</li> <li>2. The Applicant confirms that the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] will further develop action B-PH4(f), as set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments. This will commit to the reinstatement of any farm boundaries such as hedgerows, fences, gates and walls affected during construction to maintain the boundary.</li> </ol>
	Point 2 Whilst I do not have the benefit of sound level reading equipment, I have the experience of living in this location and can confirm that that during the winter months when the ground vegetation has died back and the trees and hedgerows have lost their leaves there is a distinct increase in noise levels this will be further be increases as a result of the observation at point 1 above.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unless constituting a dense area of woodland, regardless of whether they have leaves, trees do not achieve notable reductions in road traffic noise. Please see above response for further discussion on this point.</li> </ol>
	Point 3 I am unable to find within this document any detail relating to West View. Please detail where this is.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The operational stage noise assessment within Appendix 16.5 Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-331] has been replaced by the Noise Addendum [REP1-019]. The existing receptors at West View are assessed within the Part A detailed calculation area within Section 1.11 of the Noise Addendum [REP1-019]. The Part A detailed calculation area is presented within Figure 1: Operational Road Traffic Noise Study Area within Appendix D: Noise Addendum Figures – Part 1 [REP1-021]. Table 1.30 of the Noise Addendum, along with Figure 6: Determination of Significance – Receptor Groups – Part A within Appendix D: Noise Addendum Figures – Part 2 [REP1-022] presents the assessment of significance for defined receptor groups. No significant operational noise effects are predicted at existing receptors on West View.</li> </ol>
	I would observe that whilst on a satellite vision of the area of Northgate farm and adjacent houses there were substantial vehicles numbers within that complex. Therefore, it follows that the total number of movements has the potential to double at least that is not counting the agricultural vehicles. I would also add that Northgate farm has been used as a shop in the past and given access via West View may potentially inspire someone to open the Farm shop again in fact there are distinct possibility other businesses may move there all of which will increase the volume of traffic using West View.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that there is a total of seven properties at Warreners House which will utilise West View following completion of the Scheme. The Applicant acknowledges that this will result in an increase in the number of vehicles using West View. However, West View will remain as a cul-de-sac serving fewer than 20 properties and the proposed alterations to West View exceed the minimum requirements for that category of access road in the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual referenced in response to point 3 of 1.71.1 above.</li> <li>2. As Northgate Farm will no longer have direct access to the A1 carriageway the Applicant would contend that it is less likely that a farm shop would be re-opened given the reduction in passing trade.</li> <li>3. The Applicant considers that the proposed alterations therefore provide for safe usage of West View in operation. Any business uses or activities at Northgate Farm beyond that which is currently permitted would require planning permission which would be based on the merits of the development, separate to this DCO. New developments would need to set out their traffic generation as well as any other potential changes to the locality in a Planning Application made to NCC who would make their decision accordingly on a case by case basis as to whether it would be an acceptable change of use, able to be granted permission on the basis of taking access through West View.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>The response from the applicant plays down the level of traffic and assumes very low levels this may well be not the case, for instance a change of use of the fields to live stock will result in several visits a day by the farmer and if so likely to be via a tractor and trailer, cattle wagons to move the stock there will be required also. There are endless possibilities of potential changes to the land and buildings when improve access is given, whilst the applicant is detailing low levels of addition movement there is no consideration for the potential increase so therefore i would consider the predicted outcomes flawed.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant does not accept that changing the use of the fields to livestock would necessarily lead to several visits per day by the farmer or that these visits would require a tractor and trailer and the Applicant considers that moving livestock, if the fields were to be used for livestock, would only be undertaken on an occasional basis.</li> <li>2. The proposed carriageway width of 5.4m for the upgrade of West View exceeds the guidelines for an access road serving up to 50 properties in the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual referenced in response to point 3 of 1.71.1. As West View will serve less than 20 domestic properties on completion the upgraded road provides additional capacity to accommodate increased usage of the road for agricultural purposes.</li> <li>3. Future levels of growth or change are not something that can be reliably predicted and as such, a DCO application must take cognisance of what is known e.g. existing uses and those that have some surety of being developed by having established planning permission. However, this is still only for certain cases where cumulative increases are quantifiable. These are presented in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement which presents the Cumulative Effects assessments that have undertaken [APP-062] with of particular relevance, Figure 16.1 - Cumulative Assessment Applications [APP-184] which shows the planning applications included in assessment.</li> <li>4. Any new developments that do not have the benefit of existing planning permission would need to set out their traffic generation as well as any other potential changes to the locality in a Planning Application made to NCC who would make their decision accordingly on a case by case basis as to whether it would be an acceptable change able to be granted permission.</li> </ol>
	<p>I can only conclude removing buildings hedgerows and tress, the increase in traffic volumes in West View has the potential to increase the noise levels in West View given that this traffic will be passing at speed within 3 metres of my front door whereas at present we have only slow moving turning to facilitate leaving the street.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that there is a total of seven properties at Warreners House which will utilise West View following completion of the Scheme. The Applicant acknowledges that this will result in an increase in the number of vehicles using West View, with vehicles potentially travelling at higher speeds than currently apply. Given the limited number of additional properties using this road, the number of daily vehicle trips would be expected to be small. Therefore, regardless of the speed of vehicles on West View and associated influence on noise levels, the contribution of noise from a small number of vehicles using the access road to the overall noise levels in the area is expected to be inconsequential compared to the noise levels from the A1 carriageway.</li> </ol>
<p>Ref 1.17.4</p>	<p>Point 1 The light pollution I referred to was not resulting from Street lights. New designs and LED fitments have reduced light pollution in general.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant notes the respondent's comment.</li> </ol>
	<p>My concern is related to the removal of the Gas Pumping station, hedge rows and trees as detailed in Ref1.17 3 point1 this will create a clear tunnel for lights from the slip road on to the A1 from the A 697. There is also the distinct possibility of light from the A1 to, this source may be shielded by the embankment on which the afore mentioned slip road is built on.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the alignment of the access road, from West View to the edge of the field to the north, the existing vegetation to the rear of the properties on West View would be largely unimpacted. As the alignment of the slip road to the A1 from the A697 is unchanged, the Applicant does not expect there to be any substantial change in the impact of headlights as traffic joins the A1. At the point at which traffic joins the A1, the A697 and A1 are both set within shallow cutting, and existing roadside vegetation would be unchanged, as such, the Applicant does not perceive there being a noticeable change in the impact of vehicle lights on properties on West View.</li> </ol>



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
1.17.5	<p>Points 1 Refer s to a stage 1 safety audit and states there were no safety concerns. This document has not been seen or referenced within the documents for the scheme hence there is no evidence of the statement. Can this be supplied please?</p> <p>Given that I consider CDM regulations have not been adhered to by the applicant that gives me reason to question the above statement.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Road Safety Audit Stage 1 is the Applicant's internal governance report undertaken by an independent assessor and reviewed by safety experts within the Applicant's organisation and does not form part of the Application. The Applicant confirms that it has complied with the CDM Regulations as set out in the various responses above.</li> </ol>
	<p>Point 2 Acknowledge the commitment and look forward to that report when available.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response required</li> </ol>
	<p>Point 3 The applicant has been given numerous different proposals for access for these properties / fields and has only briefly responded to one, after many telephone conversations asking for these to be considered. I have also in my Statutory consultation response 16th April 2020 to 14th May 2020 (appendix 1) proposed an alternative route which is shorter than the proposed route safer to construct and removes all the proposed works within West View.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms that the alternative off-network access proposed by the respondent was considered and discounted for the reasons set out in the response to point 4 of 1.71.1 above.</li> <li>The Applicant confirms that the alternative PMA would result in an increase in the overall length of PMA required to provide access to the resident of Warreners House and the adjacent fields. Given that the extent of the construction works required to construct the alternative PMA would therefore be greater the Applicant considers that the alternative PMA would not reduce health and safety risks during construction.</li> <li>The Applicant confirms that the alterations to West View will provide a two lane carriageway, nine parking bays and a 1.8m footpath on the east side of the road which provides for separation between vehicles and pedestrians and thereby provides for safe usage during operation.</li> </ol>
Ref 1.17.6	<p>Point 1 The applicant states there will be a small increase in agricultural traffic levels.</p>	
	<p>At one of the consultation meetings I asked a representative from WSP what the level of agricultural vehicles was would be using the fields it is about four visits a year was the reply when asked where the numbers were derived from the response was "We asked the farmer how often he goes there" very little scientific evidence there.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms that it has liaised with the tenant farmer who currently accesses the plots in question via a direct access from the A697 slip road. There would be significant safety benefits as the Scheme proposes to close this direct access and divert access to the field plots via West View.</li> </ol>
	<p>I challenge this statement that the level will be low, if the fields are sown and harvested there has to be many visits when you consider the operations needed, Hedge cutting which generally occurs over a four or 5 day period, first plough, second plough seeding, fertilizer application weed spraying, harvesting of crop, bailing of straw removal of straw. Muck spreading, to name but a few, of course there is also the possibility of two crops a year in a field. This would double the aforementioned visits Likewise the land may be changed from arable to live stock, or a combination of both.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As mentioned above the Applicant has engaged with the farmer of the land in question. Information has been collated on the current use of the land and the frequency of current and future access levels.</li> <li>As is the nature of agriculture and cropping cycles the level of access may fluctuate depending on the specific activity being undertaken at any given time. This may on occasions give rise to some minor intensification of use on a periodic basis. The Applicant does not consider the potential intensification to be excessive.</li> <li>The proposed carriageway width of 5.4m for the upgrade of West View exceeds the guidelines for an access road serving up to 50 properties in the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual referenced in response to point 3 of 1.71.1. As West View will serve less than 20 domestic properties on completion the upgraded road provides additional capacity to accommodate increased usage of the road for agricultural purposes.</li> </ol>
	<p>Therefore, I would contend that agricultural traffic will not be low it may in fact be substantial consequently I reaffirm my opinion that this design is flawed, it is not a route that designs out danger but designs danger in particularly to the residents of West View.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms that the alterations to West View will provide a two lane carriageway, nine parking bays and a 1.8m footpath on the east side of the road which provides for separation between vehicles and pedestrians. The Applicant considers that this thereby provides for safe usage of West View during operation including usage by agricultural vehicles.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
Ref 1.17.7	Point 1.To date the only information regarding the modification/alteration to services the housing developer has informed the residents about is the renewal of the water service wherein they have agreed as part of the land purchase agreement to undertake the renewal of the water main along the length of West View and provide new individual services complete with meters to each house. The developer last year sent out the individual proposals for each property for acceptance of the propose routes in to each property, the proposed works are not to the front of the property but are to the rear of each property on the land between the rear gardens and the new development.	1. The Applicant confirms that the only statutory utility main scheduled for diversion on West View is Northern Gas Networks.
	The electric supply is in the front gardens of the properties therefore will not require alterations.	1. The Applicant notes that the electric supply is in the front gardens and will therefore not be affected by the proposed works. .
	There may be street lighting to consider.	1. The Applicant confirms that the existing street lighting will be reinstated following widening works as described under Work No. 5A in the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] and the final arrangement of the street lighting including the cables and ducts will be confirmed at detailed design stage.
	BT supplies are overhead.	1. There are no plans to impact BT services in this area.
	The gas for no 12 and 11 is fed from the land adjacent to the gas station and splits into both houses I have no definite proof but believe it then continues through other front gardens Southwards. Feeding the remaining properties.	1. The Applicant confirms that the relocation of the gas main will be subject to detailed design by Northern Gas Networks at a later stage, at which point service connections to properties will be considered.
	The applicant states that the PMA (private means of access) is the reason to relocate the gas house, If that is the case it would therefore probably have to move Eastward as there is little land to the to the West of the proposed opening, this would therefore move the gas house closer to my property increasing the risk to my property. The gas was installed many years after the properties were constructed it is clear the gas house at that point in time was located as far away from the properties as possible obviously for safety reasons. The relocation of this would also have to be well away from the PMA as there will be risk of damage to the gas house from traffic using the road. This consideration would therefore move the gas house even closer to my property.	1. The Applicant notes that the gas house is located well away from the existing road and is therefore unlikely to be affected by the proposed alterations to the road. The Applicant confirms that the detailed design of the gas main works will be undertaken by Northern Gas Networks at a later stage, at which point all required safety measures will be considered.
	I would observe that recently constructed Gas house at the South end of West View has been located well away from the existing properties, the new properties, and well away from the roads. See photographs below.	1. The Applicant notes that the gas house is located well away from the existing road and is therefore unlikely to be affected by the proposed alterations to the road. The Applicant confirms that the detailed design of the gas main works will be undertaken by Northern Gas Networks at a later stage, at which point all required safety measures will be considered.

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	 <p data-bbox="379 1010 1041 1031">Gas house at southern end of West View well away from existing houses and road</p>	
	 <p data-bbox="350 1787 1012 1808">Gas house at Southern end of West View sited well away from new houses</p>	
	<p data-bbox="320 1864 1448 1934">I consider that this is another reason why this design is not the safest solution and is building in dangers.</p>	<p data-bbox="1567 1854 2873 1923">1. The Applicant notes that the gas house is located well away from the existing road and is therefore unlikely to be affected by the proposed alterations to the road. The Applicant confirms</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		that the detailed design of the gas main works will be undertaken by Northern Gas Networks at a later stage, at which point all required safety measures will be considered.
	<b>General Comments</b>	
1	At present bin wagons, large wagons, 7 tonne plus struggle to negotiate this street and most have to reverse up to ensure easy exit from the street without going on the grass at the North of the Street to turn . How will this be dealt with within the design?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the proposed design includes widening the carriageway and realigning the tie-in to the main road which will make it easier for larger vehicles including refuse vehicles to negotiate the road.</li> <li>2. The Applicant considers that vehicles, such as refuse vehicles, using Warreners House new access track will utilise the new access track and driveway areas to turn around.</li> </ol>
2	I have previously received notification that a section of my drive will be required to enable this development thus reducing the length of my drive thus making it more difficult to park on my drive and bringing the traffic closer to my property. This again indicates situations where dangers are designed in not out.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that none of the existing driveways will be reduced by the works on West View and that the proposed road alterations will comprise widening to the west of the existing road. The provision of a footway along the east side of the road, will therefore result in the re-located West View being further away from the boundary of the properties than it presently is.</li> </ol>
3	I do not have the option of gating my property to keep my child and visitor's children safe as the gates would have to open out on to the road and into traffic.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the proposed alterations are an improvement on the present arrangements in that the re-located West View will be further from the properties than it presently is and will be separated from the properties by the proposed footway.</li> </ol>
4	One of the properties has been developed almost to the Kerb Line and could easily be hit particularly by agricultural traffic at harvest time.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the re-located West View will be further from the properties than it presently is and will be separated from the properties by the proposed footway. The proposed alterations will therefore reduce the risk of the property being struck by errant vehicles.</li> </ol>
5	There are times and events (Funerals , house moving, building works to list but a few )in the street where Vehicles have to park in the street for prolonged periods of time blocking access this will be more difficult with the increase of use.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the alterations to West View include for the provision of nine parking spaces. This is shown in the General Arrangement Plans [APP-008] and described in draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] as Work No. 5A.</li> </ol>
6	The documents now talk about a PMA to Northgate Farm. This statement alone brings concerns.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the PMA is the private means of access to the properties at Warreners House and Northgate Farm.</li> </ol>
6.1	Where will the PMA commence, is it at the edge of the turning circle or will it commence at the line of the hedgerow?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the PMA will commence at the edge of the realigned turning circle.</li> </ol>
6.2	If it commences at the edge of the turning circle, then there will be a stretch of road where the residents of West View will not have ability to ensure it is maintained in good order. Or is it the intention to commence the PMA at the hedgerow? If so, will the stretch of road from the edge of the turning circle be of adoptable standard and adopted by the Local Authority? Previous consultations have not answered these questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the alterations to West View will be designed and constructed to adoptable standards and that the new access road to Warreners House which forms a direct continuation of West View will have a tarmac surface.</li> </ol>
6.3	We were once advised the track would be of a compacted hardcore construction with passing places if that is the case no doubt mud from the farming operations will migrate on to the track and within a short period of time contaminate the hardcore. Therefore, if	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the access to Warreners House will have a tarmac surface and therefore there will not be an opportunity for mud to contaminate the hardcore.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>this PMA commences at the turning circle the migrated mud and the excess water previously noted at Ref 1.17.2 point 1 of this response Will form a mud mess on West View. If the section of road from the edge of the turning circle is adoptable standard there is still the prospect of this muddy sludge running down West View.</p>	<p>2. The proposal to upgrade West View includes upgrading the associated drainage network as required by the increased carriageway area and as confirmed for Work No. 5A in the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005].</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>		
	<p>We firmly believe that these proposal are flawed, and the designer has failed to discharge his duties to design out risk or at the very least reduce it to the lowest possible level then, having done so control the residue risks. We have detailed at point that it is the intention to move the risks to the main contractor for the construction phase contrary to the CDM regulation.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant has set out in the foregoing responses that the preliminary design has been undertaken in accordance with the CDM Regulations, that the proposed alterations to West View demonstrate that due consideration has been given to safety in the design and that these alterations provide for safe usage of West View in operation through the widening of the road to provide for two way movement and the provision of a footway and parking spaces.</p>
	<p>The design which has been proposed has not achieved this duty of the designer, and we would contend that this design builds in significant risk not only during the construction Phase but for the whole term this facility will be in use until its final demolition.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant has set out in the foregoing responses that the preliminary design has been undertaken in accordance with the CDM Regulations, that the proposed alterations to West View demonstrate that due consideration has been given to safety in the design and that these alterations provide for safe usage of West View throughout its operation.</p>
	<p>The route chosen will bring hazards into West View which are not there at present and increase the likelihood of hazards which are there been released.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that there is a total of seven properties at Warreners House which will utilise West View following completion of the Scheme. The Applicant acknowledges that this will result in an increase in the number of vehicles using West View. However, West View will remain as a cul-de-sac serving less than 20 properties and the proposed alterations to West View exceed the minimum design requirements for that category of access road in the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual referenced in response to point 3 of 1.71.1 above.</p>
	<p>In simple terms if you look at the people who are likely to be exposed to these risks, they are substantial.</p>	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that there is a total of seven properties at Warreners House which will utilise West View following completion of the Scheme. The Applicant acknowledges that this will result in an increase in the number of vehicles using West View, but the Applicant does not accept that this will result in additional risks. West View will remain as a cul-de-sac serving fewer than 20 properties and the proposed alterations to West View in terms of the two lane 5.4m wide carriageway, the 1.8m wide footpath separating the carriageway from the properties and the separate parking bays exceed the minimum design requirements for that category of access road in the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual referenced in response to point 3 of 1.71.1 above and minimises the risk from vehicles using West View. One of the key purposes for having design guidance for roads is to ensure that they are safe for the intended level of usage. The Applicant therefore considers that the proposed alterations therefore provide for safe usage of West View in operation.            2. The Applicant confirms that a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit will be undertaken by an independent assessor prior to completion of the detailed design of the works to upgrade West View and also that a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit of the completed works will be undertaken prior to the upgraded West View becoming operational.</p>
	<p>The residents, tradesmen, service workers of West View, the same group of people for the 250 plus houses nearing completion, The next residents of proposed housing development, 150 plus houses then the patients and staff and visitor to the hospital all of</p>	<p>1. The Applicant confirms that there is a total of seven properties at Warreners House which will utilise the road providing access to West View following completion of the Scheme. The increase in vehicle movements on this road as a result of the Scheme will therefore be very</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	these will be exposed to the hazards quite possibly upwards of 800 people could be affected by this proposed route in particular from the agricultural traffic. These people cannot use an alternative route all of these people will be exposed to these risks when the traffic leaves West View on to the main road through the complex grounds.	<p>small in comparison to the vehicle movements generated by the hospital, the existing houses and the proposed housing developments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant can confirm that vehicle tracking has been undertaken along the proposed route to assess its suitability for use by the various agricultural vehicles understood to utilise the Warreners House access. Improvements to West View, including carriageway widening, have been proposed to safely accommodate these vehicles where appropriate.</li> <li>A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken on the proposed design which did not identify any hazards to road users (which includes pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders) in relation to the proposed access to West View and Warreners House.</li> </ol>
	If you look at the alternative route heading North there are the resident of some 8 houses which would be affected however designed correctly, they will each join the track safely, and exit on to the surrounding road network safely, the Agricultural traffic will have good visibility. In short, the alternative route substantially reduces the hazards but most importantly reduces the people at risk down to numbers of 20/30 max instead of potentially 800 people	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has confirmed in the foregoing responses that it considered and discounted the alternative proposal on the basis that the alternative will not reduce the risks during construction.</li> <li>West View will remain as a cul-de-sac serving less than 20 properties and the proposed alterations to West View exceed the minimum requirements for that category of access road in the Residential Roads and Footpaths manual referenced in response to point 3 of 1.71.1 above. The Applicant considers that the proposed alterations therefore provide for safe usage of West View in operation.</li> <li>The Applicant confirms that the design of the alterations to West View will be in compliance with the relevant standards such that agricultural vehicles accessing and egressing West View will have requisite visibility and that this design and the implementation of the design into construction will be subject to road safety audit.</li> <li>The Applicant notes that the agreement between the housing developer and NCC requires that the works to upgrade West View be undertaken regardless of whether the Scheme proceeds or not and therefore the health and safety risks associated with these works will not be increased by these works being undertaken as part of the Scheme.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-6 – Mark Hawes**

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	As the homeowner of , I am submitting this "Written Representation" summary on behalf of my family and the property. Having considered all aspects of the current plans in detail we have no choice but to raise an objection to them in the current guise. The proposed plans which directly impact are far reaching and unfortunately predominantly detrimental to the property and the family lifestyle which we have enjoyed for over 25 years. The plans remove many benefits of the property replacing them with a catalogue of negative changes which together create a major blight and leave a legacy of long-term issues.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant does not accept that the Scheme will have an unacceptable adverse effect on the Hawes's property. The "blight" to which Mr Hawes refers relates to the perceived impact on the benefits currently enjoyed at the property. The Applicant is committed to providing mitigation so far as appropriate. Dialogue is ongoing with Mr and Mrs Hawes with a number of calls/meetings planned to answer specific questions and provide solutions.</li> <li>If Mr Hawes wishes to serve a blight notice, he may do so under paragraph 24(c) of Schedule 13 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It will then be considered in accordance with the duties of the Applicant under that provision.</li> </ol>
	In principle we are not opposed to the general aims of the scheme, but do not believe that this particular application represents a good solution to achieve those aims. With greater consultation and localised consideration much of the negative impacts could	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant confirms that ES Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives [APP-038] sets out the reasonable alternatives that have been studied and indicates the main reasons for selecting the chosen option for Part A. However, the Applicant understands that Mr Hawes's primary concern relates to the interventions to be carried out at and in the vicinity of the property. These</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>have been mitigated to provide an optimum sustainable solution while reducing public purse spend. The remainder of this summary provides an outline of those plans that we do not agree with and which have an impact upon the property. A more detailed description of the issues are provided in the attached document.</p>	<p>have been discussed with Mr Hawes and account has been taken of his representations and discussions with him. It is considered that the solutions proposed are appropriate in the circumstances.</p> <p>2. The Applicant continues to engage with Mr and Mrs Hawes to address any outstanding issues. The last meeting was held on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2021 with a further follow up meeting being arranged.</p>
1	<p>Acquisition of permanent rights. The current plans include provision to permanently acquire rights over 308 square metres (1-8b) of mature (deciduous woodland) within the eastern boundary of the property to build a new access road. If fully implemented in line with this Land Take this would represent a major negative impact, removing key features and benefits that have been enjoyed by the family for a number of years. While losing a private and secure play area the impact on wildlife and the environment would be equally disappointing. Given the scope to select a number of other options which protect the woods we struggle to understand the rationale behind this decision. Similarly concerns also exist for the acquisition of rights of 640 square metres over parcel 1-8a.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plots 1/8a and 1/8b are included within the Order limits to enable revised access tracks to Northgate Farm and neighbouring properties to be constructed, so that access is no longer directly from the A1. The permanent acquisition of rights over these plots is sought under the DCO.</li> <li>2. It is acknowledged within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health of the ES [APP-054], section 12.10, under Views from the Road, that there would be a moderate adverse effect (significant) on views from the road due to the loss of vegetation during construction (specifically Coronation Avenue), and into operation until mitigation planting (as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3) reaches maturity (which is expected to take at least 15 years).</li> <li>3. In terms of the loss of a "private and secure play area", there is no acquisition of garden ground in this location as part of the Scheme. As such there is no such loss. There is no additional overlooking and no impact on privacy.</li> <li>4. In relation to the effect on wildlife, a response from the Applicant is presented in 1E below.</li> <li>5. In considering impacts on woodlands and vegetation, the design of the access road has sought to avoid unnecessary removal of trees along the property boundary, nevertheless it would be necessary to remove a limited number in the north east corner in order to achieve the design bend radius for the access road whilst avoiding unnecessary land take from the adjacent field. The loss of the limited number of trees (anticipated to be less than 10 no., subject to detailed design) is not anticipated to significantly reduce the enjoyment of the garden space. Awareness of the access road from the garden space would be screened through the establishment of a hedge line between the property and the access road, as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3).</li> </ol>
A	<p>If fully implemented in line with the 1-8b rights acquisition, then there is a risk that over 50 mature deciduous trees and hedgerow would be felled which would effectively eradicate a woodland sanctuary.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The permanent acquisition of rights over land 1-8b (as shown on the Land Plans [APP-006]) would not result in the loss of over 50 mature deciduous trees. Further, there is no hedgerow habitat present within land parcel 1-8b. Land parcel 1-8b represents the eastern edge of a small woodland block that comprises two parallel lines of trees and a central corridor/path wide enough for vehicular access (see Tree 232A, Appendix B of Appendix 9.9 Bat Survey Report 2018 Part A [APP-235]). As detailed in the response to Item 1 above, it would be necessary to remove a limited number of trees in the north east corner, anticipated to be less than 10 no. (subject to detailed design), in order to achieve an appropriate bend in the access road whilst avoiding unnecessary land take from the adjacent field.</li> <li>2. Measure S-B10 of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) commits to keeping site/vegetation clearance and tree felling to a minimum as far as practicable. The Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) will identify the area or features to be protected within a works plan agreed with the Contract Manager. Further, as detailed in the Applicant's response to item 1.42.5.4 of the Relevant Representations [REP1-064], the Applicant confirms that the current proposed alignment of the private means of access sites</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>centrally between the Order limits either side of the road. There is some flexibility within the Order limits to enable an alignment of the track to mitigate negative impacts to existing trees.</p> <p>3. Whilst the felling of the trees and construction of the road may result in adverse effects to the woodland and the species it supports, it is incorrect to state that these activities will “eradicate a woodland sanctuary”. A response to this statement is detailed in full within Item E below. The Applicant has undertaken appropriate ecological survey of the area to inform design and mitigation to ensure that no significant adverse effects would arise from the felling of the trees within land parcel 1-8b.</p>
B	<p>This area of the property is an integral part of the garden which provides a private and secure place to enjoy day and night. The land acquisition and land take changes all of that. Given the introduction of the access road it will no longer be safe to use the area at night and it will be necessary to make secure anything of value in the area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health of the ES [APP-054], section 12.10, under Private Property, that there would be a slight adverse effect (not significant) during construction on private property whose access is affected, as this would not preclude use of the property. It is considered that there would be a slight beneficial effect (not significant) during operation to properties with affected access as although there would be small increases in journey time, new accesses would be comparatively safer when not directly accessed from the A1.</li> <li>2. The current direct access to the Property will be closed up. Two existing bus stop laybys close to the Property are proposed to be removed as part of the Scheme. The access to the property via the proposed private means of access (PMA) would be signed appropriately. The Application also includes for the boundary of the PMA to have native hedgerows with trees, as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3). Until this is fully established a boundary fence will be included.</li> <li>3. The combination of the removal of direct access from the A1 and the boundary treatment measures are considered to address the perceived security threat.</li> </ol>
C	<p>The current pleasant outlook across rolling fields and woods will be replaced with a tarmac road and regular vehicle traffic and people footfall.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing view to the north and east is partially screened by a combination of tall boundary and garden vegetation, and neighbouring property. Although the individual property has not been visited, aerial imagery would suggest that the views east comprise the garden and a boundary of trees, beyond which is open countryside.</li> <li>2. The Scheme would impact primarily on the western side of the curtilage to the property which currently abuts the existing A1, whilst to the north and east boundaries there is a requirement to form a new Private Means of Access (PMA) to the property and neighbouring house.</li> <li>3. The Applicant does not consider that, with the formation of the PMA on the northern and eastern perimeter of the property boundary, and the retention of the majority of the mature vegetation on the boundary that the presence of the PMA would give rise to a significant impact. In addition, the Applicant has proposed a hedgerow to be planted to reinforce the screening capacity of the boundary, as indicated on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] which has been revised and provided at Deadline 3.</li> <li>4. With reference to the suggestion that the PMA would be subject to regular vehicle traffic and footfall. This would only be to the extent that traffic and people would be accessing the two residential properties or the fields to the north, and would have appropriate signs to discourage unauthorised use to be set out in the signage strategy which will form part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP1-023 and 024] secured by Requirement 4 of the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005].</li> </ol>



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
D	Children and pets will no longer be able access the area safely and secure fencing will be needed to cordon the area off.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Application includes for the boundary of the PMA to have native hedgerows with trees, as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3). Until this is fully established a boundary fence will be included. Under Requirement 4, Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] any fencing or other means of enclosure that is erected must be DMRB compliant, unless formally agreed as a departure with the Secretary of State. This is considered sufficient to ensure that any fencing will be safe and secure.</li> </ol>
E	The felling of the trees and the construction of the road will eradicate a wide range of wildlife that have been encouraged over the years.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whilst the felling of the trees and construction of the road may result in adverse effects to protected and notable species, it is incorrect to state that these activities will “eradicate a wide range of wildlife”. The trees in question (to the north east corner of the property) have been subject to baseline ecological surveys.</li> <li>2. Bat surveys identified the trees are of Moderate roosting suitability for bats (see Ground 232A, Table 3-1; Appendix 9.9 Bat Survey Report 2018 Part A [APP-235]), meaning that they support potential roost features that could be used by bats but are unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (such as a maternity or hibernation roost) (defined in Table 2-1, Appendix 9.9 Bat Survey Report 2018 Part A [APP-235]). Further survey concluded the likely absence of roosting bats (see paragraphs 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, Appendix 9.9 Bat Survey Report 2018 Part A [APP-235]). Mitigation includes an updated assessment of all trees with bat roost suitability (which would include the trees in question). Those trees that retain Moderate (or High) roosting suitability and where presence of a roost has not been identified, would be soft-felled under ecological supervision (see measure S-B7 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3)).</li> <li>3. The trees offer nesting suitability to birds. Mitigation includes the timing of vegetation and site clearance outside the bird nesting period (outside the period March to August, inclusive). Where this is not possible, site clearance would be preceded by an inspection from the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) within 24 hours of clearance to confirm the absence of active nests. Where an active nest is recorded, a minimum buffer of 5 m would be implemented (as determined by the ECoW) (see measure S-B9 of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023] (and as submitted at Deadline 3)).</li> <li>4. The trees were not identified as a woodland parcel suitable for red squirrel (see Appendix 9.16 Red Squirrel Survey Report Part A [APP-242]) and nearby woodland parcels (to the east of the A1) were also recorded as Low suitability for red squirrel.</li> <li>5. Further, Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3) indicates where woodland and replacement trees would be provided.</li> <li>6. In response to the findings of the baseline ecological surveys, the Applicant has therefore developed suitable and appropriate mitigation to ensure that no significant adverse effects on wildlife would arise from the felling of the trees to the north east corner of the property. Further, measure S-B10 of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) commits to keeping site/vegetation clearance and tree felling to a minimum as far as practicable. The ECoW will identify the area or features to be protected within a works plan agreed with the Contract Manager.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
F	The introduction of the road will add noise and air pollution where there was none.	<p>1. It is not the case that noise and air pollution are absent in this location. This site is adjacent to the existing A1 trunk road. To the extent that change occurs, this is addressed in assessments before the Examination. The following looks particularly at the new access road.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b></p> <p>1. The volume of traffic that would use the private access road is well below the level that would warrant inclusion within the dispersion modelling of the operation impacts of the Scheme i.e. a change in flow of 1000 vehicle AADT. The dominant local sources of pollution for the property and surrounding land are the A1 to the west and, to a lesser extent, the A697 to the south-west. These roads and the impact of the Scheme on them have been fully evaluated in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Part B [APP-041], Appendix 16.4 [APP-330]) and the assessment has demonstrated that no significant effects are likely as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b></p> <p>1. The new access road provides access to residents of Northgate Farm and other immediately adjacent dwellings.</p> <p>2. Whilst there is a small cluster of seven dwellings in this location, five of these dwellings are located to the south of Northgate Farm and are accessed, now and in the future, from the south. Therefore, the section of access road that passes to the north and east of the Northgate Farm landholding (which is approximately 70m from the Northgate Farm building at its closest point) carries vehicles associated with just two dwellings, one of which is Northgate Farm itself.</p> <p>3. As a consequence, the number of vehicles travelling along the access road each day is expected to be minimal, especially when compared against the traffic using the A1 itself. In this regard, the anticipated number of vehicles using the adjacent section of the A1 each day is in excess of 20,000 vehicles (over the 18 hour period from 06:00 – 00:00 hours used in the noise assessment) in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme.</p> <p>4. Another key contrast is vehicle speed. Ordinarily vehicles travelling at higher speeds will generate more noise. The traffic on the A1 is expected to be moving at relatively high speeds, whilst the vehicles on the access road (given its narrow width and the presence of bends) would be travelling much slower.</p> <p>5. Existing noise levels are already high at Northgate Farm (as a result of traffic on the A1 as mentioned above) and are predicted to exceed the daytime and night-time significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) thresholds in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme (the SOAEL thresholds for the daytime and night-time are 68 dB <math>L_{A10,18h}</math> and 55 dB <math>L_{Aeq,8h}</math> respectively). Therefore, the addition of an occasional, slow moving vehicle on the access road would be expected to have an inconsequential effect on overall noise levels in the area.</p>
G	The woodland was one of the main attractions of the property and the proposed acquisition represents a significant loss of benefit. Any compensation offered to offset the impact would fall well short of the real value to the household.	<p>1. As stated previously, reassurance has been provided to the landowner that any tree loss will be kept to a minimum. Discussions over compensation for any land or rights to be acquired will continue with the landowner and their professional representatives with the District Valuer on behalf of the Applicant. However, the amount and sufficiency of compensation is not a matter for this examination.</p> <p>2. The Applicant has set this out that as much of the existing planting as is reasonably practical, and should be retained and protected. This will be under the responsibility of the ECoW, and in line with the REAC S-B10 of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>Deadline 3) where vegetation clearance and tree felling is to be kept to a minimum, as far as reasonably practicable. The ECoW will identify the area or features to be protected within a works plan agreed with the Contract Manager. Further, as detailed in the Applicant's response to item 1.42.5.4 of the Relevant Representations [REP1-064], the Applicant confirms that the current proposed alignment of the private means of access sites centrally between the Order limits either side of the road. There is some flexibility within the Order limits to reduce negative impacts to existing trees.</p> <p>3. The design of the access road has sought to avoid unnecessary removal of trees along the property boundary, nevertheless it would be necessary to remove a limited number in the north east corner in order to achieve an appropriate bend in the access road whilst avoiding unnecessary land take from the adjacent field. The loss of the limited number of trees, anticipated to be less than 10 no. (subject to detailed design), is not anticipated to significantly reduce the enjoyment of the garden space.</p>
H	<p>There are no details in the plans as to what is proposed for parcel 1-8a which is concerning given where we are with the planning process. In the absence of a plan, I am naturally concerned at what will be done when the rights are acquired.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Statement of Reasons [APP-018] Annex A confirms plot 1-8a is required for the construction of new access track to the north of the West View turning circle. New rights required for access to Warreners House properties, including maintenance and utilities.</li> <li>2. This modification to the Order limits was first made in July 2019 at a meeting with the Hawes and re-confirmed on a stakeholder call with the landowner on 13/01/21; the area is temporarily required to make amendments to the access to the property as the current access from the A1 will be stopped up. The extent of the plot is to ensure that at detailed design that all appropriate forms of access amendments can be accommodated by the Scheme whilst minimising loss of existing vegetation.</li> </ol>
2	<p>Placement of Layby close to the property. The submitted plans include the construction of a large layby close to the property and as such will become a primary visual feature on the landscape. As the layby span is similar to a dual carriageway it will significantly increase the amount of tarmac on view to 7 lanes. In addition to the visual impact, it is unfortunate that laybys attract a variety of anti-social behaviours which are commonly seen on other parts of the A1. This includes fly tipping which appears to be prevalent in the area. The Acquiring Authority has failed to demonstrate why they have chosen this particular location given the obvious impact on a number of residences. The following provides further details on why this is considered to a significant issue.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As previously stated, the proposed layby is located approximately 200 m north of the properties on the northbound carriageway, which is the carriageway furthest from the properties and the location has been determined using TD 69, The Location of Laybys and Rest Areas (DMRB design standards).</li> <li>2. This location has been chosen because the distance to the nearest existing layby to the south at around 7km is significantly in excess of the maximum desirable spacing of 5km hence it is not possible to move the layby further north. Moving the layby south to reduce the layby spacing would move it closer to the respondent's property. The layby location has also been chosen because it is on a straight section of road and so will not compromise the forward visibility of vehicles on the northbound carriageway, it is on level ground so there is no need to create an embankment or cutting to form the layby and it is remote from other junctions to avoid driver confusion and ensure safety. With regard to this last point, it is not possible to move the layby to the south of the respondent's property because of the A697 junction. Given these constraints the Applicant considers that it has moved the layby as far away from the respondent's property as is reasonably practical.</li> <li>3. The layby will be of Type A in accordance with standard TD 69. As such there will be 3.5m wide carriageway and a 3.5m wide parking area. While this will notionally create two additional lanes at the location of the layby i.e. there would be 6 lanes rather than 7, the oblique views from Northgate Farm given that the layby is some 200m to the North will reduce the visual impact of the layby.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The layby will be separated from the northbound carriageway by a narrow, kerbed island. Vehicles parked in the layby will therefore be fully visible to other vehicles passing on the A1 carriageway and this will act as a deterrent to anti-social behaviour or fly tipping.</li> <li>5. The Applicant notes that two existing bus stop laybys close to the Property are proposed to be removed as part of the Scheme. Indeed, this is of concern to the respondent even though they would presumably represent the same risks as the respondent references here.</li> <li>6. The assessment of visual effects within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [App-044] has assessed all elements of the Scheme on the occupants of the property, as set out in Appendix 7.3 Residential Visual Effects Schedule - Part A [APP-218]. This assessment identified that the occupants of R98 – Northgate Farm currently have partially screened views of the existing A1, with limited awareness to the north, except for the tops of roadside trees. The receptor would be subject to a large adverse effect (significant) during the construction period arising from the requirement to remove some of the roadside hedge that partially screens views of the A1 and awareness of construction activity to the west and north which would include the construction of the layby, and of the formation of a new access track to the north. Upon its construction, the noise barrier would give some immediate secondary screening benefit.</li> <li>7. Once operational, and as a result of the retention of some of the existing hedge to the western boundary and the proposed noise barrier extending for a little over 20m from the north facing elevation of Northgate Farm, the effects would be limited with the wider A1 that includes the layby being visible to the north-west in the same position as the existing A1, albeit wider. As mitigation along the boundary of the property matures, views of the A1, including the layby would diminish.</li> </ol>
A	Laybys are commonly used by HGV vehicles to provide a stopover. The prospect of overlooking a tarmacked layby is not great but a HGV vehicle park would spoil the landscape further.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed layby is located approximately 200 m north of the properties on the northbound carriageway, which is the carriageway furthest from the properties. As such any vehicles parked in the layby will be screened intermittently by vehicles passing on both the northbound and southbound carriageways together with the boundary vegetation. The Applicant confirms that a new abnormal load layby will be provided approximately 3,200 m north of Northgate Farm and that this will have a greater parking length and width than the layby adjacent to the respondents property so would be more attractive and suitable location for HGV stopovers.</li> </ol>
B	Laybys are essential to assist broken downs vehicles. Unfortunately, it is also common that they look to the local properties for assistance.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The layby is proposed approximately 200 m north of the property on the northbound carriageway, which is the carriageway furthest from the properties. The new dual carriageway, central reserve configuration and boundary fences and hedges will deter drivers of broken down vehicles from crossing over to the Property which will no longer have direct access to the A1.</li> </ol>
C	The close proximity of the layby provides a convenient place to park for anyone wishing to burgle the local properties.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed layby is approximately 200 m north of the property on the northbound carriageway, which is the carriageway furthest from the properties. The new dual carriageway, central reserve configuration and boundary fences/ hedges will deter drivers from crossing over to the Property. Direct access to the Property will be closed up. Two existing bus stop laybys close to the Property are proposed to be removed as part of the Scheme.</li> <li>2. There is no reason to suppose that the risk of burglary will be increased.</li> </ol>
D	The wide expanse of the layby minimises what can be done to the landscape to mitigate the impact of removing the hedgerow and coronation trees.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Scheme would widen the existing A1 corridor at this location, and the addition of the layby would increase the width locally. The oblique views of the layby from the properties at Northgate House given that it is some 200m to the North would reduce the visual impact of the layby.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Applicant does not therefore consider that the layby would be perceived to be a wide expanse of tarmac within the landscape, or that the design of the layby minimises what can be done to mitigate its potential impacts locally. The only limitation placed on tree planting associated with the layby is the need to ensure that forward visibility for drivers is not blocked by trees, or overhanging branches.</li> <li>3. It is acknowledged that there is a requirement to remove some of the existing roadside vegetation, including the southern extents of the Coronation Avenue, which forms an irregular avenue of trees along the existing A1 in order to construct the Scheme. However, the Applicant has at Deadline 1, submitted Appendix LV.2 Trees to be Removed and Replaced at Coronation Avenue WQ LV.1.8 [REP1-044], which provides further information relating to the number and location of trees to be replaced as part of the mitigation strategy, which would replicate some of the existing landscape features. This expands on the Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3) and secures trees to be planted on the approaches to the layby and along the southbound highway boundary to replace those trees removed by the Scheme. The effect of this would be to re-establish over a period of time a strong linear feature within the landscape, comparable to that which exists currently, and which contributes to the existing landscape character of the area.</li> </ol>
E	It is common to see vehicles sitting idle in laybys running their engines thereby further increasing concerns on air quality.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The numbers of vehicles that could be accommodated within the layby is limited to a few vehicles, and would not trigger the requirement for an air quality assessment under the criteria set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HA207/07 (or, its update, LA105). The impacts of vehicles using the layby would be negligible and would not affect the conclusions of Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Appendix 16.4: Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330], namely, that no significant air quality effects are likely.</li> </ol>
F	Unfortunately, the antisocial behaviour on display at laybys is not restricted to just fly tipping.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The layby will be separated from the northbound carriageway by a narrow kerbed island. Vehicles parked in the layby will therefore be fully visible to other vehicles passing on the A1 carriageway and this will act as a deterrent to anti-social behaviour or fly tipping.</li> </ol>
3	Placement of an operational depot and soil store close to the property. The submitted plans include provision to establish an operational depot and soil deposit directly west of the property. Whilst naturally anxious at the additional noise, fumes and dust that this will bring, the primary concern is the impact on the environment and in particular the mature woodland that will be felled to accommodate the depot. Given the scale of the land acquisition there is a risk that the whole woodland could be lost leaving a significantly marred westerly outlook exposing both the A697 and the A1. Given the multitude of less destructive options to place the depot I do not understand the rationale behind this decision. The Acquiring Authority has failed to demonstrate why they have chosen this particular location given the impact on local residences and environment. The following provides further details on why this is considered to be a significant issue.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As already stated in the Applicants Response to the Relevant Representations [REP 1-064], there is no proposal for any operational depot immediately west of Northgate Farm and the land is sought only to be temporarily possessed in respect of a soil storage area during construction. Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-037] sets out the high level details of the earthworks strategy, what the temporary land would be used for and the extent to be acquired.</li> <li>2. The site for the soil storage area was chosen because part of the site will become a storage swale (Storage Swale 1 as shown on Sheet 1 of the General Arrangement plans [APP- 008]) for the treatment of carriageway drainage prior to discharge into the adjacent watercourse. The construction of the swale will require the excavation of soil which will have to be stored temporarily until it can be used elsewhere on the Scheme. Use of the site therefore avoids the for the acquisition of rights over a further plot of land.</li> <li>3. Vegetation Clearance Plans [APP-013] show the limits of woodland to be lost. These demonstrate that no woodland is required to be removed to accommodate the proposed temporary soil storage area itself. However, several mature trees would be removed at the</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>boundary of North Gate House to provide a permanent access to the proposed drainage measures, which would also temporarily permit access to the storage area.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The works fall within the Order limits for the Scheme, and are therefore included within the construction dust assessment set out in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Appendix 16.4: Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330]. The conclusion of this assessment is that there would be no significant air quality effects resulting from the Scheme during construction.</li> </ol> <p><b>Noise:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to the soil store which would be in use during the construction phase, associated noise generating activity has been considered as part of the earthworks activity within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042]. Construction mitigation measures are set out within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] and Appendix 6.8 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part A [APP-213].</li> <li>An Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and REP1-024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> </ol>
A	<p>The current land take which is planned to accommodate the depot is extensive and includes all of the woodland west of the property. Having acquired the land there would be no constraint on how much woodland is felled to accommodate the depot and local works. There is has been no justification as to why so much land has been acquired. The acquisition should be tailored to actual need rather than leaving it so open ended.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation Clearance Plans [APP-013] show the limits of woodland to be lost. Vegetation clearance drawings will be certified DCO plans secured through this Application (see Schedule 12 of the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005]).</li> <li>As stated above in response to item 3, no woodland is required to be removed to accommodate the proposed temporary soil storage area itself.</li> <li>A number of temporary topsoil storage locations have been identified along the length of the scheme, with their positions chosen based on their proximity to the areas where the soil is to be used, amongst other considerations. The area required for topsoil storage is based on calculated volumes of required soil, factoring in a 2m height limit on soil bunds. At this location, Topsoil Storage Location 1 as shown on Sheet 2 of the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] is 12,000m<sup>3</sup>. This accounts for the initial section of online widening of the A1 and the substantial drainage feature, Storage Swale 1. The next soil storage area is at the proposed Highlaws junction approximately 1.3km north. Use of this area would increase the storage requirements significantly and result in more inefficient vehicle movements from the southern extent of the Scheme,</li> <li>Following construction, the land used for soil storage would be restored to its former use. This is secured within item S-GS5 of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, within the Outline CEMP [REP-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3).</li> <li>However, several mature trees would be removed at the boundary of North Gate House to provide a permanent access to the proposed drainage measures, which would also temporarily</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>permit access to the storage area. In addition, measure S-B10 of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) commits to keeping site/vegetation clearance and tree felling to a minimum as far as practicable. The ECoW will identify the area or features to be protected within a works plan agreed with the Contract Manager. Further, as detailed in the Applicant's response to item 1.42.5.4 of the Relevant Representations [REP1-064], the Applicant confirms that the current proposed alignment of the private means of access sites centrally between the Order limits either side of the road. There is some flexibility within the Order limits to enable an alignment of the track to be agreed with Mr Hawes to further reduce negative impacts to existing trees.</p> <p>6. Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-037] sets out the high level details of the earthworks strategy, what the temporary land would be used for and the extent to be acquired. In addition, top soil bunds would not be stored any higher than 2m, which influences the area of land required to store the required volumes. This is secured within item S-GS5 of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, within the Outline CEMP [REP-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3). Following construction the land would be restored to its former use.</p>
B	<p>The proposed acquisition for the depot includes plans demolishing of a very pleasant stone cottage.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054], section 12.10, under Private Property, that North Gate House would be required to be demolished during construction of the Scheme. The assessment concluded that the magnitude of impact (major), is considered to be reduced to minor as compensation has been agreed with the occupiers of the property as outlined in paragraph 12.9.17. Overall, there would be a direct, permanent effect of moderate adverse significance, and would not be considered to be critical in the decision-making process at this scale of loss.</li> <li>2. The blight notice served by the owner of North Gate House, latest update in the Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions [REP1-032] is agreed and being processed by the Applicant. There is no objection to its acquisition as it is required as part of the widening of the existing A1 for the new northbound carriageway and for Storage Swale 1.</li> </ol>
C	<p>A regularly used footpath through the woodlands will be lost the acquisition and the works. The removal of the footpath leaves the property land locked with no option to venture west of the property.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has assessed the impact on walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH) using designated public rights of way and non-designated footways within the study area, as outlined within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054]. The Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-003] do not show an existing footpath through the woodlands, and there are no additional designated footpaths shown on the Northumberland County Council Public Right of Way mapping tool in this location (including through the woodland south and west of Northgate Farm). Locally used, un-designated footpaths on private land have not been included within the Population and Human Health assessment.</li> <li>2. There are no formal WCH crossings of the A1 in the vicinity of the Northgate Farm, so safe access to the west of the A1 is already limited under the existing layout of the A1. The only non-designated footway identified in this area is the footway alongside the carriageway of the A1, which traverses north to south, and would be retained as part of the Scheme.</li> <li>3. The Applicant does not agree that the property will be "land locked". It is accepted that with the current A1 with a single carriageway configuration it is possible for pedestrians to cross westwards from Northgate Farm, and this will not be possible with the Scheme being a dual carriageway, which would restrict travel to the west. However, access to the east, north and south will would be possible for pedestrians.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Bridleway 407/010 is located south of Warreners House, between the A697 and the unclassified road between Morpeth and Hebron, providing access from an easterly direction from the property. This PRoW will still be accessible with the Scheme in place.</li> <li>5. The Scheme would result in the dualling of the A1, and therefore crossing it in the vicinity of the property would not be safe for WCH. The existing footway along the A1, which is located on the eastern side of the A1, and accessible to residents of Northgate Farm, would be retained and extended to the new Highlaws Junction, where provision would be made for safe, grade separated, east to west crossing of the Scheme onto either Hebron Road, or High Highlaws Road. To improve the overall Scheme safety objective, there are no at-grade WCH crossing proposed on the dualled section of the Scheme. A new section of bridleway would also be provided at the south of the Scheme, extending on from Bridleway 407/010, which would tie into the road network north of Morpeth at West View. From here, travel west by footway is possible on the A192.</li> </ol>
D	<p>Information on how the HGV vehicles access the depot is still not clear. This includes vehicles required to deposit soil. It is likely that further tarmac will be need to laid to facilitate this during construction thereby adding to the existing 7 lanes of tarmac on view. The significant negative impact the depot will have on the landscape is recognised in the plans during the construction phase.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access configuration are not detailed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP1-025 and 026] but will be set out in the final CTMP.</li> <li>2. Vehicles will access the soil storage area through traffic management on the existing A1 and via the new northbound carriageway and it is expected that vehicles would use the existing gated entrance next to North Gate House.</li> <li>3. The soil storage area does not overlap with the proposed layby so there will not be 7 lanes of tarmac on view.</li> <li>4. As this is proposed to be a temporary soil storage area and not a depot and as the land is only to be acquired temporarily, compacted stone will be used to temporarily surface the access road instead of tarmac as the access road will be removed and the land reinstated on completion as set out in the Outline CEMP [REP-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3) (reference S-PH12).</li> <li>5. The assessment of landscape character effects of Part A on local landscape character is set out in Appendix 7.1 Landscape Effects Schedule Part A [APP-216], and this identifies the local effects that temporary storage mounds would have on the landscape character area 38b Lowland Rolling Farmland – Longhorsley, in which the location of the proposed temporary storage area would be located. The assessment of landscape effects has in paragraph 7.5.1 (j) of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044] assumed that temporary top soil bunds would not be stored any higher than 2m and that following construction the land would be restored to its former use. This is secured within item S-GS5 of Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, within the Outline CEMP [REP-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3). As such, the local impacts arising on the perception of landscape character would be temporary, and due to their limited height and location to the edge of the field and north of existing woodland, would not represent a significant negative impact.</li> </ol>
E	<p>Access of vehicles to the depot will add to the air quality, dust and noise concerns.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no depot in the vicinity of Mr Hawes's property, although there is a temporary soil storage area. Activities associated with this storage area are included within the assessment of construction dust impacts, undertaken in line with DMRB HA207/07. The potential for impacts has been identified within the assessments and appropriate mitigation measures set out in the</li> </ol>



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and -024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3). In relation to the storage of soil, relevant mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loads entering and leaving the site with dust generating potential would be covered</li> <li>- Water assisted sweeping of local roads would be undertaken if material tracked out of site</li> <li>- Plan site layout to maximise distance from plant/stockpiles, etc. to sensitive receptors</li> <li>- Exposed soils would be protected from winds</li> </ul> <p>2. The final measures employed will be developed by the main contractor. No significant effects are likely with the Scheme.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As described above in the Applicants response to Ref. No. 3, no operational depot is proposed in the vicinity of the property.</li> <li>2. With regard to the soil store which would be in use during the construction phase, associated noise generating activity has been considered as part of the earthworks activity within Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042]. Construction mitigation measures are set out within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] and Appendix 6.8 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part A [APP-213].</li> <li>3. An Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>4. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> </ol>
F	<p>Given the negative impact on the environment and landscape and the close proximity to a cluster of houses it is even more confusing as to why this site was chosen.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Temporary soil storage locations have been identified along the length of the Scheme, with their positions chosen based on their proximity to the areas where the soil is to be excavated and used. This site was chosen because part of the site will become a storage swale (Storage Swale 1 as shown on Sheet 1 of the General Arrangement plans [APP- 008]) for the treatment of carriageway drainage prior to discharge into the adjacent watercourse. The construction of the swale will require the excavation of soil which will have to be stored temporarily until it can be used elsewhere on the Scheme. This avoids the need to acquire an additional plot elsewhere. The area required for soil storage is based on calculated volumes of required soil, factoring in a 2m height limit on soil bunds. Following construction, the land used for soil storage would be restored to its former use.</li> <li>2. As set out in the responses to the foregoing and subsequent points the impacts of the temporary soil storage area has been assessed and this assessment has confirmed that there are no significant environmental impacts on the properties at Northgate Farm.</li> </ol>
4	<p>Access to the property. The submitted plans propose that the current direct access be replaced with a convoluted private road, extending to nearly one kilometre, passing through 4 different properties with existing contentions and constraints. The issues are</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property is situated at the southern end of Part A at Warreners House. The existing access from the property onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety following completion of the Scheme. Plots 1/8a and 1/8b on Sheet 1 of Land Plans [APP-006] Permanent Acquisition</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>further exasperated by a less than picturesque point of access into the property that eradicates any kerb appeal and a creates a complete mismatch to the current orientation of the buildings. This is far from optimum creating a long list of negative impacts and leaving a legacy of issues that will continue to burden the property in the future. The rationale behind the chosen route is also questionable from a Public purse perspective as the cost of implementing the road exceeds the value of the two properties that it is intending to service. The following provides further details on why this is considered to be a significant issue.</p>	<p>of Rights Over Land would be used to create the shared private means of access to the property (Work No. 5B) as the Scheme will remove the direct access from the A1 on safety grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussions have taken place with the Hawes in respect of the <a href="#">Private Means of Access</a> (PMA) construction costs, and it was demonstrated that the acquisition of Northgate Farm did not show a cost benefit to the Scheme.</li> <li>Consideration of cost is only one factor which must be considered when proposing to acquire residential property to construct a road widening scheme. Where practical alternatives are available, they must be explored. The proposed PMA is considered by the Applicant to be a practical alternative to acquisition which can be delivered by the Applicant. At the time of design, the owner of the neighbouring property made no request for their property to be acquired under blight and was in support of the proposal for a PMA. The new owner of the neighbouring property is also supporting of the closure of the A1 access and the creation of a PMA.</li> </ol>
A	<p>Although it is understandable that the current direct access has to be replaced the proposed solution is not good one removing many benefits while imposing additional burdens on the household.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing access from the property onto the A1 will be closed on the grounds of safety following completion of the Scheme. A replacement private means of access road (Work No. 5B) will be constructed to gain access to all the properties via West View as shown on Sheet 1 of the General Arrangement Plans [APP-008].</li> <li>The Applicant does not accept that the Scheme's proposed access to the property will have a detrimental impact on the household. The provision of the PMA will represent an improvement over the existing "left in/left out" access to the Property, providing a safer access with enhanced amenity.</li> <li>The Applicant will ensure that each party is provided with access rights suitable to their property type and needs. These rights will be conferred formally so that the rights of each party are clear. This is an arrangement that works perfectly well in other circumstances.</li> </ol>
B	<p>Even at this late stage in the planning process there is still a lack of information on how the access road is to be managed and what rules will apply to govern its usage. Various models have mentioned but all are less ideal and all would place additional burden and risk on the property.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of discussions have taken place since 2018 around the future management of the new PMA. The Applicant will continue to work with all users to agree an acceptable strategy for future maintenance of the access.</li> <li>The provision of a PMA for this group of properties will bring some future maintenance liability for users. The current proposal is for each user to be compensated by way of a commuted sum for their share of the future maintenance liability. The levels of compensation are yet to be calculated and agreed with discussions ongoing over the required access rights and uses. Alternate possibilities have been discussed with landowners including the creation of a management association among the residents. The Applicant has offered ongoing assistance/advice in the formation of such an association although this would require agreement from all residents.</li> </ol>
C	<p>The current pleasant outlook across rolling fields and woods will be replaced with a tarmac road.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addressing item 1C above, the Applicant has identified that the existing view to the west and north and towards the A1 is substantially screened by a combination of tall boundary and garden vegetation, with evergreen trees providing an effective screening component. Although the individual property has not been visited, aerial imagery would suggest that the views east comprise the garden and a boundary of trees, beyond which is open countryside.</li> <li>The Scheme would impact primarily on the western side of the curtilage to the property which currently abuts the existing A1, whilst to the north and east boundaries there is a requirement to form a new access track to the property and neighbouring house, due to the retention of the existing boundary vegetation, awareness of this is anticipated to be limited to the garden space</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>and east facing elevation. The north elevation only being impacted at the point at which the road crosses the property boundary to the north. Measures, to include a hedgerow and additional tree planting, to mitigate the effects are identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3).</p>
D	<p>The introduction of the road will add noise and air pollution where previously there was none.</p>	<p>1. The volume of traffic that would use the private access road is well below the level that would warrant inclusion within the dispersion modelling of the operation impacts of the Scheme i.e. a change in flow of 1000 vehicle AADT. The dominant local sources of pollution for the property and surrounding land are the A1 to the west and, to a lesser extent, the A697 to the south-west. These roads and the impact of the Scheme on them have been fully evaluated in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Part B [APP-041], Appendix 16.4 [APP-330]) and the assessment has demonstrated that no significant effects are likely as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new access road provides access to residents of Northgate Farm and other immediately adjacent dwellings.</li> <li>2. Whilst there is a small cluster of seven dwellings in this location, five of these dwellings are located to the south of Northgate Farm and are accessed, now and in the future, from the south. Therefore, the section of access road that passes to the north and east of the Northgate Farm landholding (which is approximately 70m from the Northgate Farm building at its closest point) carries vehicles associated with just two dwellings, one of which is Northgate Farm itself.</li> <li>3. As a consequence, the number of vehicles travelling along the access road each day is expected to be minimal, especially when compared against the traffic using the A1 itself. In this regard, the anticipated number of vehicles using the adjacent section of the A1 each day is in excess of 20,000 vehicles (over the 18 hour period from 06:00 – 00:00 hours used in the noise assessment) in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme.</li> <li>4. Another key contrast is vehicle speed. Ordinarily vehicles travelling at higher speeds will generate more noise. The traffic on the A1 is expected to be moving at relatively high speeds, whilst the vehicles on the access road (given its narrow width and the presence of bends) would be travelling much slower.</li> <li>5. Existing noise levels are already high at Northgate Farm (as a result of traffic on the A1 as mentioned above) and are predicted to exceed the daytime and night-time SOAEL thresholds in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme (the SOAEL thresholds for the daytime and night-time are 68 dB <math>L_{A10,18h}</math> and 55 dB <math>L_{Aeq,8h}</math> respectively). Therefore, the addition of an occasional, slow moving vehicle on the access road would be expected to have an inconsequential effect on overall noise levels in the area.</li> </ol>
E	<p>In wrapping around the property, the access road raises concern on security for the first time. Furthermore, all privacy enjoyed in the garden will be lost.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The access to the property via the proposed private means of access would be signed appropriately and, in comparison to the existing direct access from the A1, the security threat is not perceived to be impacted by this change.</li> <li>2. The loss of the limited number of trees is not anticipated to significantly reduce the enjoyment or privacy of the garden space. The design of the access road has sought to avoid unnecessary removal of trees along the property boundary, nevertheless it would be necessary to remove a limited number in the north east corner in order to achieve an appropriate bend in the access</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>road whilst avoiding unnecessary land take from the adjacent field. Awareness of the access road from the garden space could be screened through the establishment of a hedge line between the property and the access road, as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3). Until this is fully established a boundary fence would be included.</p>
F	<p>Entrance to the property from the North will take much longer to complete with circa 3 extra miles of travel and an additional 15-minute journey to access the property. Similarly, journeys to the south will take much longer. The prospect of friends popping into the house will no longer be an option.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The provision of the PMA will represent an improvement over the existing "left in/left out" access to the Property, providing a safer access with enhanced amenity.</li> <li>2. The Applicant acknowledges that the residents of the property will have a greater distance to travel to access the A1. Traffic modelling of the Scheme has been undertaken as described in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP344]. Section 4.8 of Chapter 4 details the forecast improvements to average journey times as a result of the Scheme, which will help to offset any increase in journey time for drivers accessing the A1 from the property. Drivers will also benefit from using the new grade separated junction at St Leonards Junction via Morpeth Bypass which will enable safer access through avoiding right turn traffic movements and reduced delays compared with the current left in/left out" access.</li> </ol>
G	<p>The new access road to the property will entail travelling through the property of 4 different owners, who are known to have concerns about the access. Although it is understood that the owners cannot change or restrict usage there is still an overriding feeling of being beholding to the respective owners and will be open to abuse or a conflict of interest. For example, the farm use of the road will be very different to domestic use and will understandably be motivated to maximise crop growth. Similarly, the domestic properties will be unhappy at the level of mud being transferred by farm vehicles.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant proposes that following completion of the Works, it will grant – or secure the grant – of rights over the access road to the residents of Northgate Farm, Capri Lodge and the Woodland to the north that uses this access or the purposes of their property. This will be a grant of easement, registrable at the Land Registry. The right will be subject to the landowners each paying a suitable proportion of the costs of maintaining the access road.</li> </ol>
H	<p>To get access to the rear of the property (to carry out maintenance) by car the new plans require a journey of over 1k over 2 additional properties.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant acknowledges that the route by car will be longer. However, the access will be safer via the newly constructed PMA and not from the use of two existing "left in/left out" accesses.</li> </ol>
I	<p>Given the high level of dependency on 6 different properties to gain access to the property there is real risk that the access will become compromised with any relationship fall-out. This has happened in the past and unfortunately is likely to happen again especially when you factor in road maintenance responsibilities. This arrangement will be a constant source of contention going forward and is not sustainable. Unfortunately, even before the route has been established it has already created a fall-out between neighbours.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant will ensure that each party is provided with access rights suitable to their property type and needs. These rights will be conferred formally so that the rights of each party are clear. This is an arrangement that works perfectly well in other circumstances.</li> </ol>
J	<p>The maintenance of the new access road will place an additional obligation on the property. Given the length of the private road and the mixed usage (including farm vehicles) this undoubtedly represents a major new burden on the household.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As discussed with the landowner on 13/01/21 there are a number of options to be explored in relation to future maintenance of the access road. Ultimately, any additional maintenance burden placed on the household as a result of the scheme will be addressed through compensation.</li> </ol>
K	<p>The planned point of access to the property is less than optimum. The original build and design of the house (and gardens) were purposely customised to orientate around the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant confirms that the current design includes some vegetation removal in plot 1/8a to ensure the access is appropriate.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>current access and significant investment has been over the years to landscape the property to optimise the ease of use and maximise the “kerb appeal”. The proposed plans effectively negate all this effort and investment and will require a major redesign which is not been planned. This will also involve the removal of further trees which will expose the new carriageway further. The current point of access is also not wanted by the neighbour whose property the access road has to travel over.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. As part of the Scheme design to date, consideration has been given to the avoidance of woodland removal to reduce the effect of the Scheme, including in the vicinity of the property. The Applicant confirms that the detailed design of the tie-in to the existing driveway will seek to minimise the vegetation loss. This is in addition to the replacement of planting on the western boundary to restore the boundary planting and provide a long term screen, as identified in Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3), and secured through item S-L2 in Table 3-1 - Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme, within the Outline CEMP [REP-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3).</li> <li>3. The District Valuer has met with the neighbour in question and discussed the current proposal. The neighbour has raised concern over the current proposals due to existing and ongoing access disputes between the two properties. The Applicant will continue to discuss the access provisions with all affected parties in an attempt to reach an agreeable solution,</li> <li>4. The Applicant proposes that following completion of the Works, it will grant – or secure the grant – of rights over the access road to the residents of Northgate Farm, Capri Lodge and the Woodland to the north that uses this access to use it for the purposes of their property. This will be a grant of easement, registrable at the Land Registry. The right will be subject to the landowners each paying a suitable proportion of the costs of maintaining the Northgate Farm and Capri Lodge access road.</li> </ol>
L	<p>The costs of constructing the access road to service the two properties represent a significant public purse spend and one that exceeds the value of the properties. This position is further exasperated with plans to construct a further access road to the rear of the property.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed Private Means of Access (PMA) not only provides access to the subject property but also to other dwellings and land which will have their current left in/left out access direct from the A1 closed. The Applicant is required to provide access to all those affected by the Scheme. The cost of providing the private means of access is not referable solely to the respondent's property. As such, the cost to the Scheme of this proposal is merited.</li> </ol>
5	<p>Transport. The submitted plans make very little provision for other types of transport to complement the dualling project. Indeed, existing transport modes in my local area are to be removed. This includes a regular bus service with bus stops outside of my property. Similarly, the local cycle link and footpath are to be removed. Given the government agenda to encourage greater use of cycle paths I was surprised not to see a more strategic plan to integrate cycle links with the project. This was successfully achieved with the recent Morpeth bypass project. The following provides further details on why this is considered to be a significant issue.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The footpath referred to by the landowner (footway along the eastern side of the A1 from Strafford House to the southern extent of the Scheme at the tie in to the existing dual carriageway) is not being removed and it is proposed to be retained as shown on Sheet 1 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-003]. There are no cycle links within the vicinity affected by the Scheme.</li> <li>2. A number of bus stops (northbound and southbound) would be removed across the Scheme, but the Scheme also includes retention, relocation and formalisation of existing bus stop provision as set out in the outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) (reference A-PH1e). The provisions of the CEMP are secured by Requirement 4, Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (APP-014).</li> <li>3. At one location new stops are proposed offline from the A1 for safety reasons.</li> <li>4. The Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) includes mitigation measures S-PH9, A-PH11 and B-PH2 which provide the detail on the relocation of the bus stops along the Scheme during both the construction and operational periods.</li> <li>5. The desire to create a separate cycle track would be over and above the requirements of the Scheme, so other funding routes would have to be explored. 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.</li> <li>6. In the vicinity to Northgate Farm, a new section of bridleway would be provided at the south of the Scheme, extending on from Bridleway 407/010, which would tie into the road network north</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>of Morpeth at West View. The new private access road which would service Northgate Farm will tie into this bridleway to the south, and will extend to Highlaws Junction to the north, where pedestrian and cycle provision is made for crossing the A1.</p>
A	<p>Having a regular bus service directly outside the property is a major benefit to the property and has been well used over the years. There is minimal reference to the impact on Transport links in the DCO.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is expressly referenced within Chapter 12: Population and Human Health of the ES [APP-054], section 12.10, under Community Severance, that there would be increased journeys for those who access public transport from the existing bus stop at Warreners House, which would be removed as part of the Scheme. In the case of residents at Northgate House, this would be an increase in journey length of over 2km if wanting to access the X15 bus service on foot. Other bus services can be accessed at Fairmoor, approximately 1.1km to the south of Northgate Farm.</li> <li>2. Section 4.11 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] describes the impact of the Scheme on public transport. The Applicant met with Arriva bus several times during the Scheme development phase to discuss the bus routes affected by the Scheme. Development of the Preliminary Design concluded that it would not be practicable to provide safe access to the northbound bus stop at Warreners House as part of the Scheme, with the only feasible option being to remove the northbound bus stop completely. Subsequently Arriva confirmed, that if the northbound bus stop is to be removed, then they would not want to retain the southbound stop and so this should also be removed.</li> <li>3. It was recognised in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054] and Part B [APP-055], Section 12.10 that usage of these services (as reported by the service provider) is low, however the Scheme ensures continued access to public transport. Refer to Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-054] and Part B [APP-055] and Chapter 14: Climate Part A [APP-058] and Part B [APP-059].</li> </ol>
B	<p>In the future my family and I will need to walk over a mile to the nearest bus stop. The prospect of anyone from the family walking alone along an unlit country road in the winter is a nonstarter given the obvious safety concerns.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The nearest alternative bus stop (to those located at Warreners House, which would be removed as part of the Scheme) is located to the south of the property at Fairmoor, approximately 1.1km away, and is not affected by the Scheme. This is serviced by three different bus routes to those which currently stop at Warreners House.</li> <li>2. As part of the Scheme, a bus stop on both the northbound and southbound carriageways would be formalised on the A697 at Espley (outside of the Order limits of Part A), which would be a journey of over 2km for pedestrians.</li> <li>3. The existing footway along the A1, which is located on the eastern side of the A1, and accessible to residents of Northgate Farm, would be retained and allows travel for pedestrians to the north (for Espley) and south (for Fairmoor) of the bus stop at Warreners House. The footway would be extended to the north to the new Highlaws Junction, where provision would be made for safe, grade separated, east to west crossing of the Scheme onto either Hebron Road, or High Highlaws Road.</li> <li>4. A new section of bridleway would also be provided at the south of the Scheme, extending on from Bridleway 407/010, which would tie into the road network north of Morpeth at West View.</li> </ol>
C	<p>To neglect the potential of improving cycle links and footpaths in the area would appear to be a missed opportunity.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 on Part A. 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 provision of the shared pedestrian and cyclist facility as part of the new link road is to future proof this new</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>section of infrastructure i.e. to avoid having to undertake further works at some point in the future. This same approach is taken for new footways located at new grade-separated junctions to provide safe, east-west connectivity with Public Rights of Way [REP2-003].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Applicant is working with NCC to identify alternative funding options to enhance WCH provision in the area. Subject to funding availability and any proposals meeting set criteria, such as being able to demonstrate it is an activity deemed beyond <i>business as usual</i> that is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme, there may be opportunities to make use of Designated Funds.</li> <li>3. Designated Funds are a series of the ring-fenced funds provided by Government to address a range of issues over and above the traditional focus of road investment and may be available to deliver additional enhancements, for example, cycling provision to enhance safety, connectivity and integration. The Applicant will liaise with NCC to identify possible enhancements for which Designated Funds can be applied for. There may also be other funding opportunities that NCC can explore such as through the Department for Transport Transforming Cities Fund.</li> <li>4. However, the disbursement of these funds is discretionary and cannot be assured.</li> </ol>
D	<p>The loss of these transport options, particularly the bus service, represents a significant loss of benefit to the property.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To the extent that there is a loss of benefit, that is a matter for compensation, not appropriate for discussion in the Examination.</li> <li>2. Whilst it is recognised that there will be an increase in journey length to residents at Northgate Farm to access bus services and the location of the bus stop north of Warreners House is beneficial to the residents in this location, the Applicant does not believe that this constitutes a significant adverse effect on the private property in this location (when considered in accordance with the Population and Human Health assessment methodology, as detailed in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health Part A [APP-045]).</li> <li>3. It is also worth noting that in consultation with the service providers of the bus services, it was noted that usage of these services is low. The placement of replacement bus stops provided as part of the Proposed Scheme were informed by these current levels of usage, and the removal of bus stops from the dualled section of the new A1.</li> <li>4. Section 4.11 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] describes the impact of the Scheme on public transport. The Applicant met with Arriva bus several times during the Scheme development phase to discuss the bus routes affected by the Scheme. Development of the Preliminary Design concluded that it would not be practicable to provide safe access to the northbound bus stop at Warreners House as part of the Scheme, with the only feasible option being to remove the northbound bus stop completely. Subsequently Arriva confirmed, that if the northbound bus stop is to be removed, then they would not want to retain the southbound stop and so this should also be removed.</li> <li>5. The existing footway along the A1, which is located on the eastern side of the A1, and accessible to residents of Northgate Farm, will be retained and allows travel for pedestrians to the north and south.</li> </ol>
6	<p>Landscape and Visual. We currently enjoy a picturesque outlook with mature woodland, rolling fields and tree lined avenue. The proposed plans radically change this with the introduction of an operational depot, additional access roads, a layby and the expansion of the carriageway all in close proximity to the property. After overcoming the significant visual impact of the construction phase, we will be facing the prospect of</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The layby, situated approximately 200m north of the property, will consist of a 3.5m wide carriageway and a 3.5m wide parking area. This will notionally create two additional lanes over the discrete length of the layby i.e. there would be 6 lanes rather than 7 at the oblique views from Northgate Farm.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>7 lanes of tarmac being the primary landscape view from the front of the property. Furthermore, the removal of woodland to the west of the property will leave the A697 trunk clearly visible for the first time. Whilst there is some attempt in the Landscape Mitigation plan to mask some element of this it falls well short and what is proposed will take a long time before it has any positive impact. The following provides further details on why this is considered to be a significant issue.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. In addressing item 1C above, the Applicant has identified that the existing view to the west and north and towards the A1 is substantially screened by a combination of tall boundary and garden vegetation, with evergreen trees providing an effective screening component. Although the individual property has not been visited, aerial imagery would suggest that the views east comprise the garden and a boundary of trees, beyond which is open countryside.</li> <li>3. The Applicant can confirm that there would be no operational depot to the west of Northgate Farm, the soil storage area would be temporary and the area returned to its former use after construction as set out in the outline CEMP [REP-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3)(reference S-PH12).</li> <li>4. As has been outlined in 1C and 4C above, the access road would not be readily visible from the property, beyond the retained boundary vegetation, and building (Capri Lodge) to the north. Once mitigation planting as set out on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (and updated at Deadline 3) has established, only at the point at which it crosses the property boundary to the north would a view to the north be afforded, which would be filtered by the establishing roadside trees to the east of the Scheme. The provision of the access road and compacted field access to the north is therefore not anticipated to radically change the outlook.</li> <li>5. As has been addressed in 2 above, once operational, and as a result of the retention of some of the existing hedge to the western boundary and the proposed noise barrier extending for a little over 20m from the north facing elevation of Northgate Farm, the visual effects would be limited to views to the north-west with the wider A1 that includes the layby being visible, broadly in the same position as the existing A1, albeit wider. As mitigation along the boundary of the property matures, views of the A1 including the layby, would diminish.</li> <li>6. The existing A1 would be widened to the west of the existing alignment, in an effort by the Applicant to reduce the potential for additional impacts on the property, but inevitably requiring features of the landscape to be altered. Nevertheless, the Scheme would impact primarily on the western side of the curtilage to the property which currently abuts the existing A1, whilst to the north and east boundaries there is a requirement to form a new access track to the property and neighbouring house, which would be screened through the establishment of a hedge line between the property and the access road, as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3).</li> <li>7. The removal of woodland to the west of the property would occur within the woodland, and a broad tract of woodland (approximately 15-20m) would be retained between the A697 and the property to reduce the effect of this.</li> <li>8. There is a requirement to remove some of the existing roadside vegetation, including the southern extents of the Coronation Avenue, which forms an irregular avenue of trees along the existing A1. The Applicant has, at Deadline 1, submitted Appendix LV.2 Trees to be Removed and Replaced at Coronation Avenue WQ LV.1.8 [REP1-044], which provides further information relating to the number and location of trees to be replaced as part of the mitigation strategy, which would replicate some of the existing landscape features. The effect of this would be to re-establish over a period of time a strong linear feature within the landscape, comparable to that which exists currently, and which contributes to the existing landscape character of the area.</li> </ol>



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>9. The removal of woodland to the west of the property would occur within the woodland, and a broad tract of woodland (approximately 15-20m) would be retained between the A697 and the property to reduce the effect of this.</p>
A	<p>The current plans also include a significant public spend to construct a high-quality formal road to the woods north of the property. Given the low farm usage of this road it would appear an expensive over engineered solution. There is an opportunity to save budget by extending the existing farm track to the woods while at the same time significantly improving the landscape outlook.</p>	<p>1. The PMA servicing Northgate Farm and Capri Lodge will be paved but continuation north will be a field access of compacted stone, which will be appropriate for the volume of agricultural vehicles. The selection of this route will also allow access to the existing private water meter. This was confirmed to the landowner on the liaison call on 13/01/21.</p>
B	<p>With the new access road wrapping around the property all views from the property will be dominated by tarmac.</p>	<p>1. The proposed access road would be constructed on the periphery of the property boundary – where possible retaining the existing boundary vegetation, except on the north east corner where a limited number of trees would be removed to facilitate the construction of the bend in the access road. Should the property owner wish, the Applicant has provided the option of establishing a hedge line between the property and the access road, as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3). As a result, the awareness of the access track would not be a substantial new element within the views to the east, whilst views to the north would be substantially screened by the property to the north (Capri Lodge) and retained boundary vegetation, except where the access road would tie into the frontage of the property. The Applicant does not consider that this would dominate views within all views from the property.</p>
C	<p>The plans involve significant felling of mature trees on the north, west and east outlook leaving tarmac on view.</p>	<p>1. As identified above (6B), the proposed access road would be constructed on the periphery of the property boundary – where possible retaining the existing boundary vegetation, except on the north east corner where a limited number of trees would be removed to facilitate the construction of the bend in the access road. Should the property owner wish, the Applicant has provided the option of establishing a hedge line between the property and the access road, as identified on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] (latest version submitted at Deadline 3). As a result, the awareness of the access track would not be a substantial new element within the views to the east, whilst views to the north would be substantially screened by the property to the north (Capri Lodge) and retained boundary vegetation, except where the access road would tie into the frontage of the property. The Applicant does not consider that this would dominate views within all views from the property.</p>
7	<p>Noise and Vibration. The proposed plans suggests that the introduction of a sound barrier and the use of low-noise surface will be sufficient to reduce noise levels of increased traffic travelling at much faster speeds. However, the proposed sound barrier is not guaranteed and only covers part of the property leaving much of it exposed. I welcome the use of lownoise surface, however, as seen on other roads the noise levels significantly increase with time as the road ages and becomes damaged with wear. We currently enjoy the use of the garden after 7pm when the traffic is very quiet and not noticeable. The expansion of the road will encourage a 24/7 use of the road thereby creating a constant noise barrage. Given the uncertainty with the sound barrier more could have been done to mitigate the impact of noise which is known to have a</p>	<p>1. The Applicant can confirm that the proposed noise barrier (PNB1), can be constructed within the existing verge and would provide meaningful noise benefits to the Northgate Farm property. The barrier extends to the north and south of the Northgate Farm building and provides noise benefits on all façades of the building. PNB1 is secured through the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) in Row A-N4 of Table 3-1 – Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 5.2.5 of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3). states: “In the longer term, expected planned maintenance will include activities such as resurfacing the road and replacement of assets when they become life expired.”</p> <p>3. As reported in the Noise Addendum [REP1-019], whilst the operation of the Scheme is anticipated to lead to increased traffic flows on the section of the A1 adjacent to Northgate Farm, the maximum increase in noise level in the short term (comparing the projected opening</p>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>detrimental impact upon health. The following provides further details on why this is considered to be a significant issue.</p>	<p>year of 2024 with and without the Scheme not including the noise level benefits from PNB1) is only predicted to be 2 dB during the daytime (which includes the evening period) and night-time (corresponding to a minor magnitude of impact). This noise level increase has been deemed significant given the high absolute noise levels at the property which are predicted to exceed the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) both with and without the Scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. As this property is predicted to experience a significant adverse operational noise effect, noise barrier PNB1 has been proposed, and will be constructed within the existing verge. With PNB1, the representative daytime and night-time noise level at the Northgate Farm building is predicted to decrease as a result of the Scheme, resulting in a beneficial impact in the short-term.</li> <li>5. At the time the Noise Addendum [REP1-019] was prepared there was some uncertainty regarding whether PNB1 could be constructed. It has recently been confirmed that this barrier can be constructed.</li> <li>6. Nevertheless, because of the previous uncertainty, the following alternative mitigation measures were considered, although it was concluded that neither was appropriate in this location:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Road Speed and Vehicle Restrictions - Whilst a reduction in the road speed limit or a restriction on noisy vehicles using the Scheme would have the potential to reduce noise levels, such measures are not normally suitable for use on motorways and all purpose trunk roads such as those contained in the Scheme. This is acknowledged within the DMRB LA 111 Noise and Vibration which notes that: "Speed limits or restrictions on noisy vehicle types are not normally practical for use on motorways and all purpose trunk roads"</li> <li>– Earth bunds – Given the available space between the Scheme and the properties in the Northgate Farm area, an earth bund would not be feasible in this location.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
A	<p>There is no detail available as to why the sound barrier is at risk and why it cannot be extended.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further investigation was required to determine whether there is space for the required foundations for the proposed noise barrier (PNB1) within the existing verge. Recent buildability advice confirms that there is room and PNB1 is secured through the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) in Row A-N4 of Table 3-1 – Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme.</li> <li>2. With regard to the extension of the barrier:</li> <li>3. The noise barrier proposed in this location is designed to reduce road traffic noise levels resulting from the Scheme at properties in the area of Northgate Farm.</li> <li>4. Section 1.12 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of the Noise Addendum [REP1-019] presents the rationale for the inclusion of a 70m long noise barrier, PNB1, alongside the A1 carriageway at Northgate Farm. The purpose of this barrier is to reduce the noise levels predicted to affect the nearby properties as a result of the Scheme. With the 70m long barrier a beneficial impact is predicted at the Northgate Farm building in the short-term. Increasing the length of the barrier would also increase the cost and would be likely to reduce the value for money ratio of the barrier. Therefore, the 70m barrier was considered most appropriate in this location.</li> </ol>
B	<p>In comparing the noise levels between a dual carriageway and the current single carriageway it is very noticeable how much noisier the dual is compared to the single</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The operational stage noise assessment within the Noise Addendum [REP1-019] is based on noise level predictions which take into account (amongst other factors such as the road</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>carriage. The higher speeds and increased volume of HGV traffic significantly increase noise levels.</p>	<p>alignment) predicted traffic flows, mix of vehicles (percentage heavy goods vehicles (HGVs)) and vehicle speeds both with and without the Scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment concludes that (without PNB1) Northgate Farm is predicted to experience a significant adverse operational road traffic noise effect as a result of the Scheme. This is due to both the predicted noise level change at the property (an increase of 2 dB which corresponds to a minor magnitude of impact), the predicted absolute noise levels which exceed the SOAEL as defined by DMRB LA 111 and a number of other contextual factors as discussed within the Noise Addendum [REP1-019].</li> <li>As a significant effect has been identified at the property, PNB1 has been proposed and will be constructed in the existing verge. With PNB1, the representative daytime and night-time noise level at the Northgate Farm building is predicted to decrease as a result of the Scheme, resulting in a beneficial impact in the short-term. PNB1 is secured through the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) in Row A-N4 of Table 3-1 – Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme.</li> </ol>
C	<p>Given the DCO conclusion that there will be no increase in noise levels I am very sceptical on how this has been derived. It would appear that they have prematurely assumed that the sound barrier will be constructed and have not taken into account of how noise levels change at different times of the day.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Noise Addendum [REP1-019] does not state that there would be no increase in noise levels at Northgate Farm. It is stated within paragraph 1.13.19 that given the potential design constraint risk which might have prevented the construction of PNB1, this barrier was not included in the summary of significant effects presented in Table 1-40 of the Noise Addendum [REP1-019]. However, it has since been confirmed that this barrier can be constructed and a significant adverse operational road traffic noise effect is therefore no longer predicted at Northgate Farm. With PNB1, a beneficial impact is predicted at the Northgate Farm building in the short-term.</li> <li>As required by DMRB LA 111 which is the principal guidance document for operational road traffic noise assessment such as this, the operational noise assessment has been undertaken over two periods. The daytime period from 06:00 - 00:00 hours, and the night-time period from 23:00 - 07:00 hours.</li> <li>The operational stage noise assessment presented within the Noise Addendum [REP1-019] is therefore deemed robust and in line with appropriate guidance including the different time periods considered.</li> </ol>
D	<p>As highlighted in the DCO the average speeds along the current single carriageway are circa 50 mph which is an optimum speed for minimising noise levels. Vehicles travelling at 70 miles an hour or over are significantly noisier regardless of road surface.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The operational stage noise assessment within the Noise Addendum [REP1-019] is based on noise level predictions which take into account (amongst other factors such as the road alignment) predicted traffic flows, mix of vehicles (percentage heavy goods vehicles (HGVs)) and vehicle speeds both with and without the Scheme.</li> <li>The assessment concludes that (without PNB1) Northgate Farm is predicted to experience a significant adverse operational road traffic noise effect as a result of the Scheme. This is due to both the predicted noise level change at the property (an increase of 2 dB which corresponds to a minor magnitude of impact), the predicted absolute noise levels which exceed the SOAEL as defined by DMRB LA 111 and a number of other contextual factors as discussed within the Noise Addendum [REP1-019].</li> <li>As a significant effect has been identified at the property, PNB1 has been proposed, and will be constructed in the existing verge., , With PNB1, the representative daytime and night-time noise level at the Northgate Farm building is predicted to decrease as a result of the Scheme, resulting in a beneficial impact in the short-term. PNB1 is secured through the Outline CEMP</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		[REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) in Row A-N4 of Table 3-1 – Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments: The Scheme.
E	The DCO does not provide any indication of the impact of the new access roads and the depot on the noise levels.	<p><b>New Access Road</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new access road provides access to residents of Northgate Farm and other immediately adjacent dwellings.</li> <li>2. Whilst there is a small cluster of seven dwellings in this location, five of these dwellings are located to the south of Northgate Farm and are accessed, now and in the future, from the south. Therefore, the section of access road that passes to the north and east of the Northgate Farm landholding (which is approximately 70m from the Northgate Farm building at its closest point) carries vehicles associated with just two dwellings, one of which is Northgate Farm itself.</li> <li>3. As a consequence, the number of vehicles travelling along the access road each day is expected to be minimal, especially when compared against the traffic using the A1 itself. In this regard, the anticipated number of vehicles using the adjacent section of the A1 each day is in excess of 20,000 vehicles (over the 18 hour period from 06:00 – 00:00 hours used in the noise assessment) in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme.</li> <li>4. Another key contrast is vehicle speed. Ordinarily vehicles travelling at higher speeds will generate more noise. The traffic on the A1 is expected to be moving at relatively high speeds, whilst the vehicles on the access road (given its narrow width and the presence of bends) would be travelling much slower.</li> <li>5. Existing noise levels are already high at Northgate Farm (as a result of traffic on the A1 as mentioned above) and are predicted to exceed the daytime and night-time SOAEL thresholds in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme (the SOAEL thresholds for the daytime and night-time are 68 dB <math>L_{A10,18h}</math> and 55 dB <math>L_{Aeq,8h}</math> respectively). Therefore, the addition of an occasional, slow moving vehicle on the access road would be expected to have an inconsequential effect on overall noise levels in the area.</li> </ol> <p><b>Depot</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As described above in the Applicants response to Ref. No. 3, no operational depot is proposed in the vicinity of the property.</li> <li>2. With regard to the soil store which would be in use during the construction phase, associated noise generating activity has been considered as part of the earthworks activity within Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042]. Construction mitigation measures are set out within Section 6.9 Design, Mitigation and Enhancement of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] and Appendix 6.8 Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses Part A [APP-213].</li> <li>3. An Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] (and as submitted at Deadline 3) has been produced for the Scheme which includes the noise and vibration mitigation measures (Section 3 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments).</li> <li>4. The construction noise and vibration assessment within Section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects of Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation, no significant adverse effects are predicted during the construction stage of the Scheme, including at this property.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
F	<p>With the new access road circling the property there is no longer any part of the property where it is possible to escape from road noise.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new access road provides access to residents of Northgate Farm and other immediately adjacent dwellings.</li> <li>2. Whilst there is a small cluster of seven dwellings in this location, five of these dwellings are located to the south of Northgate Farm and are accessed, now and in the future, from the south. Therefore, the section of access road that passes to the north and east of the Northgate Farm landholding (which is approximately 70m from the Northgate Farm building at its closest point) carries vehicles associated with just two dwellings, one of which is Northgate Farm itself.</li> <li>3. As a consequence, the number of vehicles travelling along the access road each day is expected to be minimal, especially when compared against the traffic using the A1 itself. In this regard, the anticipated number of vehicles using the adjacent section of the A1 each day is in excess of 20,000 vehicles (over the 18 hour period from 06:00 – 00:00 hours used in the noise assessment) in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme.</li> <li>4. Another key contrast is vehicle speed. Ordinarily vehicles travelling at higher speeds will generate more noise. The traffic on the A1 is expected to be moving at relatively high speeds, whilst the vehicles on the access road (given its narrow width and the presence of bends) would be travelling much slower.</li> <li>5. Existing noise levels are already high at Northgate Farm (as a result of traffic on the A1 as mentioned above) and are predicted to exceed the daytime and night-time SOAEL thresholds in the opening year (2024) without the Scheme (the SOAEL thresholds for the daytime and night-time are 68 dB <math>L_{A10,18h}</math> and 55 dB <math>L_{Aeq,8h}</math> respectively). Therefore, the addition of an occasional, slow moving vehicle on the access road would be expected to have an inconsequential effect on overall noise levels in the area.</li> <li>6. Consequently, it is wrong to characterise the Property as being transformed into a location where it is not possible to escape from noise as a result of the private means of access.</li> </ol>
G	<p>There is very little reference in the DCO on what impact vibration will have on the properties. Positioned just 8 meters from the new dual carriageway the increase in HGV vehicles and speeds will lead to a significant increase of vibration on the property. The stone building which was built over 100 years ago was never engineered to withstand the impact of a dual carriageway so close to the property. A survey has not been carried out to assess the impact on the building</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The appropriate guidance for operational road traffic assessments is DMRB LA 111 Noise and Vibration, May 2020 (Revision 2). In section 1 of this document the following is noted:</li> <li>2. "Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects."</li> <li>3. It has therefore not been considered necessary to undertake an assessment of operational vibration within the Noise Addendum [REP1-019], including at this property.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
8	<p>Air quality. The current projections from data captured in 2015 suggest that the actual air quality when the road becomes operational will under standard conditions be within legal limits. I am surprised that such an important aspect to people's health is left to such a longrange estimation without further surveys to validate. In deriving an air quality forecast I understand that there are a large range of unknown variables which require assumptions to be made. Given the dependency on such variables I was expecting a wider range of potential results to cover different scenarios. For example, what is the impact on air quality in the event that there is an accident and traffic is stationary for some time.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project specific air quality baseline data were collected in 2017, and local authority data were presented for 2013 to 2017. For use in the verification of the air quality model, it was necessary to back-project the project specific monitoring from 2017 to 2015. This was undertaken following guidance in LAQM TG 16.</li> <li>2. As a result of many years' experience and data gathering, environmental assessors and Highways England through its published assessment methodologies have approaches that allow these types of assessment, including future forecasting, to be undertaken. The air quality assessment has been based on the latest available and approved data. As more data has become available, the sensitivity of the modelled impacts has been reviewed and it has been concluded that the findings of Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Part B [APP-041] are robust.</li> <li>3. Whilst there may be some inherent uncertainty in the traffic data, this has been minimised as far as is practicable. Moreover, in relation to air quality, it is acknowledged that there is inherent uncertainty in future year forecasts, but that this has been taken into account using the methodology set out in DMRB HA207/07 and latterly LA105. Further details are provided below. Paragraph 5.5.3 in Chapter 5 Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and in Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] set out the approach taken within the air quality assessment in dealing with uncertainty in the projection of vehicle emissions into the future. The assessment approach follows guidance set out in IAN 170/12v3, which takes into account the latest available projection factors which best reflects the most recent evidence on the trends in vehicle emissions and monitored concentrations of NO2 over time. This process is termed gap analysis, i.e. addressing the gap between predicted reductions in pollutant concentrations and those observed. The gap analysed results are presented throughout the air quality assessment. This represents a conservative approach to the prediction of future pollutant concentrations.</li> <li>4. In relation to accidents and stationary traffic, the key metric for the air quality assessment is the annual mean concentration of nitrogen dioxide (and, to a lesser extent, particulate matter). The short term variability in emissions, introduced by individual events (accidents / periods of very low flow etc) has limited impact on annual mean concentrations – which are, dominated by average conditions. Notwithstanding this, the limited impact is taken into account into account in the modelling via the verification of model results against roadside monitoring. This monitoring inherently includes the effects of short term and long term events and variability, and, therefore, the verification of the model takes into account real world traffic behaviour.</li> </ol>
9	<p>Air quality. The current projections from data captured in 2015 suggest that the actual air quality when the road becomes operational will, under standard conditions, be within legal limits. I am surprised that such an important aspect to people's health is left to such a longrange estimation without further surveys to validate. In deriving an air quality forecast I understand that there are a large range of unknown variables which require assumptions to be made. Given the dependency on such variables I was expecting a wider range of potential results to cover different scenarios. For example, what is the impact on air quality in the event that there is an accident and traffic is stationary for some time. The following provides further details on why this is considered to be a significant issue.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project specific air quality baseline data were collected in 2017, and local authority data were presented for 2013 to 2017. For use in the verification of the air quality model, it was necessary to back-project the project specific monitoring from 2017 to 2015. This was undertaken following guidance in LAQM TG 16.</li> <li>2. As a result of many years' experience and data gathering, environmental assessors and Highways England through its published assessment methodologies have approaches that allow these types of assessment, including future forecasting, to be undertaken. The air quality assessment has been based on the latest available and approved data. As more data has become available, the sensitivity of the modelled impacts has been reviewed and it has been concluded that the findings of Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Part B [APP-041] are robust.</li> <li>3. Whilst there may be some inherent uncertainty in the traffic data, this has been minimised as far as is practicable. Moreover, in relation to air quality, it is acknowledged that there is inherent</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>uncertainty in future year forecasts, but that this has been taken into account using the methodology set out in DMRB HA207/07 and latterly LA105. Further details are provided below. Paragraph 5.5.3 in Chapter 5 Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and in Chapter 5 Air Quality Part B [APP-041] set out the approach taken within the air quality assessment in dealing with uncertainty in the projection of vehicle emissions into the future. The assessment approach follows guidance set out in IAN 170/12v3, which takes into account the latest available projection factors which best reflects the most recent evidence on the trends in vehicle emissions and monitored concentrations of NO2 over time. This process is termed gap analysis, i.e. addressing the gap between predicted reductions in pollutant concentrations and those observed. The gap analysed results are presented throughout the air quality assessment. This represents a conservative approach to the prediction of future pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>4. In relation to accidents and stationary traffic, the key metric for the air quality assessment is the annual mean concentration of nitrogen dioxide (and, to a lesser extent, particulate matter). The short term variability in emissions, introduced by individual events (accidents / periods of very low flow etc) has limited impact on annual mean concentrations – which are, dominated by average conditions. Notwithstanding this, the limited impact is taken into account into account in the modelling via the verification of model results against roadside monitoring. This monitoring inherently includes the effects of short term and long term events and variability, and, therefore, the verification of the model takes into account real world traffic behaviour.</p>
A	<p>I understand that the majority of the data was captured in 2015 and the subsequent results extrapolated before the current plans were formulated. A significant number of changes have been made to the plans since then which have a direct impact on air pollution.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project specific air quality baseline data were collected in 2017, and local authority data were presented for 2013 to 2017. For use in the verification of the air quality model, it was necessary to back-project the project specific monitoring from 2017 to 2015. This was undertaken following guidance in LAQM TG 16 (Ref 5.25 in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Part B [APP-041]).</li> <li>2. All changes to the design of the Scheme as it has been developed and refined since the preferred route announcement in 2017 have been reviewed in terms of their materiality to Air Quality. Where the result of this review indicates that a change in the aspects of the Scheme e.g. the design or planned opening year, may have an impact to air quality which has not been considered in the air quality assessment, this has been considered as a supplement to the main the air quality assessment. These considerations have been incorporated in the Scheme which is the subject of the DCO Application, take the form of either an Appendix, in the case of the change to the Scheme opening year set out in Appendix 16.4 Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330], or as an addendum, as it will in the case of the changes to the construction methodology for Scheme design to be submitted as a Change Request at Deadline 4. In all cases, these supplements indicate the level of change anticipated with the updated Scheme design and/or guidance and do not change the conclusion of the air quality assessment; that no significant effects in terms of human health are anticipated.</li> </ol>
B	<p>The DCO would appear to be content that no mitigation is required as it meets EU standards. The measurement of air quality is not something that should be assessed in such a digital manner. Any degradation of air quality should be recognised as a negative and taken seriously. There can be no doubt that an increase in levels of traffic, particularly of HGV vehicles, there will be a greater level of pollutants in the air. There is no mitigation planned to offset this.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The requirement for mitigation of air quality impacts is assessed in relation to the potential for significant effects arising from those impacts. Since the future concentrations are assessed, following the accepted guidance in DMRB HA207/07 (and LA105 update), to be within the UK's air quality standards, indeed to be well within the standards, there is no requirement for mitigation.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
C	The air quality predictions documented in the DCO are based upon various receptors that were placed along the route in 2015. This includes one that was placed within our property which we are unaware of.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The receptors considered in Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] and Part B [APP-041] represent locations which have been identified as being sensitive to air quality changes and therefore been considered within the assessment. The receptor at Mr Hawes's property has been placed digitally within a dispersion model, rather than physically on site.</li> </ol>
D	Although I understand that it is standard industry practice to extrapolate the expected air quality 10 years in advance, I am struggling to understand how an accurate forecast can be derived given the wide range of different factors which have an impact upon air quality.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a result of many years' experience and data gathering, environmental assessors and Highways England through its published assessment methodologies have approaches that allow these types of assessment to be undertaken.</li> <li>The air quality assessment has been based on the latest available and approved data. As more data have become available, the sensitivity of the modelled impacts has been reviewed and it has been concluded that the findings of Chapter 5: Air Quality Part A [APP-040] are robust. Whilst there may be some inherent uncertainty in the traffic data, this has been minimised as far as is practicable. Moreover, in relation to air quality, it is acknowledged that there is inherent uncertainty in future year forecasts, but that this has been taken into account using the methodology set out in DMRB HA207/07 and latterly LA105. Paragraph 5.5.3 in Chapter 5 Air Quality Part A [APP-040] set out the approach taken within the air quality assessment in dealing with uncertainty in the projection of vehicle emissions into the future. The assessment approach follows guidance set out in IAN 170/12v3, which takes into account the latest available projection factors which best reflects the most recent evidence on the trends in vehicle emissions and monitored concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> over time. This process is termed gap analysis, i.e. addressing the gap between predicted reductions in pollutant concentrations and those observed. The gap analysed results are presented throughout the air quality assessment. This represents a conservative approach to the prediction of future pollutant concentrations.</li> </ol>
E	In the event that the forecasts are wrong there would appear to be no options for recourse after the event.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the projected future concentrations (well below the air quality standards), the risk that the forecast air quality impacts are incorrect to such a degree as would cause an exceedance of the air quality standards, or significantly increased risk of exceedance of the standards, is negligible. As such, no options for recourse are necessary for air quality.</li> </ol>
F	Occasionally the traffic is brought to a standstill on such occasions it is noticeable that fumes drift into the property. With the dualling of the road the impact will be double what we have experienced in the past.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The contribution from accidents/periods of stationary traffic/queuing to the modelled annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are accounted for within the model verification factor. This verification is based on monitored roadside concentration which, by definition include the impact of short term events on roadside pollutant concentrations.</li> </ol>
G	Given the age of the data sources I was expecting to see a schedule for further surveys to be carried out to update and validate the results.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the low risk of impacts, no further data collection is proposed. In their response to question AQ.1.2 in the ExA's First Written Questions, NCC has confirmed that they accept the data the Applicant has used in the assessment [REP1-073].</li> </ol>
H	The DCO does not provide any detail on the impact of the access road encircling the property.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The access road is included within the assessment of construction dust for the Scheme, as set out in Chapter 5 Air Quality Part A [APP-040].</li> <li>Operationally, the low levels of traffic flow on the road fall well below the AADT and HDV changes criteria set out in LA105, and the road is unlikely to result in any material change to the air quality impacts presented at the property.</li> </ol>
I	The DCO does not provide any detail on the impact of the layby close to the property.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The numbers of vehicles that could be accommodated within the layby is limited and would not trigger the requirement for an air quality assessment under the criteria set out in DMRB</li> </ol>



Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		HA207/07 (or, its update, LA105). The impacts of vehicles using the layby will be negligible and will not affect the conclusions of the Environmental Statement namely, that no significant air quality effects are likely.
	Although we are realistic in recognising that a project of this scale is inevitably going to have some negative impact, we have been stunned by the scale and detrimental nature of the planned changes on a single property. At this stage of the planning process, we still have well over 50 issues which remain outstanding which does not feel right given the availability of viable alternatives that would address them. In summary, we believe that there are specific elements of the current plans that are far from optimum, however, there are cost saving alternatives which would mitigate the impact upon the property and the environment, while still meeting the scheme objectives.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant does not accept that the Scheme will have a particularly detrimental impact on the Hawes' property as set out in the responses above. The Applicant also does not accept that there are 50 issues which remain outstanding and would contend that there are significantly fewer issues, but frequently repeated in the respondent's submission.</li> <li>2. The outstanding queries are predominantly related to the detailed design of the Scheme in the vicinity of Warreners House, which would be addressed during the detailed design stage following the making of a DCO. Further meetings are being arranged with the Hawes to discuss outstanding design queries, but these will be on a without prejudice basis as the finalised design is yet to be prepared.</li> </ol>

**Table 1-7 – Brockthorpe Consultancy**

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
1	The landowners and land occupiers are concerned about the drainage of the land and the impact of the works on drainage of surrounding land. We would request that an independent drainage consultant be appointed before any works commence and both a pre- and post-drainage scheme is designed and built in conjunction with the land occupier and HE. We hope this is a point that can be agreed by HE, but we await confirmation.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representations (see Tables 1-21 to 41) [REP1-064] submitted by the Brockthorpe Consultancy on behalf of a number of landowners provide a full analysis of the concerns raised regarding drainage and the relevant measures secured through the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP1-023 and 024] (and as updated at Deadline 3). These submissions are not repeated here.</li> <li>2. The Applicant has discussed the principles of advance drainage surveys with the interested party. This included recent liaison calls in November and December 2020. The Applicant's approach for advanced surveys is that they will be undertaken prior to the start of works to allow any alterations required to the existing land drains to be identified and accommodated within the temporary works and final Scheme proposal. S-W5 Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] has been updated at Deadline 3 and commits the Applicant to complete surveys of land drains prior to start of works The Applicant will engage with landowners with regards to these matters when the detailed design and specification has commenced.</li> </ol>
2	There are a number of service roads being built, namely to Rock South Farm, West Link Hall and Charlton Hall. HE have confirmed that these will be adopted by the Local Authority, but we require evidence of confirmation by the Local Authority that this is the case. If the Local Authority are not willing to adopt these roads, then we object to them being a privately maintainable road due to large volumes of traffic that will be using these roads.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is agreed in principle with NCC that the local roads listed by the Brockthorpe Consultancy will be adopted by NCC, but this is provided for by Article 13(1) of the dDCO [REP2-04 and 005] meaning that if the DCO is made the principle will have the force of law regardless of the view of NCC. Section 5.2.2 of the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] also confirms that side roads and link roads will be adopted by NCC.</li> <li>2. Furthermore, table 3.2 Item 12 of the draft Statement of Common Ground with Northumberland County Council [REP1-028] confirms the new local roads to be adopted and includes Rock South Farm Access Road, West Linkhall Access Road and East Linkhall Access Road the last of which provides access to Charlton Hall.</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Highway Adoption and Maintenance Boundary Plans are being submitted at Deadline 3 (document reference 2.11). These plans indicate those roads listed by the interested party which are to be adopted by the local highway authority. These roads include Rock South Farm Access Road, West Linkhall Access Road and East Linkhall Access Road.</li> <li>4. As stated in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP-064] submitted at Deadline 1, pending adoption the Applicant will operate and maintain the local roads. There is no proposal within the Application for local roads to be privately maintained. Private Means of Access (PMA's) are identified separately on the Traffic Regulations Measures Plan [APP-101] and do not include the access roads to Rock South Farm, West Link Hall and Charlton Hall identified above.</li> </ol>
3	<p>We are concerned that the submitted plans show that certain areas of vegetation are being removed, even though we have had verbal confirmation that this is not the case by HE. We require an amendment to these areas or clarification of what will be removed. The trees provide a vital screen and we had been assured that these will remain.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not possible to respond to this submission as the respondents have failed to identify the locations of vegetation to which they refer. As such, the point should be given no weight.</li> <li>2. Nevertheless, in the absence of specific locations identified by the Brockthorpe Consultancy, the Applicant's response details the approach taken by the Applicant in identifying vegetation to be cleared and how this would be mitigated.</li> <li>3. 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 Scheme, and this has been assessed within the relevant chapters of the ES, including Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045] and Chapter 9 Biodiversity Part B [APP-049]. 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). In addition, the Applicant confirms to the ExA that as much of the existing planting as is reasonably practical, should be retained and protected. This will be under the responsibility of the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW), and in line with the REAC S-B10 of the Outline CEMP [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 identify the area to be protected within a works plan.</li> <li>4. Mitigation planting will be provided in line with Figures 7.10 and 7.14 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144 and 148] with the aim of replacing where appropriate existing blocks of vegetation and providing suitable mitigation measures to integrate and screen views of the Scheme.</li> </ol>
4	<p>Our main representation relates to the relocation of the 66kV cable serving the wind farm. We have previously made submissions that we consider the additional land take to be unnecessary.</p> <p>Firstly, the application made by HE is not clear as to what they required; they seem to have reserved the right to 2 different options and routes. They have subsequently confirmed that they wish to acquire the permanent land take option to us personally, but we are not certain if this has been communicated to the Planning Inspectorate, we consider this necessary to be able to provide clarity when making representations going forward. So firstly, we require clarification from HE on which option they are pursuing.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant's previous submissions as to why the permanent land take in respect of the wind farm cable diversion is necessary are set out in the Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representations [REP1-064]. The relevant works are described in paragraph 2.5.279 of Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-037], and are shown on pages 42 to 58 and 64 to 68 of Appendix 2.2 Technical Drawings [APP-188]. The justification for the proposed land take is also set out in the Statement of Reasons Annex A [APP-018] and the Compulsory Acquisition Schedule [REP2-017 and 018].</li> <li>2. It is true that two options and routes are provided for. This is perfectly acceptable in an application for a DCO. This has happened recently, for instance in relation to the A1 Birtley to Coalhouse Improvement Scheme. However, for the avoidance of doubt, the</li> </ol>

Ref. No.	Response:	Applicant's Response:
	<p>We do not agree that the taking of this additional land is necessary. The acquiring authority should only acquire land that is necessary, and we have been in discussion with the acquiring authority as to whether this is necessary. We received a without prejudice letter from HE and so are unable to disclose the contents, but I can confirm that we are not in agreement at present. We do not consider it necessary to compulsory acquire this additional area and we have provided representations to this effect previously.</p> <p>We have provided our reasoning to HE as to why this is not necessary. I'm not sure if we need to do that now or whether we wait for the Hearings? Please can you advise.</p> <p>We are confident that there is another option available that would not require the additional land take and none of the reasons we have been provided by HE would be considered as reasonable for compulsory acquisition purposes. We are providing HE with our legal representations view in the forth coming week and we would hope that matters may be resolved, but we may require to speak further on this during the hearings.</p>	<p>Applicant's preference is the option of permanent acquisition of land, which it considers will reduce the risk of ongoing interference with private property. This was clearly set out in Table 1-11 of the Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representations [REP1-064] and the impact on the landscape mitigation measures (LV1.31) in the Applicant's Response to the First Written Questions [REP1-032].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The high voltage cable is to be diverted to the east of the online widening section of Part B. An overview of the route is described in ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. The cable will be located in a position where it can remain whilst the road works are in progress and thereafter. A statutory undertaker corridor outside the highway boundary on third party land (including that of the respondent) was originally devised and easements would have been required for future maintenance. However, through consultation with landowners, including through the Brockthorpe Consultancy, and the utility company, an alternative location providing the corridor within a similar alignment but inside the permanent highway boundary has been considered as Parameter 3 in the ES Chapter 2 [APP-037]. This location is now preferred by the utility company and will remove the majority of easements over (and hence potential for ongoing interference with) third party land.</li> <li>4. In order to undertake this proposal, there is a need for a narrow strip of permanent land acquisition to the east of the new dual carriageway to allow for the cable to be diverted. Following permanent acquisition, this land will fall within the ownership of Highways England. The permanent land acquisition is shown on the Land Plans [APP-006] and an alternative Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Parameter 3 submitted as part of the Application [APP-148] 6.6 Environmental Statement - Figure 7.14 Landscape Mitigation Plan including Assessment Parameter 3 Part B. Therefore, there is sufficient information available for the Examining Authority to understand it as an option.</li> <li>5. The alternative proposal put forward by the Brockthorpe Consultancy, detailed in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-064], is not practical or economic. It has been considered by the Applicant's expert Consulting Engineers. To move the cable from its current location to a diverted location in the new highway verge would entail two full diversions – first to allow a safe working area; and secondly to provide the final alignment. This is inevitably more work-intensive and also has higher environmental impacts, as well as incurring additional cost to the public purse. A cable cannot ordinarily be reused in these circumstances, so it would need replacing twice. This is a poor use of resources.</li> <li>6. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Brockthorpe Consultancy and notes the provisional request to be heard during the hearings.</li> </ol>

© Crown copyright 2020.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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