

A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham
Scheme Number: TR010059

**7.2 National Policy Statement for National
Networks Accordance Table (Tracked)
for Change Request**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(g) Rule 8(1)(c)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Examination Procedure) Regulations 2009 Rules 2010

Volume 7

March 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning (~~Applications:
Prescribed Forms and Examination
Procedure~~) ~~Regulations 2009~~ Rules 2010**

The A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham

Development Consent Order 20[xx]

**NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT FOR NATIONAL NETWORKS
ACCORDANCE TABLE FOR CHANGE REQUEST**

<u>Regulation Rule</u> Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010059
Document Reference	7.2
Author	A1 in Northumberland Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	June 2020	Application Version
<u>Rev 1</u>	<u>March 2021</u>	<u>Revised for change request</u>



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
--------------------	---

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 - Scheme Conformity with NPS NN Chapter 3	5
TABLE 2 - Scheme Conformity with NPS NN Chapter 4	14
TABLE 3 - Scheme Conformity with NPS NN Chapter 5	30

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) Accordance Table (this “Accordance Table”) relates to an application made by Highways England (the “Applicant”) to the Secretary of State for Transport via the Planning Inspectorate (the “Inspectorate”) under the Planning Act 2008 (the “2008 Act”) for a Development Consent Order (DCO). If made, the DCO would grant consent for the A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham (the “Scheme”).
- 1.1.2 The Scheme comprises of two sections: Morpeth to Felton (known as ‘Part A’) and Part B: Alnwick to Ellingham (‘Part B’). A detailed description of the Scheme can be found in **Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1** of the Environmental Statement (ES) (**Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1**).
- 1.1.3 The NPS NN sets out Government’s policies in respect of the delivery of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) on the national road and rail networks in England. It provides planning guidance for promoters of NSIPs and the basis for the examination by the Examining Authority (ExA) and decisions by the Secretary of State. Further details about NPS NN can be found in the Case for the Scheme (**Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1**).
- 1.1.4 This Accordance Table comprises part of a suite of application documentation and is included in the Application in compliance with Regulation 5(2)(q) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (“APFP Regulations”) which require:
- “5(2)(q) any other documents considered necessary to support the application”*
- 1.1.5 This Accordance Table provides an assessment of the Scheme’s strategic alignment and conformity with the NPS NN. The Accordance Table is set out as follows:
- Table 1: Scheme conformity with NPS NN Chapter 3 – Wider Government policy on national networks;
 - Table 2: Scheme conformity with NPS NN Chapter 4 – Assessment principles; and
 - Table 3: Scheme conformity with NPS NN Chapter 5 – Generic impacts.
- 1.1.6 Each relevant paragraph in the NPS NN is set out with commentary as to the extent of compliance by the Scheme with its terms. In line with the approach taken in the ES, the conformity of the Scheme is considered in relation to Part A and Part B.

- 1.1.7 A review of the combined effects of the Scheme reported for Part A in **Chapters 5 to 13, Volume 2** of the **ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2)** and for Part B **Chapters 5 to 13, Volume 3** of the **ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3)** has been undertaken to identify environmental effects and therefore those that could combine to result in an effect of greater significance. These combined effects are described in **Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4** of the **ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4)** and where combined effects have been identified these have been identified in this Accordance Table.
- 1.1.8 The Accordance Table references other relevant documentation submitted as part of the Application and provides a summary where appropriate. The following documents and assessments have been used to inform the completion of the Accordance Table:
- Draft Development Consent Order (**Application Document Reference:TR010059/APP/3.1**);
 - Consents and Agreement Position Statement (**Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.3**);
 - Consultation Report and Appendices (**Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1 and 5.2**);
 - Environmental Statement, including Figures, Appendices and Non-Technical Summary (**Application Documents Reference:TR010059/APP/6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8 & 6.9**);
 - Flood Risk Assessment, **Appendix 10.1, Volume 7** of the **ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7)** for Part A; **Appendix 10.1, Volume 8** of the **ES (Application Document Reference:TR010059/APP/6.8)** for Part B
 - Habitats Regulations Assessment (**Application Document Reference:TR010059/APP/6.14**);
 - Case for the Scheme (**Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1**);
 - Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) (**Application Document Reference:TR010059/APP/7.3**).
 - Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance (**Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.15**).

1.2 Deadline 4 Request for Changes to the Scheme

1.2.1 A request for changes to the Proposed Scheme was made at Deadline 4 (12th March 2021). These changes can be characterised as: amendments to the proposed earthworks; stabilisation works to the northern bank of the River Coquet; and a proposed new southern access works.

1.2.2 The environmental impacts of these changes to the Scheme are assessed in the following documents:

- ES Addendum: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.36**):
- ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.38**):
- ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.240**):

1.2.3 The Tables, below, use the conclusions of these ES Addendums to assess whether the changes to the Scheme have a material effect on its compliance with the NPS NN. There are minor adverse effects resulting from the changes to the Scheme, these include biodiversity and cumulative impact. Whilst additional adverse impacts are acknowledged, this does not alter our assessment of the Scheme's overall compliance with the NPS NN.

1.2.4 Following the acceptance of the design changes for examination, the **Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346)** will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.36**) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.38**); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.40**).

1.2.5 The documents and their associated reference numbers depicted in the Tables below are representative of the design changes implemented at Deadline 4. The documents subject to amendment following the design changes can be found in the Application Document Tracker (**Document Reference: AS-002**).

TABLE 1 - Scheme Conformity with NPS NN Chapter 3

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
3.2	The Government recognises that for development of the national road and rail networks to be sustainable these should be designed to minimise social and environmental impacts and improve quality of life.	<p>A comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken, together with proposals for mitigating likely significant environment effects arising from the Scheme. The EIA is reported in Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2), in relation to Part A and Volume 3 of ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) in relation to Part B. Where specific mitigation measures are necessary, these are reported under each specialist topic chapter for each of Part A and Part B, then overall in Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP6.4).</p> <p>The Scheme will have a variety of impacts, both beneficial and adverse, which are summarised in Chapter 17: Assessment Summary, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference:).</p> <p>Table 17-2 – Part A: Summary of Significant Effects within Chapter 17: Assessment Summary, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4) summarises the impacts of Part A as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality – No significant adverse or beneficial Air Quality effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase; • Noise and Vibration – During the operational phase of Part A there would be a decrease in noise levels at 24 dwellings and 3 other sensitive receptors along the offline section although there would also be an increase in noise levels at Northgate Farm; • Landscape and Visual – There would be a range of adverse Landscape & Visual impacts on residential receptors of Public Right of Way (PROW), ranging from ‘<i>major adverse</i>’ to ‘<i>moderate adverse</i>’. However, by Year 15 when mitigation measures will become fully established these impacts will have reduced to ‘<i>Slight Adverse (not significant)</i>’ and ‘<i>Neutral (not significant)</i>’; • Cultural Heritage - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the operational phase of Part A; • Biodiversity - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the operational phase of Part A. However during construction there would be significant adverse effects due to the loss of riverbank habitat in the River Coquet and Coquet Valley SSSI as a result of the proposed hard-engineered scour protection to the north banks of the river. • Road Drainage and the Water Environment - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase of Part A for Road Drainage and the Water Environment; • Geology and Soils - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction phase of Part A. • Population and Human Health – Part A would have a range of impacts classed as ‘<i>moderate adverse</i>’; • Material Resources - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase of Part A for Material Resources • Climate - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase of Part A for Climate. <p>Table 17-3 – Part B: Summary of Significant Effects within Chapter 17: Assessment Summary, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4) summarises the impacts of Part B as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality – There would be no significant adverse or beneficial Air Quality effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase; • Noise and Vibration - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction phase of Part B and that there would be a decrease in road traffic noise to sensitive receptors within the operational noise Study Area;

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Visual – There would be a range of adverse Landscape & Visual impacts on residential receptors of PROW, ranging from ‘<i>major adverse</i>’ to ‘<i>moderate adverse</i>’. However, by Year 15 when mitigation measures will become fully established these impacts will have reduced to ‘<i>Slight Adverse (not significant)</i>’ and ‘<i>Neutral (not significant)</i>’; • Cultural Heritage - There would be adverse impacts although these can be mitigated; • Biodiversity - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the operational phase of Part B. • Road Drainage and the Water Environment - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase of Part A for Road Drainage and the Water Environment; • Geology and Soils – There would be an adverse impact due to the loss of some of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land; • Population and Human Health – Part B would have a range of impacts classed as ‘<i>moderate adverse</i>’; • Material Resources - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase of Part B for Material Resources • Climate - No significant adverse or beneficial effects have been identified for the construction or operational phase of Part B for Climate. <p>As part of the overall mitigation proposals a Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) has been produced and is included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3). This details the environmental mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction, why they are required, who is responsible for delivering them and details any ongoing maintenance arrangements required.</p> <p>Following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
3.3	In delivering new schemes, the Government expects applicants to avoid and mitigate environmental and social impacts in line with the principles set out in the NPPF and the Government’s planning guidance. Applicants should also provide evidence that they have considered reasonable opportunities to deliver environmental and social benefits as part of schemes.	<p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) lists and assesses the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Local planning policies that are relevant to each of the topics are covered in Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. These are then addressed in the Case for the Scheme, which also addresses other material considerations.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) shows that the Scheme is compliant with local and national planning policy. The ES provides details of the opportunities for social and environmental benefits of the Scheme considered as part of the EIA process. Each chapter of the ES sets out how environmental impacts of the Scheme would be mitigated, in line with current relevant guidance and accepted principles. Reasonable opportunities for environmental and social benefits have also been considered as part of the EIA process and would also be an ongoing aim of the detailed design process to deliver environmental and social benefits.</p>
3.4	The Appraisal of Sustainability accompanying this NPS recognises that some developments will have some adverse local impacts on noise, emissions, landscape/visual amenity, biodiversity, cultural heritage and water resources. The significance of	<p>The Scheme has sought to mitigate all effects wherever possible. However, it is recognised in, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B that the Scheme results in some adverse and local effects.</p> <p>In relation to Part A, a range of impacts have been identified as moderate adverse and these relate to:</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>these effects and the effectiveness of mitigation is uncertain at the strategic and non-location specific level of this NPS. Therefore, whilst applicants should deliver developments in accordance with Government policy and in an environmentally sensitive way, including considering opportunities to deliver environmental benefits, some adverse local effects of development may remain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Visual; • Cultural Heritage; • Biodiversity; • Geology and Soils; • Population and Human Health; <u>and</u> • <u>Cumulative</u> <p>In relation to Part B, a range of impacts have been identified as significant adverse and these relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Visual; • Cultural Heritage; • Biodiversity; • Geology and Soils; and • Population and Human Health. <p>Chapter 17: Assessment Summary, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4) also recognises that some adverse and local effects of the Scheme will need to be mitigated. Chapter 17 summarises mitigation actions and monitoring requirements to minimise the significance of effects as far as possible. These are identified and included, as necessary, within Chapters 5 to 15, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapters 5 to 15, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. The mechanism for securing these will be delivered through requirements imposed under Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1). In particular, mitigation measures have also been included in the REAC which forms part of the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) which is a requirement of the draft DCO.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p>The potential for some developments to result in adverse effects is recognised in paragraph 3.4 of the NPS NN and Chapter 6 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1). In assessing the planning balance, Chapter 6 of the Case for the Scheme concludes that suitable mitigation is proposed to manage adverse impacts and that the benefits of the Scheme, in terms of improved traffic flows, resilience, support for economic growth and improved journey quality, reliability and safety, are considered to outweigh the adverse effects.</p>
3.5	<p>Outside the nationally significant infrastructure project regime, Government policy is to bring forward targeted works to address existing environmental problems on the Strategic Road Network and improve the performance of the network. This includes reconnecting habitats and ecosystems, enhancing the settings of historic and cultural heritage features,</p>	<p>Wider Government policy in relation to specific environmental topics is addressed in the following chapters within Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES for Part B (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5: Air Quality; • Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration;

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>respecting and enhancing landscape character, improving water quality and reducing flood risk, avoiding significant adverse impacts from noise and vibration and addressing areas of poor air quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual; • Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage; • Chapter 9: Biodiversity; • Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment; and • Chapter 13: Material Resources. <p>In accordance with this policy, the Scheme would address existing environmental problems providing appropriate mitigation measures where any significant impacts are predicted. The Scheme improves the performance of this part of the network by increasing capacity, improving resilience and delivering journey time and safety improvements.</p>
3.6	<p>Transport will play an important part in meeting the Government's legally binding carbon targets and other environmental targets. As part of this there is a need to shift to greener technologies and fuels, and to promote lower carbon transport choices. Over the next decade, the biggest reduction in emissions from domestic transport is likely to come from efficiency improvements in conventional vehicles, specifically cars and vans, driven primarily by EU targets for new vehicle CO2 performance. Electrification of the railway will also support reductions in carbon.</p>	<p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) assesses the impact of Part A on air quality, whilst Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) assesses the impact of Part B on air quality.</p> <p>The overall assessment for both Part A and Part B concludes that, with appropriate mitigation, no significant effects from the Scheme are anticipated.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) considers the impact of Part A on climate change and potential impacts of climate change upon Part A whereas the equivalent for Part B is in Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3). Both Part A and Part B are expected to have a slight adverse effect on climate and given the embedded mitigation measures, the magnitude of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and the context of the Scheme, using professional judgement based on knowledge and experience of similar schemes, it is considered that the slight adverse effect during the construction and operational phases is not significant.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Climate, of Volumes 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B also concludes that, with the mitigation measures embedded in the Scheme, and outlined in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3), climate change would have no significant impacts on either Part A or Part B.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p>The overall effects of Part A and Part B are additive in respect of the impacts of these topics. As such, there is no additional assessment for the Scheme as a whole.</p> <p><u>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 have been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>In relation to Air Quality, these documents conclude that the impacts of the requested changes would not result in any material changes to the original assessment. Therefore, the change request will not affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 3.6 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>In relation to Climate, these ES Addendum documents assess the impacts to result in no change against the original assessment. Therefore, the change request will not affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 3.6 of the NPS NN. NPS NN policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
3.8	<p>The impact of road development on aggregate levels of emissions is likely to be very small. Impacts of road development need to be seen against significant projected reductions in carbon emissions and improvements in air quality as a result of current and future policies to meet the Government's legally binding carbon budgets and the European Union's air quality limit values. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon – the annual CO2 impacts from delivering a programme of investment on the Strategic Road Network of the scale envisaged in Investing in Britain's Future amount to well below 0.1% of average annual carbon emissions allowed in the fourth carbon budget. This would be outweighed by additional support for ULEVs also identified as overall policy. • Air quality – aggregate air quality impacts from delivering a programme of investment on the Strategic Road Network of the scale envisaged in Investing in Britain's Future are small. Total PM10 and NOx might be expected to increase slightly, but this needs to be seen in the context of projected reductions in emissions over time. PM10 and NOx are expected to decrease over the next decade or so as a result of tighter vehicle emission standards, then flatten, with further falls over time due to greater levels of electric and other ultra-low emission vehicles. 	<p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) assesses the impact of Part A on Air Quality. Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) contains the equivalent assessment for Part B. The conclusion of the ES is that the effects of Part A and Part B are not significant for air quality.</p> <p>No significant effects have been identified for the operational phase of Part A or Part B and no additional monitoring is necessary. Ambient air quality monitoring will be ongoing by Northumberland County Council (NCC) (as the Local Authority) who undertake air quality monitoring using a network of continuous (automatic) monitors and non-automatic (i.e. diffusion tubes) monitoring sites.</p> <p>The Green House Gas (GHG) emissions from Parts A and Part B are set out in Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. These chapters also assess the impacts of the Scheme against the UK National Carbon Budgets, concluding that the Scheme would have a 'minor adverse' impact that could be characterised as '<i>not significant</i>'.</p> <p>The construction monitoring regime and reporting requirements are set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) which is secured through the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1).</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request will not affects affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 3.8 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
3.10	<p>The Government's overall vision and approach on road safety is set out in the Strategic Framework for Road Safety. It is a vision in which Britain remains a world leader in road safety; where highway authorities are empowered to take informed decisions within their area; where driver and rider training gives learners the skills they need to be safe on our roads; and where tough measures are taken against the minority of offenders who deliberately choose to drive dangerously. The scheme promoters are expected to take opportunities to improve road safety, including introducing the most modern and effective safety measures where proportionate.</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) provides an economic assessment of the Scheme and calculates the accident cost savings in accordance with the Department for Transport's (DfT) online Transport Appraisal Guidance (WebTAG) using the Cost and Benefit to Accidents – Light Touch (COBALT). This assessment forecasts that, over the 60-year assessment period, the Scheme will provide an accident reduction benefit of £32 million and will save 414 accidents when compared to the 'without Scheme' scenario. This reduction in accidents is forecast to reduce the number of casualties by 708 over the 60-year period, of which 17 were predicted to be fatal.</p>

<p>3.15</p>	<p>The Government is committed to provide people with options to choose sustainable modes and making door-to-door journeys by sustainable means an attractive and convenient option. This is essential to reducing carbon emissions from transport.</p>	<p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) notes that Part A would help to promote sustainable modes of transport, by providing improved facilities for Walkers, Cyclists and Horseriders (WCH) users to cross the A1. As listed in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES, Part A has been designed to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footways at the three new junctions link into the existing side roads. Pedestrians are accommodated by footpaths immediately to each side of the proposed junctions and across the new bridges. This increases linkages and provides safer pedestrian access across the A1. • The proposed Causey Park overbridge would be designed to safely carry both pedestrians and vehicular traffic. • The proposed Burgham Underbridge would be designed with access for pedestrians using hardened verges, and vehicular traffic, with clear visibility for all users. • A new segregated 3 m wide footway / cycleway would be provided along the length of the eastern side of the proposed link road, between the de-trunked A1 and Felton Road. This improves access and safety for cyclists alongside the A1. • Use of best practice design with regards to the safety of WCHs would improve the amenity of users of the footpaths in the surrounding areas. Additionally, landscaping that can provide screening of the road where possible and reduce noise level for the wider network of PRow would also improve amenity for users. <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that for Part B, best practice design has been used to improve the facilities for PRow users, particularly in those areas where diversions of PRow are proposed. Part B has been designed to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A footway to facilitate safe pedestrian access across Charlton Mires Junction would be provided. The footway would tie into a diverted footpath to the east of the Scheme, extend via a bridge across the A1 and along the improved B6341 to the west of the Scheme, to near Rock Lodge; • A footway to facilitate safe pedestrian access across Heckley Fence Overbridge would be provided. The footway would link to a diverted PRow to the east of the Scheme across the A1 to a PRow on the other side; • Use of best practice design with regards to the safety of WCH users would improve the amenity of users of the footpaths in the surrounding areas. Additionally, landscape planting would provide screening of the road. <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) also notes that severance is not identified as a widespread problem in this location: <i>“There are no community facilities along the route, so the temporary effects on community severance would be isolated to individuals accessing community facilities in Alnwick”</i>.</p> <p>This improved provision for WCH users for Parts A and B is considered to help people choose sustainable modes of transport and make door-to-door journeys by a sustainable means of transport a more attractive and convenient option.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken to understand the existing baseline conditions relating to public transport and WCH users. The impacts of the Scheme have been considered and amendments to the design have been incorporated. Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) concludes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Scheme will not result in a significant impact on Rail Users; • The Scheme incorporates proposals to relocate the bus stops on the A1 at the Charlton Mires Junction to the location of an informal pick up point off the A1, which will improve the visibility of this stop to users with a bus stop flag to mark the location. Additionally, the Scheme is forecast to reduce delays which should contribute to improved bus journey times and service reliability., and • Proposed changes to bus stops along the Scheme have been discussed and agreed with the main bus operator Arriva.
-------------	---	--

The impacts of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 have been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.36**) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.38**); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.40**). In relation to Population and Health, these assessments conclude that there would not be any changes to the original assessment. Therefore the change request will not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 3.15 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.36**) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.38**); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (**Document Reference: 6.40**).

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
3.16	As part of the Government's commitment to sustainable travel it is investing in developing a high-quality cycling and walking environment to bring about a step change in cycling and walking across the country.	The information required for conformance of Para 3.16, can be found in response to Para 3.15 of the NPS NN.
3.17	There is a direct role for the national road network to play in helping pedestrians and cyclists. The Government expects applicants to use reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. The Government also expects applicants to identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure in locations where the national road network severs communities and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking, by correcting historic problems, retrofitting the latest solutions and ensuring that it is easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions.	<p>The information required for conformance of Para 3.17, can also be found in response to Para 3.17 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Additionally, the improvements for WCHs have been considered in the form of a Walker, Cyclists and Horse-riders Assessment Report (WCHAR), as discussed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1). The impact on WCH will not be significant as the Scheme has been designed to minimise the impact on the PROW network. The Scheme includes some changes to PROW's including some diversions. The overall impact on WCH users for both Part A and Part B is 'not significant'.</p>
3.19	The Government is committed to creating a more accessible and inclusive transport network that provides a range of opportunities and choices for people to connect with jobs, services and friends and family.	<p>The Scheme would improve the resilience of the A1 on the single carriageway sections between Morpeth and Ellingham, providing a more reliable and safer route for all road users.</p> <p>Diversions, or where necessary stopping up of PROW are proposed to ensure the safety of WCH. They are designed to improve the amenity of footpath users in the surrounding areas wherever it is possible to do so. Additionally, landscaping to provide screening of the road where possible and reduce noise level for the wider network of PROW would also improve amenity for users. Details of proposed screening are shown in the Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Figure 7.8, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5) for Part A and Landscape Mitigation Plan, Figure 7.10, Volume 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.6) for Part B.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2), Part A is predicted to result in a net improvement to the WCH facilities within the vicinity of Part A. During operation, improvements to WCH routes would improve user safety, enhance access and improve community connectivity to the wider footpath network. In terms of the section of the A1 to be de-trunked the reduction in traffic along this carriageway (as a result of the Scheme) would improve safety for WCHs using the adjacent footways and cycleways. A reduction in traffic would also improve air quality around the junctions which currently access the section of the A1 to be de-trunked, which would improve amenity levels for WCHs on these routes.</p> <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that for Part B the construction of the Heckley Fence Overbridge and the Charlton Mires Junction would provide grade separated WCH provision for crossing the A1, reducing the need for WCH to cross the highway and interact with traffic which is assessed as providing a 'substantial' relief on existing severance in the area. It is assessed that overall, the magnitude of change of amenity for users of PROW following the implementation of mitigation measures during operation is negligible.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above, therefore the change request will not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 3.19 of the NPS NN as there would be no impacts on the creation of an inclusive transport network. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
3.20	<p>Accessibility for disabled people is set out in Transport for Everyone: an action plan to improve accessibility for all. In particular: The Government will continue to work to ensure that the bus and train fleets comply with modern access standards by 2020, and to improve rail station access for passengers with reduced mobility. The private car will continue to play an important role, providing disabled people with independence where other forms of transport are not accessible or available. The Government expects applicants to improve access, wherever possible, on and around the national networks by designing and delivering schemes that take account of the accessibility requirements of all those who use, or are affected by, national networks infrastructure, including disabled users. All reasonable opportunities to deliver improvements inaccessibility on and to the existing national road network should also be taken wherever appropriate.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 3.20, can be found in response to Para 3.19 of the NPS NN.</p>
3.21	<p>Applicants are reminded of their duty to promote equality and to consider the needs of disabled people as part of their normal practice.</p> <p>Applicants are expected to comply with any obligations under the Equalities Act 2010.</p>	<p>An EqIA has been prepared for the Scheme and meets the requirements of the Equalities Act 2010. The EqIA was embedded within the Scheme to ensure the needs of these groups were central to Scheme development, including in the Scheme design, communication and engagement strategy, and any required mitigation development.</p>
3.22	<p>Severance can be a problem in some locations. Where appropriate applicants should seek to deliver improvements that reduce community severance and improve accessibility.</p>	<p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) provides a summary of the effects on community severance for Part A. Chapter 12: Population and Human Health confirms that existing PRoW and WCH routes would be retained where possible, and where they are crossed by the route an alternative proper means of access would be provided in order to reduce severance caused by the Scheme.</p> <p>As listed in response to NPS NN paragraph 3.15 above, Part A will result in several key designed improvements to the WCH facilities, meaning it is less of a barrier to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. Part A will therefore improve accessibility to communities alongside the A1.</p> <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that <i>“There are no community facilities along the route, so the temporary effects on community severance would be isolated to individuals accessing community facilities in Alnwick”</i>. However, as noted in the in the response to NPS NN paragraph 3.19, above,</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>Part B will result in substantial relief from existing severance as a result in improvements at Heckley Fence Overbridge and the Charlton Mires Junction.</p> <p><u>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above, the change request does not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 3.22 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>

TABLE 2 - Scheme Conformity with NPS NN Chapter 4

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
4.3	<p>In considering any proposed development, and in particular when weighting its adverse impacts against its benefits, the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its potential benefits, including the facilitation of economic development, including job creation, housing and environmental improvement, and any long-term or wider benefits • Its potential adverse impacts, including any longer term and cumulative adverse impacts, as well as any measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any adverse impacts. 	<p>Chapter 3 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) confirms that the strategic case for intervention is based around the following Scheme objectives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve journey times on the route of strategic national importance; • Improve network resilience and journey time reliability; • Improve safety; • Maintain access for local traffic whilst improving conditions for strategic traffic; and • Facilitate future economic growth. <p>Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) provides an overview of the economic, social and environmental benefits associated with the Scheme. The Scheme would lead to a decrease in lost productive time and subsequent increase in business user benefits. Commuters and other users would benefit from improved journey reliability, improved journey times and associated vehicle operating costs such as fuel, vehicle maintenance and mileage related depreciation.</p> <p>Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4) assesses cumulative effects arising from the Scheme and summarises the mitigation and monitoring actions to be implemented to reduce the significance of effects as far as possible. It concludes that <i>“There would be no significant cumulative effects due to the Scheme and ‘other development’.</i> In addition, <i>no further likely combined significant residual effects have been identified above the level of significance of those reported for the Scheme alone”</i> and that therefore <i>“...no further mitigation or monitoring is required, other than that set out in Part A Technical Chapters 5 to 15, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) and Part B Technical Chapters 5 to 15, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3)”</i>.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) is secured through the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) and will be used to mitigate any identified adverse impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p><u>In accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 has been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>In relation to Cumulative Effects, these documents conclude that the impacts do not result in change against the original assessment, and therefore change request will affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.3 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38) ; and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40) .
4.4	<p>In this context, environmental, safety, social and economic benefits and adverse impacts should be considered at national, regional and local levels. These may be identified in this NPS or elsewhere.</p>	<p>Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B reports the EIA which has been carried out with consideration for the potential effects at national, regional and local levels, including the requirements of the NPS NN. Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) outlines the safety benefits of the Scheme whilst Chapter 5 provides an assessment of the economic benefits.</p>
4.5	<p>Applications for road and rail projects (with the exception of those for Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges (SRFIs), for which the position is covered in paragraph 4.8 below) will normally be supported by a business case prepared in accordance with Treasury Green Book principles. This business case provides the basis for investment decisions on road and rail projects. The business case will normally be developed based on the Department's Transport Business Case guidance and WebTAG guidance.</p> <p>The economic case prepared for a transport business case will assess the economic, environmental and social impacts of a development. The information provided will be proportionate to the development. This information will be important for the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State's consideration of the adverse impacts and benefits of a proposed development.</p> <p>It is expected that NSIP schemes brought forward through the development consent order process by virtue of Section 35 of the Planning Act 2008, should also meet this requirement.</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) sets out the economic assessment of the Scheme. It presents the anticipated benefits and dis-benefits associated with the Scheme. After accounting for delays associated with construction and maintenance, the combined monetised value of benefits of the Scheme is forecast to be £130 million. The Business Case for the Scheme has been developed based on DfT's Business Case guidance and WebTAG guidance.</p>
4.6	<p>Applications for road and rail projects should usually be supported by a local transport model to provide sufficiently accurate detail of the impacts of a project. The modelling will usually include national level factors around the key drivers of transport demand such as economic growth, demographic change, travel costs and labour market participation, as well as local factors.</p> <p>The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State do not need to be concerned with the national methodology and national assumptions around the key drivers of transport</p>	<p>A local transport model has been produced in line with DfT guidelines. Core, high growth (optimistic) and low growth (pessimistic) scenarios have been modelled. Details are provided in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	demand. We do encourage an assessment of the benefits and costs of schemes under high and low growth scenarios, in addition to the core case. The modelling should be proportionate to the scale of the scheme and include appropriate sensitivity analysis to consider the impact of uncertainty on project impacts.	
4.9	The Examining Authority should only recommend, and the Secretary of State should only impose, requirements in relation to a development consent, that are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be consented, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects. Guidance on the use of planning conditions or any successor to it, should be taken into account where requirements are proposed.	The draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) includes suggested draft requirements that are considered necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be consented, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects. The Explanatory Memorandum (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.2) explains the purpose and effect of each provision in the draft order.
4.10	Planning obligations should only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the proposed development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.	We do not at this stage anticipate the need for and have not proposed any planning obligations.
4.12	In considering applications for linear infrastructure, decision makers will need to bear in mind the specific conditions under which such developments must be designed. The generic impacts section of this NPS has been written to take these differences into account.	The Scheme has been assessed against the generic impacts as listed in the NPS NN and these assessments are detailed within this Accordance Table.
4.13	The NPS does not identify locations at which development of the road and rail networks should be brought forward. However, the road and rail networks provide access for people, business and goods between places and so the location of the development will usually be determined by economic activity and population and the location of existing transport networks.	The Scheme involves the improvement to two sections of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton (Part A) and Alnwick to Ellingham (Part B) and is in the corridor of the existing transport network with the exception of approximately 6.1 km of new dual carriageway on Part A to the west of the existing A1.
4.15	All proposals for projects that are subject to the European Union's Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive and are likely to have significant effects on the environment, must be accompanied by an environmental statement (ES), describing the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project. The Directive specifically requires an EIA to identify, describe and assess effects on human beings, fauna and flora, soil,	The application is accompanied by an ES of which Volume 2 (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) details the likely significant effects of Part A on the environment and where necessary, mitigation measures to avoid, prevent, reduce, or if possible, offset any identified significant adverse effects. Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) provides the equivalent assessment for Part B. The combined facts of Parts A and B, together with cumulative impacts with other developments in assessed in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4). This meets the requirements of the European Union's EIA Directive (2014/52/EU).

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>water, air, climate, the landscape, material assets and cultural heritage, and the interaction between them. Schedule 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2009 sets out the information that should be included in the environmental statement including a description of the likely significant effects of the proposed project on the environment, covering the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the project, and also the measures envisaged for avoiding or mitigating significant adverse effects. Further guidance can be found in the online planning portal. In this NPS, the terms 'effects', 'impacts' or 'benefits' should accordingly be understood to mean likely significant effects, impacts or benefits.</p>	<p>The scope of the ES complies with the Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.10) provided for Part A and the Scoping Opinion (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.12) provided for Part B.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.3 above, the change request will not affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.15 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.16	<p>When considering significant cumulative effects, any environmental statement should provide information on how the effects of the Applicant's proposal would combine and interact with the effects of other development (including projects for which consent has been granted, as well as those already in existence).</p>	<p>Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059APP/6.4) provides an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Scheme in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable development, as well as impact interactions.</p> <p>This chapter also identifies the developments that have been considered in the cumulative assessment. Past and present development is considered as part of the baseline and, in some cases, reflects the sensitivity of the receptors assessed. The developments considered in the assessment include those recommended for inclusion by the local planning authorities.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.3 above, the change request will not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.16 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.17	<p>The Examining Authority should consider how significant cumulative effects and the interrelationship between effects might as a whole affect the environment, even though they may be acceptable when considered on an individual basis with mitigation measures in place.</p>	<p>Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4) assesses cumulative effects arising from the Scheme and summarises the mitigation and monitoring actions to be implemented to reduce the significance of effects as far as possible. It concludes that "<i>There would be no significant cumulative effects due to the Scheme and 'other development'. In addition, no further likely combined significant residual effects have been identified above the level of significance of those reported for the Scheme alone.</i>"</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.3 above, the change request will not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.17 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
4.18	In some instances, it may not be possible at the time of the application for development consent for all aspects of the proposal to have been settled in precise detail. Where this is the case, the applicant should explain in its application which elements of the proposal have yet to be finalised, and the reasons why this is the case.	<p>The Scheme design is described in Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1 of the ES Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1) and the details shown on the Engineering Section Drawings (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/2.7) and General Arrangement Plan (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/2.4)</p> <p>The draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) contains powers of lateral and vertical deviation as shown on the Works Plans (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/2.3). However, the existing geometry of the A1 within the Order limits is such that it can be expected that this design will not vary materially in the horizontal or vertical plane. As such, the reference design shown on the above drawings has been assessed for the purposes of EIA.</p> <p>Further details on the Applicant's approach to limits of deviation in the EIA is provided within Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1), and the limits of deviation are also described in the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) and the Explanatory Memorandum (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.2). The realistic worst-case scenario has been considered, where applicable, in Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2), which assesses the likely significant effects of Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3), which assesses the likely significant effects of Part B.</p>
4.19	Where some details are still to be finalised, applicants are advised to set out in the environmental statement, to the best of their knowledge, what the maximum extent of the proposed development may be (for example in terms of site area) and assess the potential adverse effects which the project could have to ensure that the impacts of the project as it may be constructed have been properly assessed.	<p>.</p> <p>The information required for the conformance of Para 4.19, can be found in response to Para 4.51 of the NPS NN.</p>
4.20	Should the Secretary of State decide to grant development consent for an application where details are still to be finalised, this will need to be reflected in appropriate development consent requirements in the development consent order.	The requirements of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) make provision where appropriate for consideration of elements of the detailed design of the Scheme.
4.21	In cases where the EIA Directive does not apply to a project, and an environmental statement is not therefore required, the applicant should instead provide information proportionate to the project on the likely environmental, social and economic effects.	Not applicable. The Scheme requires a comprehensive EIA that has been undertaken to support this DCO application. The ES reports the findings in Volume 2 (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and in Volume 3 (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B.
4.22	The applicant should seek the advice of Natural England and, where appropriate, for cross-boundary impacts, Natural Resources Wales and Scottish Natural Heritage to ensure that impacts on European sites in Wales and Scotland are adequately considered.	<p>Advice has been sought from Natural England to ensure that impacts on European sites have been considered as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>For Part A, a HRA Screening Matrix within the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.14) states that the Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Wetland (a designated European Site) are approximately 9.5km downstream from where the A1 crosses the River Coquet. Therefore, no impacts from noise, lighting,</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>odour, emissions or changes in air quality are anticipated as a result of the Scheme. Given the intervening distance, no impacts on the European site are anticipated as a result from changes in water quality or potential pollution or contamination incidents.</p> <p>For Part B, Natural England were contacted for comment on the proposals. Following a meeting on the 11 December 2019 to discuss the approach to ecological receptor assessments and surveys, and proposed mitigation, Natural England provided written confirmation and feedback that they were satisfied with the approach presented and discussed. This is recorded within the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.14).</p> <p>Natural England also agreed to the approach and conclusions of the impact assessment in relation to European sites, as presented in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.14). The HRA concludes that there are no likely significant effects to European sites as a result of Part B.</p> <p>Natural England was also consulted on the request for changes submitted at Deadline 4 and the Applicant's response to their comments is set out in the Consultation Statement submitted at Deadline 4 (Document Reference: 7.20).</p>
.4.23	Applicants are required to provide sufficient information with their applications for development consent to enable the Secretary of State to carry out an Appropriate Assessment if required. This information should include details of any measures that are proposed to minimise or avoid any likely significant effects on a European site. The information provided may also assist the Secretary of State in concluding that an Appropriate Assessment is not required because significant effects on European sites are sufficiently unlikely that they can be excluded.	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 4,23, can be found in response to Para 4.22 of the NPS NN</p>
4.24	If a proposed national network development makes it impossible to rule out an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site, it is possible to apply for derogation from the Habitats Directive, subject to the proposal meeting three tests. These tests are that no feasible, less damaging alternatives should exist, that there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest for the proposal going ahead, and that adequate and timely compensation measures will be put in place to ensure the overall coherence of the network of protected sites is maintained.	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 4,24, can be found in response to Para 4.22 of the NPS NN</p>
4.25	Where a development may negatively affect any priority habitat or species on a site for which they are a protected feature, any Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI) case would need to be established solely on one or more of the grounds relating to human health,	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 4,25, can be found in response to Para 4.22 of the NPS NN</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	public safety or beneficial consequences of primary importance to the environment.	
4.26	<p>Applicants should comply with all legal requirements and any policy requirements set out in this NPS on the assessment of alternatives. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EIA Directive requires projects with significant environmental effects to include an outline of the main alternatives studied by the applicant and an indication of the main reasons for the applicant's choice, taking into account the environmental effects. There may also be other specific legal requirements for the consideration of alternatives, for example, under the Habitats and Water Framework Directives. <p>There may also be policy requirements in this NPS, for example the flood risk sequential test and the assessment of alternatives for developments in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</p>	<p>Chapter 2 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) and Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1) sets out the main Scheme alternatives that have been considered before arriving at the preferred option for Part A and Part B as detailed within this Application. The Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) also sets out the options consulted on as part of the non-statutory consultation</p> <p>The HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.14) addresses the legal requirements of the Habitats Directive and the Wild Birds Directive.</p> <p>A Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment has been undertaken and can be found at Appendix 10.2, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 10.2, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B. The assessment concludes that there would be no detrimental impact or change to the WFD status of catchments with the appropriate mitigation measures implemented, as detailed within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3).</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been undertaken and can be found at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B. The FRA confirms that the Scheme is classed as "Essential Infrastructure" under the NPPF and thus a Sequential Test and if necessary, Exception Test, must be passed before it is considered to be acceptable. The FRA confirms that the Sequential and Exception Tests have been applied and are passed on the basis that the improvements are required to enhance resilience and improve journey times and safety along the route and there are no reasonable alternatives, as set out in Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternative, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1), that could meet these objectives.</p>
4.27	All projects should be subject to an options appraisal. The appraisal should consider viable modal alternatives and may also consider other options (in light of the paragraphs 3.23 to 3.27 of this NPS). Where projects have been subject to full options appraisal in achieving their status within Road or Rail Investment Strategies or other appropriate policies or investment plans, option testing need not be considered by the examining authority or the decision maker. For national road and rail schemes, proportionate option consideration of alternatives will have been undertaken as part of the investment decision making	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 4.27, can also be found in response to Para 4.26 of the NPS NN</p> <p>The Scheme has been the subject of a full options appraisal prior to inclusion in the Roads Investment Strategy (RIS) including assessment of alternative solutions/modes. The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) outlines the history of the Scheme development prior to its inclusion in the current RIS for delivery in the road period between 2020/21 and 2024/25.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>process. It is not necessary for the Examining Authority and the decision maker to reconsider this process, but they should be satisfied that this assessment has been undertaken.</p>	
<p>4.28 - 4.29</p>	<p>Applicants should include design as an integral consideration from the outset of a proposal.</p> <p>Visual appearance should be a key factor in considering the design of new infrastructure, as well as functionality, fitness for purpose, sustainability and cost. Applying “good design” to national network projects should therefore produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible.</p>	<p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) sets out how the design evolved. Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1) describes the Scheme’s development and the options considered.</p> <p>The Scheme design has been guided by visual appearance as well as function and cost. Design options for structures and drainage, and route options for road design were assessed by the Applicant’s environmental specialists and their recommendations have informed the design choices. This ‘embedded mitigation’ is outlined within the ES (Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B). Examples of embedded mitigation include the slackening of earth embankments, careful placement of screening bunds, minimisation of off-site disposal of surplus material and proposed planting which retains long distance views where possible and/or appropriate.</p> <p>The most visually prominent part of the Scheme will be where it crosses the River Coquet within Part A. The design of the structure where the new A1 carriageway will cross the River Coquet has incorporated design principles from the existing structure at this location to minimise the impact the new structure may have on the wider landscape for Part A, as set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2). This has included consideration of the design architecture, span, breadth and vertical structural pier locations. Landscape mitigation is also illustrated on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5).</p> <p>The Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) sets out further design changes made as result of both non-statutory and statutory consultation.</p> <p>The Scheme and environmental mitigation proposals were designed with reference to guidelines in the DMRB Volume 10 Environmental Design and Management.</p> <p>The effect of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 has been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40). It is concluded that the change request will not affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.28-29 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
<p>4.31</p>	<p>A good design should meet the principal objectives of the scheme by eliminating or substantially mitigating the identified problems by improving operational conditions and simultaneously minimising adverse impacts wherever possible, for example, in relation to safety or the environment. A good design will also be one that sustains the improvements to operational efficiency for as many</p>	<p>The Scheme has been designed in accordance with the Applicant’s ‘Roads to Good Design’ report which sets out ten principles of good road design. The ten principles include consideration of ‘Environmental Sustainability’ and how the Scheme ‘Fits in Context’. Design alternatives were considered throughout at regular meetings. The EIA was integral to this design process.</p> <p>The design also considered operational efficiency for as many years as is practicable taking into account capital costs, economic and environmental impacts. The Scheme ensures the long term structural stability of the operational highway. The highways will be drained</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	years as is practicable, taking into account capital cost, economics and environmental impacts.	by a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) with a service life of 60 years and sufficient capacity to accommodate additional runoff associated with an increase in rainfall intensity of 20% allowance for climate change.
4.32	Scheme design will be a material consideration in decision making. The Secretary of State needs to be satisfied that national networks infrastructure projects are sustainable and as aesthetically sensitive, durable, adaptable and resilient as they can reasonably be (having regard to regulatory and other constraints and including accounting for natural hazards such as flooding).	Outlined within Volume 2 the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B are mitigation measures and enhancement opportunities to ensure the Scheme design is sustainable and aesthetically sensitive as far as possible. The Applicant has designed the Scheme to ensure it is durable, adaptable and resilient as can be.
4.33	The applicant should therefore take into account, as far as possible, both functionality (including fitness for purpose and sustainability) and aesthetics (including the scheme's contribution to the quality of the area in which it would be located). Applicants will want to consider the role of technology in delivering new national networks projects. The use of professional, independent advice on the design aspects of a proposal should be considered, to ensure good design principles are embedded into infrastructure proposals.	<p>The Applicant has taken into account, as far as possible, both functionality (including fitness for purpose and sustainability) and aesthetics (including the Scheme's contribution to the quality of the area in which it would be situated).</p> <p>The aesthetic requirements are assessed within Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and within Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. Furthermore, consultation has been carried out with non-statutory and statutory stakeholders which led to design changes which are presented in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1). The Applicant has considered the role of technology in delivering the Scheme and relied on professional independent advice to ensure that good design principles are embedded in the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to good design whilst having regard to responses received during the pre-application consultation process. As part of the pre-application consultation process for Part A, NCC requested a new free-flow link between Fenrother junction and de-trunked carriageway. Currently, Fenrother Lane connects to the A1 via a ghost island priority junction. This arrangement provides a right turning pocket for southbound traffic heading west onto Fenrother Lane. On completion of the Scheme, the main residual traffic movement is however anticipated to be between the de-trunked A1 and the new offline dual A1 carriageway. NCC requested junction alterations be made to reflect this change in demand. NCC's aspiration was for the priority at this junction to be revised, with priority being given between the A1/Fenrother junction and the de-trunked A1 to the north; with a new priority junction maintaining connectivity to the properties and facilities to the south. This is now part of the submitted Scheme as set out in Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1).</p> <p>The landscape strategy for Part B, set out in Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1) addresses the requirement to mitigate both landscape and biodiversity effects identified within the assessments. The assessments have focused on the retention or replacement of vegetation, ecological enhancement, protected species mitigation and landscape integration and screening to ensure the quality of the area is maintained.</p>
4.34	Whilst the applicant may only have limited choice in the physical appearance of some national networks infrastructure, there may be opportunities for the applicant to demonstrate good design in terms of siting and design measures relative to existing landscape and historical character and function, landscape permeability, landform and vegetation.	<p>The information required to confirm conformance with Para 4.34, can also be found in response to Para 4.28, 4.29 and 4.31 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>The chapters set out below in relation to Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B identify design and mitigation measures in relation to landscape and historical character and function, landscape permeability, landform and vegetation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration;

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual; • Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage; • Chapter 9: Biodiversity; • Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment; • Chapter 12: Population and Human Health; and • Chapter 13: Material Resources. <p>The requested changes would alter the physical design of the Proposed Scheme, however they would not result in additional adverse Landscape or Visual impacts. As a result, there would be no impact on compliance with Paragraph 4.34 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.35	Applicants should be able to demonstrate in their application how the design process was conducted and how the proposed design evolved. Where a number of different designs were considered, applicants should set out the reasons why the favoured choice has been selected.	The information required for the conformance with Para 4.35, can be found in response to Para 4.28, 4.29 and 4.34 of the NPS NN.
4.36	Section 10(3)(a) of the Planning Act requires the Secretary of State to have regard to the desirability of mitigating and adapting to, climate change in designating an NPS.	<p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7), Chapter 13: Material Resources and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) set out how Part A takes account of the predicted impacts of climate change and the vulnerability of Part A to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Part A includes a proposed new bridge over the River Coquet at the northern extent. The potential impacts of climate change on this bridge are set out in Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A which confirms that whilst future sea level rise associated with climate change may decrease the distance between Part A and the tidal limit for the River Coquet, the 1 km Part A Study Area is located between approximately 8 km and 9 km to the tidal limits, this indicates the future baseline at Part A is unlikely to be impacted by future sea level rise. Table 10-18 - Effects during Operation Stage Arising from Flood Risk within Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment confirms that likely significant effects associated with flood risk during the operation of Part A, including an allowance for climate change would be <i>'neutral'</i>.</p> <p>A summary of the proposed works, assessment of flood risk and proposed mitigation for each of these aspects is provided within Chapter 5 of the FRA (see Appendix 10.1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and includes Hydraulic Design of Watercourse Crossings for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cotting Burn;

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Lyne; • Fenrother Burn; • Longdike Burn; • Earsdon Burn. <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B notes that any proposed mitigation measures would need to make an allowance for climate change within the design, whilst Chapter 13: Material Resources and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) sets out how Part B takes account of the predicted impacts of climate change and the vulnerability of Part B to the impacts of climate change</p> <p>For Part B, the Scheme alignment crosses five watercourses and associated tributaries, from south to north:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denwick Burn and its tributaries; • White House Burn; • Tributaries of Kittycarter Burn; • Tributary of Embleton Burn; • Shipperton Burn. <p>The surface water drainage strategy for Part A and Part B has been designed using a 20% climate change allowance as agreed through consultation with NCC as the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA). Sensitivity testing for the 40% climate change allowance was also undertaken and is detailed in Appendix 10.5: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A, Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B.</p> <p>During construction, the main source of GHG emissions would be carbon from construction materials, waste generation and materials transportation. During operation, the main source of GHG emissions would be from the vehicles using the Scheme with a smaller, ongoing source associated with road repairs. During construction, the main source of emissions is anticipated to be embedded carbon in construction materials including those associated with the pavement for road widening and the new dual carriageway and junctions (i.e. asphalt and aggregate); and the new structures. Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B include the following measures to mitigate the effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the re-use of site arisings (earthworks, road planings, concrete (through crushing and use on haul roads)) and vegetation (through mulching). Earthworks and topsoil fill may be sourced from the surplus fill from Part A for re-use on Part B. • minimising transportation through regional sourcing of materials, use of local waste facilities and backhauling – Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B identifies that materials will be sourced from the North East in the first instance and then nationally depending on the availability of construction materials; • collection of rainwater on-site to minimise transportation of freshwater for bowsers; and • use of telematics and start – stop technology on construction plant to minimise fuel use. <p>Other practical measures include avoiding concreting during high wind events. The construction of the Scheme is predicted to have a slight adverse impact upon GHG emissions, which is not considered significant.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>The climate vulnerability assessment has identified that hazards including extreme weather events (such as extreme rainfall, drought, wetter winters and flooding, extreme temperatures and wind) have the potential to impact construction workers, business continuity, materials and equipment and the final structures and road user's safety in the long term. However, when considered with the Scheme's resilience and the mitigation measures above, no significant effects are predicted.</p> <p>During operation, the main GHG emissions source would be from end-users (traffic). Another lesser source of GHG emissions is those associated with the refurbishment (replacement of specific assets) of the Scheme over its operational lifecycle. The total regional traffic GHG emissions for the operational lifespan of Part A (2023-2082) is 178 ktCO₂e higher (approximately +1.3%) than the 'do minimum' (without Part A) scenario. This represents an increase in emissions of 1.5 ktCO₂e. On this basis the GHG emissions from the operation of Part A is likely to have a minor adverse impact (not significant). For Part B the total regional traffic GHG emissions for the operational lifespan of Part B (2023-2082) is 630 ktCO₂e higher (approximately +9%) than the 'do minimum' scenario. This represents an increase in emissions of 1.5 ktCO₂e. On this basis the GHG emissions from the operation of Part B is likely to have a minor adverse impact (not significant).</p> <p>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 has been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40). In relation to mitigating and adapting to climate change, these documents do not assess the impacts to result in not change against the original assessment. Therefore it is considered that the change request will not affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.36 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.38	Adaptation is therefore necessary to deal with the potential impacts of these changes that are already happening. New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the provision of green infrastructure.	The information required for the conformance of Para 4,38, can be found in response to Para 4.36 of the NPS NN.
4.40	New national networks infrastructure will be typically long-term investments which will need to remain operational over many decades, in the face of a changing climate. Consequently, applicants must consider the impacts of climate change when planning location, design, build and operation. Any accompanying environment statement	The information required for the conformance of Para 4,40, can be found in response to Para 4.36 of the NPS NN.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	should set out how the proposal will take account of the projected impacts of climate change.	
4.41	Where transport infrastructure has safety-critical elements and the design life of the asset is 60 years or greater, the applicant should apply the UK Climate Projections 2009 (UKCP09) high emissions scenario (high impact, low likelihood) against the 2080 projections at the 50% probability level.	<p>Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that the UKCP18 projections have been used to infer future changes in a range of climate variables that may affect the vulnerability of the Scheme to climate change. The UKCP18 projections used to define the future baseline (against which resilience is assessed) are projections for the 2080s for the North-East of England region for a high emissions scenario.</p> <p>There is no government guidance published for assessing the significance of effect of individual highway schemes on regional or GHG emissions. The Climate Change Act publishes budgets for the reduction of GHG emissions with a view to substantial national reductions being achieved by 2050. The increase in GHG emissions is included in the calculation of the WebTAG Benefits Cost Ratio (BCR) of the Scheme as a financial cost.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) includes a regional assessment for Part A, which shows an increase in emissions of NO₂, CO₂ and PM₁₀ due to an overall increase in vehicle-kilometres travelled, offset in part by congestion relief, with better results for NO₂ and PM₁₀ in the opening year (Do Something (with Part A) 2023) and design year (Do Something 2038) assessments. Overall, the assessment confirms that no exceedances of the relevant air quality objectives or EU limit values are predicted to occur over the lifetime of Part A.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that Part B is modelled to increase emissions of NO₂, CO₂ and PM₁₀ due to an overall increase in vehicle-kilometres travelled, which would be partially offset by improved traffic flows. Pollutant concentrations would be below the assessment thresholds at all receptors in Part B's opening year (2023) (NO₂ and PM₁₀/PM_{2.5}) and that there are no properties that experience a worsening or improvement of air quality where pollutant concentrations are already above an assessment threshold, or a creation/removal of an exceedance. Furthermore, Part B is at low risk of impacting on compliance with EU limit values</p> <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B confirms that the design life of the Scheme is taken as 100 years. In accordance with Environment Agency guidance on allowances for climate change (Environment Agency (2019) 'Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances') and following discussions with the Environment Agency, the allowances used in the assessment and design of the Scheme and taking into account the Scheme's vulnerability are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 25 % increase in peak river flow for the assessment of risk to the Scheme, assessment of risk to third parties, design of the watercourse crossings and design of other required mitigation if required; b. 50 % increase in peak river flow or the 1000 year peak flow (whichever is greatest) for the residual risk assessments to understand risks to the Scheme and third parties in the event of a more extreme event or uncertainty in climate change predictions. <p><u>With regard to Climate and Air Quality for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the proposed change is considered not to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.41 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
4.42	The applicant should take into account the potential impacts of climate change using the latest UK Climate Projections available at the time and ensure any environment statement that is prepared identifies appropriate mitigation or adaptation measures. This should cover the estimated lifetime of the new infrastructure.	The information required for the conformance of Para 4.42, can be found in response to Para 4.36 and 4.41 of the NPS NN.
4.43	The applicant should demonstrate that there are no critical features of the design of new national networks infrastructure which may be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond that projected in the latest set of UK climate projections. Any potential critical features should be assessed taking account of the latest credible scientific evidence on, for example, sea level rise (e.g. by referring to additional maximum credible scenarios such as from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or Environment Agency) and on the basis that necessary action can be taken to ensure the operation of the infrastructure over its estimated lifetime through potential further mitigation or adaptation.	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 4.42, can also be found in response to Para 4.36 and 4.41 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>For Part A, Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) states that future sea level rise associated with climate change may decrease the distance between Part A and the tidal limit for the River Coquet. The Environment Agency provides guidance on the cumulative sea level rise for 2115 in the North West and North East using 1990 as a baseline, indicating a rise of 0.99 m in sea level. The Study Area for Part A is located between approximately 8 km and 9 km to the tidal limits, this indicates the future baseline at Part A is unlikely to be impacted by future sea level rise.</p> <p>For Part B Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) reports that that future sea level rise associated with climate change may decrease the distance between Part B and the tidal limit for the River Aln, Embleton Burn and Long Nanny. Environment Agency guidance on the cumulative sea level rise for 2115 in the North West and North East, using 1990 as a baseline, indicates a rise of 0.99 m in sea level. The minimum elevation of Part B is approximately 60.09 mAOD at the southern part of Part B. The tidal limit for the River Aln, Embleton Burn and Long Nanny are approximately between 5 and 25 mAOD, which indicates that the future baseline at Part B is unlikely to be impacted by future sea level rise.</p> <p>The effect of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 have been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>In relation to Road Drainage and the Water Environment, these documents assess the impacts to result in change against the original assessment. As a result of earthworks there will be a slight non-significant adverse effect on local hydrology, specifically cohesive alluvium, glaciofluvial sand and gravel, sandstone and limestone bedrock. Therefore is considered that the change request will not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.43 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.44	Any adaptation measures should be based on the latest set of UK Climate Projections, the Government's national Climate Change Risk.	The information required for the conformance of Para 4.44, can also be found in response to Para 4.41 of the NPS NN.

	<p>Assessment and consultation with statutory consultation bodies. Any adaptation measures must themselves also be assessed as part of any environmental impact assessment and included in the environment statement, which should set out how and where such measures are proposed to be secured.</p>	<p>The EIA is based on the Environment Agency's latest set of Climate Change projections/measures required during construction, such as avoidance of earthworks during winter months where possible; provision of appropriate temporary measures for maintaining site free from flood waters; and controlled methods for construction of embankments. In addition, a number of adaptation measures are embedded in the Scheme to take account of climate change. For example, to take into account the potential for future variations in precipitation, the drainage design includes SuDS to limit the effect of the new works by attenuating the runoff during operation. An allowance has been made for increased intensity of rainfall. An increase of 20% has been used in line with DMRB.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B details mitigation and adaptation measures embedded in the design. These chapters confirm that adaptation and resilience to climate and weather-related risks will be considered periodically through maintenance regimes to be detailed in the CEMP, as set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3). Proposed measures include a schedule of general inspections and principal inspections of each structure which would be carried out to determine condition of the structure and identify any potential maintenance requirements. Inspections will be in accordance with DMRB BD 63/17 and will also occur following an intense rainfall event or heatwave to monitor any damage and implement appropriate mitigation as necessary. In addition, a list of extreme weather-related incidents (for example, road surface deformations, snow and ice) would be maintained by the Applicant to assist in identifying thresholds which, when exceeded, would require maintenance.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>With regard to Climate, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.44 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
4.45	<p>If any proposed adaption measures themselves gives rise to consequential impacts the Secretary of State should consider the impact in relation to the application as a whole and the impacts guidance is set out as part of this NPS (eg: flooding, water, resources, biodiversity, landscape and coastal change).</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B addresses the consequential environmental impact of the provision of flow and flood compensation for the Scheme.</p> <p>These measures, in addition to those set out in response to paragraph 4.44 of the NPS above, have not been assessed as resulting in any consequential impacts in themselves.</p> <p><u>With regard to Road Drainage and the Water Environment, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.45 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>

4.46	Adaptation measures can be required to be implemented at the time of construction where necessary and appropriate to do so.	The adaptation measures described in Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B also describe their 'Buildability'. The Applicant accepts that subject to detailed design, adaption measures could be implemented at the time of construction as appropriate or necessary to do so.
4.47	Where adaptation measures are necessary to deal with the impact of climate change, and that measure would have an adverse effect on other aspects of the project and/or surrounding environment (e.g. coastal processes), the Secretary of State may consider requiring the applicant to ensure that the adaptation measure could be implemented should the need arise, rather than at the outset of the development (e.g. reserving land for future extension, increasing the height of an existing sea wall, or requiring a new sea wall).	<p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A, Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B, Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B sets out how the Scheme takes account of predicted impacts of climate change. The proposed mitigation and adaption measures can be delivered on land within the Order limits and can therefore be implemented as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to Climate, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.47 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.50	In deciding an application, the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State should focus on whether the development itself an acceptable use of the land is, and on the impacts of that use, rather than the control of processes, emissions or discharges themselves. They should assess the potential impacts of processes, emissions or discharges to inform decision making, but should work on the assumption that in terms of the control and enforcement, the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. Decisions under the Planning Act should complement but not duplicate those taken under the relevant pollution control regime.	<p>Chapter 6 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) sets out how the Scheme conforms to planning policy and is an acceptable use of the land. In relation to Part A, Chapter 6 also considers the extent of potential harm to the Green Belt arising from the construction and operation of Part A and provides a view on whether very special circumstances apply. It concludes that whilst there would be harm to two of the fundamental aims of the Green Belt (openness and protecting the countryside from encroachment), the extent of the harm would be limited. It is concluded that the limited degree of harm identified is outweighed by the very special circumstances that exist in relation to the need for Part A and the benefits it delivers.</p> <p>The impacts of that use are considered throughout Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) sets out the control of processes, emissions and discharges through the construction process.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.51	These considerations apply in an analogous way to other environmental regulatory regimes, including those on land drainage and flood defence and biodiversity.	The information required for the conformance of Para 4.51, can be found in response to Para 4.51 of the NPS NN.
4.52	There is a statutory duty on applicants to consult the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) on nationally significant projects which would affect, or would be likely to affect, any relevant marine areas as defined in the Planning Act (as amended).	The Scheme does not impact on any marine areas.

<p>4.53</p>	<p>When an applicant applies for an Environmental Permit, the relevant regulator (the Environment Agency) requires that the application demonstrates that processes are in place to meet all relevant Environmental Permit requirements.</p>	<p>The Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.3) provides details of the various consents that may be required as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>At this point (i.e. the submission of the Application), the majority of consents and all of the powers required have been included, or addressed, within the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) as permitted by various provisions of the 2008 Act. However, not all consents/permits/licences required to deliver the Scheme are included and the following (inter alia) will be sought out with the DCO as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected Species Licences; • Water abstraction licence for permission to take water from local water courses; • An Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 for Flood Risk Activities; • Land Drainage Consent for works, in, under or over any relevant watercourses; • Waste exemptions to ensure waste exemptions for re-use of material on site are in place (if required).; • A Trade effluent consent: to obtain consent for discharge of any trade effluent into a public sewer; • Section 61 agreement obtain agreement (if requested by Local Authority (LA)) for construction sites which may result in significant noise and vibration impacts.
<p>4.54</p>	<p>Applicants are encouraged to begin pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency as early as possible. It is however expected that an applicant will have first thought through the requirements as a starting point for discussion. Some consents require a significant amount of preparation; as an example, the Environment Agency suggests that applicants should start work towards submitting the permit application at least 6 months prior to the submission of an application for a Development Consent Order, where they wish to parallel track the applications. This will help ensure that applications take account of all relevant environmental considerations and that the relevant regulators are able to provide timely advice and assurance to the Examining Authority.</p>	<p>The Environment Agency has been consulted throughout the development of the Scheme. The mitigation proposed is consistent with best practice guidelines and the outcome of the assessments undertaken follows DMRB guidelines.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B.</p> <p>A draft Statement of Common Ground is being developed with the Environment Agency to record the matters that have been agreed between both parties and to identify any matters where comments still need to be resolved. The EA has been consulted on the required changes to the Scheme that are submitted at Deadline 4, and their comments have been taken into account as set out in the Consultation Statement submitted at Deadline 4 (Document Reference: 7.20).</p>
<p>4.55</p>	<p>The Secretary of State should be satisfied that development consent can be granted taking full account of environmental impacts. This will require close cooperation with the Environment Agency and/or the pollution control authority, and other relevant bodies, such as the MMO, Natural England, Drainage Boards, and water and sewerage undertakers, to ensure that in the case of potentially polluting developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the relevant pollution control authority is satisfied that potential releases can be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework; and • the effects of existing sources of pollution in and around the project are not such that the cumulative effects of pollution when the proposed development 	<p>The information required for the conformance with Para 4.55, can also be found in response to Para 4.54 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>The impacts of the Scheme are considered throughout Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) outlines the control of processes, emissions and discharges through the construction process.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-046) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4) assesses cumulative effects arising from Parts A and B. No cumulative effects in relation to pollution are predicted.</p>

	is added would make that development unacceptable, particularly in relation to statutory environmental quality limits.	For the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.3 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.54 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
4.58	It is very important that during the examination of a nationally significant infrastructure project, possible sources of nuisance under section 79(1) of the 1990 Act, and how they may be mitigated or limited are considered by the Examining Authority so they can recommend appropriate requirements that the Secretary of State might include in any subsequent order granting development consent. More information on the consideration of possible sources of nuisance is at paragraphs 5.81-5.89.	Potential sources of nuisance have been considered with regard to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance and are dealt with in the Explanatory Memorandum (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.2) and the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) . A Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance is also provided as part of the application (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.15).
4.60	New highways developments provide an opportunity to make significant safety improvements. Some developments may have safety as a key objective, but even where safety is not the main driver of a development the opportunity should be taken to improve safety, including introducing the most modern and effective safety measures where proportionate. Highway developments can potentially generate significant accident reduction benefits when they are well designed.	Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) provides an analysis of accidents and concludes overall that the Scheme would have a beneficial impact in terms of reducing accidents. This chapter states that over the 60-year appraisal period, the Scheme will provide an accident reduction benefit with a monetised value forecast to be £32 million and that the Scheme will save 414 accidents when compared to the 'without Scheme' scenario. This reduction in accidents is forecast to reduce the number of casualties by 708 over the 60-year period, of which 17 are predicted to be fatal.
4.61	The applicant should undertake an objective assessment of the impact of the proposed development on safety including the impact of any mitigation measures. This should use the methodology outlined in the guidance from DfT (WebTAG) and from the Highways Agency.	The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) provides an assessment of overall impact of the Scheme on road safety, in accordance with WebTAG and Highways England (formerly Highways Agency) guidance.
4.62	They should also put in place arrangements for undertaking the road safety audit process. Road safety audits are a mandatory requirement for all trunk road highway improvement schemes in the UK (including motorways).	The requirements resulting from the road safety audit undertaken at Preliminary Design stage have been incorporated into the Scheme design where appropriate.
4.64	The applicant should be able to demonstrate that their scheme is consistent with the Highways Agency's Safety Framework for the Strategic Road Network and with the national Strategic Framework for Road Safety. Applicants will wish to show that they have taken all steps that are reasonably required to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimise the risk of death and injury arising from their development; • contribute to an overall reduction in road casualties; 	The information required for the conformance with Para 4.64, can also be found in response to Para 4.60 of the NPS NN. Measures to minimise the risk of death and injury arising from the construction of the Scheme are specified within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) . As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribute to an overall reduction in the number of unplanned incidents; and • contribute to improvements in road safety for walkers and cyclists. 	<p>The Scheme has been designed to be of a high safety and is modelled to decrease the overall number of accidents on the road network. Safety benefits include the removal of junctions and private accesses and the provision of dual carriageway to reduce potential vehicle conflicts. Further details on the accident analysis and forecast Scheme benefits is included in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The increased capacity provided by the additional lanes will increase the resilience of the highway, for example, in the event of a road traffic accident, and facilitate the government initiative to deliver regional economic growth.</p>
4.65	<p>They will also wish to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they have considered the safety implications of their project from the outset; and • they are putting in place rigorous processes for monitoring and evaluating safety. 	<p>The Applicant has considered safety through the consideration of alternatives, and the design evolution of the Scheme. Once the Scheme is complete there will be a Road Safety Audit undertaken to assess the safety and operational aspects of the Scheme. If any mitigation is then required, it will follow on from this assessment.</p>
4.66	<p>The Secretary of State should not grant development consent unless satisfied that all reasonable steps have been taken and will be taken to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimise the risk of road casualties arising from the Scheme; and • contribute to an overall improvement in the safety of the Strategic Road Network. 	<p>The Scheme has been designed to comply with DMRB which sets the standards for safe highway design. Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) provides an analysis of accident risk and safety and concludes overall that the Scheme would contribute to an overall improvement in the safety of the SRN between Morpeth and Ellingham. The Scheme has been designed to improve safety for WCH users as set out in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.66 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
4.76 - 4.77	<p>Where national security implications have been identified, the applicant should consult with relevant security experts from CPNI [Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure] and the Department for Transport, to ensure that physical, procedural and personnel security measures have been adequately considered in the design process and that adequate consideration has been given to the management of security risks. If CPNI and the Department for Transport (as appropriate) are satisfied that security issues have been adequately addressed in the project when the application is submitted, they will provide confirmation of this to the Secretary of State, and the Examining Authority should not need to give any further consideration to the details of the security measures during the examination.</p> <p>The applicant should only include such information in the application as is necessary to enable the Examining Authority to examine the development consent issues and make a properly informed recommendation on the application.</p>	<p>No national security issues have been identified in developing the Scheme.</p>

<p>4.81 - 4.82</p>	<p>As described in the relevant sections of this NPS, where the proposed project has likely significant environmental impacts that would have an effect on human beings, any environmental statement should identify and set out the assessment of any likely significant adverse health impacts.</p> <p>The applicant should identify measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse health impacts as appropriate. These impacts may affect people simultaneously, so the applicant, and the Secretary of State (in determining an application for development consent) should consider the cumulative impact on health.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 4.81 and 4.82, can also be found in response to Para 3.15 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>The Scheme has been subject to EIA, which has considered air quality and noise impacts on sensitive human receptors (including local communities and WCH users). Chapter 5: Air Quality, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 11: Geology and Soils and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 5: Air Quality, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 11: Geology and Soils and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B report the impacts and propose appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4) concludes that “<i>There would be no significant cumulative effects due to the Scheme and ‘other development’. In addition, no further likely combined significant residual effects have been identified above the level of significance of those reported for the Scheme alone.</i>”</p> <p>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 has been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40). With regard to ES Chapters outlined above, for the reasons set out in the response to Table 2, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 4.1 and 4.82 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) confirms that over the 60-year appraisal period, the Scheme will provide an accident reduction benefit with a monetised value forecast to be £32 million and that the Scheme will save 414 accidents when compared to the ‘Do Minimum’ scenario. This reduction in accidents is forecast to reduce the number of casualties by 708 over the 60-year period, of which 17 are predicted to be fatal.</p>
--------------------	---	---

TABLE 3 - Scheme Conformity with NPS NN Chapter 5

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.6 - 5.9	<p>Where the impacts of the project (both on and off-scheme) are likely to have significant air quality effects in relation to meeting EIA requirements and / or affect the UK's ability to comply with the Air Quality Directive, the applicant should undertake an assessment of the impacts of the proposed project as part of the environmental statement.</p> <p>The environmental statement should describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing air quality levels; forecasts of air quality at the time of opening, assuming that the scheme is not built (the future baseline) and taking account of the impact of the scheme; and any significant air quality effects, their mitigation and any residual effects, distinguishing between the construction and operation stages and taking account of the impact of road traffic generated by the project. <p>Defra publishes national projections of air quality based on evidence of future emissions, traffic and vehicle fleet. Projections are updated as the evidence base changes. Applicant's assessment should be consistent with this but may include more detailed modelling to demonstrate local impacts.</p>	<p>The method of baseline assessment is described in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B and is in accordance with NPS NN paragraphs 5.6 – 5.9. The future baseline has been assessed in these chapters and is commonly referred to as the 'do minimum' scenario which takes into account what the future air quality would be, assuming the Scheme does not go ahead. The future baseline also takes into account likely changes owing to government initiatives to reduce emissions from motor vehicles and other sources.</p> <p>The results of the air quality assessment include construction and the operational effects of the Scheme. No significant effects have been identified for the operational phase of the Scheme and no additional monitoring is necessary. During construction, monitoring will be required to determine the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation, or requirement for further mitigation. This will be the responsibility of the main contractor. The Scheme would not bring about the need for a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) or change the size of an existing AQMA; or bring about changes to exceedances of the Limit Values.</p> <p>Results of compliance with the European Union (EU) Air Quality Directive can be found in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. There are no Pollution Climate Map links within the local air quality study area modelled to exceed the EU limit value for annual mean NO₂. The Scheme (alone and cumulatively) is at low risk of affecting compliance with EU limit values.</p> <p>With regard to Air Quality, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.6 - 5.9 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.10	<p>The Secretary of State should consider air quality impacts over the wider area likely to be affected, as well as in the near vicinity of the Scheme. In all cases the Secretary of State must take account of relevant statutory air quality thresholds set out in domestic and European legislation. Where a project is likely to lead to a breach of the air quality thresholds, the applicant should work with the relevant authorities to secure appropriate mitigation measures with a view to ensuring so far as possible that those thresholds are not breached.</p>	<p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B defines a local and wider study area for assessing the air quality impacts of the Scheme. This Chapter sets out that pollutant concentrations would be below the assessment thresholds at all receptors in the Scheme opening year and that there are no receptors that experience a worsening or improvement of air quality where pollutant concentrations are already above an assessment threshold.</p> <p>These chapters also set out the mitigation measures that are proposed for the construction phase of the Scheme, set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) and that there is no requirement for Scheme-specific mitigation as no significant effects are anticipated.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>With regard to Air Quality, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.10 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.11	<p>Air quality considerations are likely to be particularly relevant where schemes are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within or adjacent to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA); roads identified as being above Limit Values or nature conservation sites (including Natura 2000 sites and SSSIs, including those outside England); and • where changes are sufficient to bring about the need for a new AQMA or change the size of an existing AQMA; or bring about changes to exceed the Limit Values, or where they may have the potential to impact on nature conservation sites. 	<p>The local and wider study area for the air quality assessment is defined in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and does not include any AQMAs (the nearest being in Gosforth managed by Newcastle City Council) but includes the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which sits within the Order limits of Part A in the northern section of the Part A when the A1 crosses the River Coquet.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms that the impacts at the River Coquet Valley and Woodland SSSI can be discounted as unlikely to give rise to a significant effect as the critical level would not be exceeded. In one part of the River Coquet Valley and Woodland SSSI, the critical level is exceeded in the do-minimum scenario but would be below the critical level with the Scheme (including the cumulative scenario). This beneficial impact on the western side of the A1 is due to the shift in the southbound carriageway to the east.</p> <p>Part A would not bring about the need for a new AQMA or change the size of an existing AQMA; or bring about changes to exceed the Limit Values.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that the ARN for Part B is not located within an AQMA. The nearest AQMA is Newcastle City Council's AQMA No.5 (Gosforth), which is approximately 46 km to the south of Part B. The Chapter also confirms that there are no designated sites, with features potentially sensitive to air quality impacts, within 200 m of the Part B ARN.</p> <p>Part B would not bring about the need for a new AQMA or change the size of an existing AQMA or bring about changes to exceed the Limit Values.</p> <p>With regard to Air Quality, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.11 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.12	<p>The Secretary of State must give air quality considerations substantial weight where, after taking into account mitigation a project would lead to</p>	<p>Results of compliance with the EU Air Quality Directive can be found in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	a significant air quality impact in relation to EIA and/or would lead to a deterioration in air quality in a zone/agglomeration.	(Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. No significant impacts or exceedances of the EU limit are predicted.
5.13	<p>The Secretary of State should refuse consent where, after taking into account mitigation, the air quality impacts of the scheme will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • result in a zone/agglomeration which is currently reported as being compliant with the Air Quality Directive becoming non-compliant; or • affect the ability of a non-compliant area to achieve compliance within the most recent timescales reported to the European Commission at the time of the decision. 	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.13, can be found in response to Para 5.11 of the NPS NN.
5.14 - 5.15	<p>The Secretary of State should consider whether mitigation measures put forward by the applicant are acceptable. A management plan may help codify mitigation at this stage. The proposed mitigation measures should ensure that the net impact of a project does not delay the point at which a zone will meet compliance timescales.</p> <p>Mitigation measures may affect the project design, layout, construction, operation and/or may comprise measures to improve air quality in pollution hotspots beyond the immediate locality of the scheme. Measures could include, but are not limited to, changes to the route of the new scheme, changes to the proximity of vehicles to local receptors in the existing route, physical means including barriers to trap or better disperse emissions, and speed control. The implementation of mitigation measures may require working with partners to support their delivery.</p>	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.14 and 5.15, can be found in response to Para 5.11 of the NPS NN.
5.16	<p>The Government has a legally binding framework to cut greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% by 2050. As stated above, the impact of road development on aggregate levels of emissions is likely to be very small. Emission reductions will be delivered through a system of five-year carbon budgets that set a trajectory to 2050. Carbon budgets and plans will include policies to reduce transport emissions, taking into account the impact of the Government's overall programme of new infrastructure as part of that.</p>	<p>Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B reports the total estimated GHG emissions arising from the Scheme for the construction, operation and the overall total for the whole lifecycle.</p> <p>The Applicant's carbon tool was developed to better manage carbon emissions resulting from the maintenance and improvement of the trunk road network. It contains average embodied carbon figures for various construction materials taken from the Bath Inventory of Carbon and Energy, along with transport, energy and waste factors from Defra 2014 and the Waste Resources Action Programme. Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 14: Climate, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B identifies the inclusion of an estimate of embodied and transport carbon for the Scheme design and construction.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.16 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference:</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
5.17	Carbon impacts will be considered as part of the appraisal of scheme options (in the business case), prior to the submission of an application for DCO. Where the development is subject to EIA, any Environmental Statement will need to describe an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Directive. It is very unlikely that the impact of a road project will, in isolation, affect the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction plan targets. However, for road projects applicants should provide evidence of the carbon impact of the project and an assessment against the Government's carbon budgets.	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.17, can be found in response to Para 5.16 of the NPS NN.
5.18	The Government has an overarching national carbon reduction strategy (as set out in the Carbon Plan 2011) which is a credible plan for meeting carbon budgets. It includes a range of non-planning policies which will, subject to the occurrence of the very unlikely event described above, ensure that any carbon increases from road development do not compromise its overall carbon reduction commitments. The Government is legally required to meet this plan. Therefore, any increase in carbon emissions is not a reason to refuse development consent, unless the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the proposed Scheme are so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.18, can also be found in response to Para 5.16 of the NPS NN. The increase in carbon emissions resulting from the Scheme is not considered so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of the Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.
5.19	Evidence of appropriate mitigation measures (incorporating engineering plans on configuration and layout, and use of materials) in both design and construction should be presented. The Secretary of State will consider the effectiveness of such mitigation measures in order to ensure that, in relation to design and construction, the carbon footprint is not unnecessarily high. The Secretary of State's view of the adequacy of the mitigation measures relating to design and construction will be a material factor in the decision-making process.	The application includes an Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) . It details the environmental mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction, why they are required, who is responsible for delivering them and any ongoing maintenance and monitoring arrangements. This includes maximising the use of renewable material resources, and any materials with recycled or secondary content, designing pre-fabricated structures and component, specifying material with the least embedded carbon as far as practicable and re-use of material resources from Scheme demolition activities on site. As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.20	<p>Biodiversity is the variety of life in all its forms and encompasses all species of plants and animals and the complex ecosystems of which they are a part. Government policy for the natural environment is set out in the Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP). The NEWP sets out a vision of moving progressively from net biodiversity loss to net gain, by supporting healthy, well-functioning ecosystems and establishing more coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Geological conservation relates to the sites that are designated for their geology and/or their geomorphological importance.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.20, can also be found in response to Para 5.22 and 5.23 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059APP/6.3) for Part B assess potential effects on sites, habitats and species of conservation importance including indirect effects.</p> <p>A biodiversity no net loss calculation has been carried out to quantify biodiversity losses and gains in terms of 'biodiversity units' for Part A and Part B. The full findings of the biodiversity no net loss calculations for Part A are presented in Appendix 9.20: Biodiversity No Net Loss Report, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7). The equivalent findings for Part B are presented in Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Report, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8). The biodiversity no net loss assessments consider whether the relevant Part of the Scheme would result in an overall net loss or net gain of biodiversity.</p> <p>Part A will deliver a net gain in biodiversity units of area-based Habitats of Principal Importance. Whilst a net loss of hedgerow units is predicted, the linear length of hedgerow planting within Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5) is greater than that lost to Part A.</p> <p>Overall, Part B would result in a net loss of biodiversity due to the loss of hedgerows and woodland and loss of running open water habitat primarily through the extension of existing culverts. However, Part B is in line to deliver a net gain in biodiversity units of area-based non-Habitats or Principal Importance (HPI).</p> <p>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 has been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>In relation to Biodiversity, these documents assess the impacts to result in change against the original assessment. As a result of the stabilisationstabilisation works, there would be a moderate adverse impact on the SSSI, as a result of loss of ancient woodland during construction. It would also result in the loss of 0.28 of broadleaf woodland habitat, a moderate adverse impact. The Southern Access Works would also result in the loss of riverbank habitat of the SSSI that is characterised as a direct, permanent moderate adverse effect in the ES Addendum Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40). Following the successful implementation of mitigation, the loss, damage and disturbance to habitats of the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI would result in a direct, temporary Slight Adverse effect (not significant). Whilst the change request will would some negative impacts on biodiversity, the Scheme overall is considered to be compliant with this paragraph.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.22 - 5.23	<p>Where the project is subject to EIA the applicant should ensure that the environmental statement clearly sets out any likely significant effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological or geological conservation importance (including those outside England) on protected species and on habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity and that the statement considers the full range of potential impacts on ecosystems. The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests.</p>	<p>For Part A the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Matrix within the HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.14) states that the Northumbria Coast SPA and Ramsar Wetland (a designated European Site) are approximately 9.5km downstream from where the A1 crosses the River Coquet. Therefore, no impacts from noise, lighting, odour, emissions or changes in air quality are anticipated as a result of Part A. Given the intervening distance and proposed mitigation, no impacts on the European site are anticipated as a result from changes in water quality or potential pollution or contamination incidents.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A assesses potential effects from Part A on sites, habitats and species of conservation importance including indirect effects. Mitigation and compensation proposals have been developed as part of Part A to address potential impacts on European Protected Species. Based on current data it is possible that this will include a requirement to obtain bat and Great Crested Newt (GCN) licenses.</p> <p>Air quality modelling (Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A showed that there would be an increase in nitrogen deposition as a result of Part A. The Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS) is 18.02 ha in size and located to the east and west of the existing A1 (ARN) where it crosses the River Coquet, The LWS includes the woodland on the northern bank of the river that has been considered as ancient woodland within the ES.</p> <p>Part A addresses the loss of all LWS woodland within the Order Limits adjacent to the existing A1 (0.41 ha) and provides woodland planting as compensation (detailed within Appendix 9.21: Ancient Woodland Strategy, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7)). As such, the closest point affected by increased NO_x levels from the existing A1 is at the Order Limits boundary, approximately 15 m distance. At this distance, NO_x levels do not exceed the critical level (30 µg/m³). As the area impacted by increased nitrogen deposition has been captured within the mitigation strategy for the construction of Part A, the effects in relation to air quality and Coquet River Felton Park LWS are considered Neutral (not significant).</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A confirms that the biodiversity no net loss assessment considered whether Part A would result in an overall loss of biodiversity due to the loss of ancient woodland (which is an irreplaceable habitat, therefore unable to achieve no net loss) as well as other habitat types such as hedgerows and arable field margins.</p> <p>As part of the Part A an Ancient Woodland Strategy has been developed through consultation and collaboration with Natural England, as presented in Appendix 9.21, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7). The Ancient Woodland Strategy includes measures such as a Woodland Creation Area (soil analysis and manipulation), the salvage / translocation of ancient woodland material (such as soil and ground flora), the establishment of a hay meadow ground flora and woodland tree planting.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms Part A would have a “<i>very large adverse</i>” and a “<i>neutral</i>” impact in construction.</p> <p>In terms of HPI, which includes mixed and broad-leaved woodland, neutral grassland, arable field margins, hedgerow and watercourses, Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2)</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>confirms Part A would have beneficial to slight adverse impact (not significant) during construction and neutral impact in the operational phase. Part A would result in some direct temporary slight adverse effects (not significant) on bats during operation, otherwise with mitigation, Part A is expected to have a “neutral” impact on all other European Protected Species and Species of Principal Importance.</p> <p>Part A is also in line to deliver a net gain in biodiversity units of area-based Habitats Priority Index. Whilst a net loss of hedgerow units is predicted, the linear length of hedgerow planting within the Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5) is greater than that lost to Part A</p> <p>For Part B, the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Matrix within the HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.14) considers the impacts of the Scheme on relevant European sites from noise, lighting and odour are not anticipated. Effects from noise, lighting and odour would be localised within the immediate vicinity of Part B with attenuation distances such that no effects would be anticipated at the European Site 3.7 km to the east.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B assesses potential effects from Part B on sites, habitats and species of conservation importance including indirect effects. Chapter 9: Biodiversity concludes that Part B is expected to have a “neutral” impact on European sites, in addition to other Statutory and non-Statutory designated sites during both the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>In terms of HPI, which include broad-leaved woodland, hedgerow and watercourses, Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms Part B would have a slight adverse impact (not significant) during construction and neutral impact in the operational phase. Part B would result in some direct temporary slight adverse effects (not significant) on bats during construction. With mitigation, Part B is expected to have a “neutral” impact on all other European Protected Species and Species of Principal Importance.</p> <p><u>With regard to Biodiversity and Air Quality for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.22 and 5.23 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.25	<p>As a general principle, and subject to the specific policies below, development should avoid significant harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests, including through mitigation and consideration of reasonable alternatives. The applicant may also wish to make use of biodiversity offsetting in devising compensation proposals to counteract any impacts on biodiversity which cannot be avoided or mitigated. Where significant harm cannot be avoided or mitigated, as a last resort, appropriate compensation measures should be sought.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A assesses potential effects including indirect effects from Part A on sites, habitats and species of conservation importance. This chapter also provides a summary of the habitat to be lost and that to be created to compensate for the loss.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) provides an assessment of likely effects arising from Part A in both construction and operation. It also sets out the ecological features identified during the baseline assessment. Chapter 9: Biodiversity confirms that Part A would result in an unavoidable overall loss of biodiversity due to the loss of ancient woodland as well as other habitat types such as hedgerows and arable</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>field margins. Compensation measures, including Appendix 9.21: Ancient Woodland Strategy, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) sets out the proposals to counteract any impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B assesses potential effects including indirect effects from Part B on sites, habitats and species of conservation importance. This chapter also provides a summary of the habitat to be lost and that to be created to compensate for the loss. For example, Part B would result in the loss of broad-leaved semi-natural woodland, a HPI, to facilitate construction. The creation of compensatory woodland at a quantity significantly greater than that lost (10.14 ha created in comparison to 0.69 ha lost) is embedded in the design.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B concludes that, with appropriate mitigation measures, Part B is not predicted to cause significant harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests other than where permanent loss of watercourse habitat during the construction, extension and realignment of culverts occurs. As this would result in a permanent loss of viable habitat with regard for proposed culverts in Shipperton Burn, Kittycarter Burn tributary and the tributary of Embleton Burn, the effect is assessed to be of Moderate adverse permanent effect.</p> <p>With regard to Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.25 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.26	<p>In taking decisions, the Secretary of State should ensure that appropriate weight is attached to designated sites of international, national and local importance, protected species, habitats and other species of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity, and to biodiversity and geological interests within the wider environment.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.26, can be found in response to Para 5.22 and 5.23 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.27	<p>The most important sites for biodiversity are those identified through international conventions and European Directives. The Habitats Regulations provide statutory protection for European sites (see also paragraphs 4.22 to 4.25). The National Planning Policy Framework states that the following wildlife sites should have the same protection as European sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation; • listed or proposed Ramsar sites; and • sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation and listed or proposed Ramsar sites. 	<p>The HRA (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.14) confirms that the designations listed below fall within the definition of a European site (Natura 2000 Site) and that all European Sites within 10 km of the Scheme, and up to 30 km where a site includes bat species as a qualifying feature, have been considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramsar sites, including potential sites (included as a matter of convention in the UK); • Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), including candidate or possible SACs (cSACs or pSACs); • Special Protection Areas (SPAs), including potential SPAs (pSPAs); and • Sites of Community Importance (SCIs).

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.28	<p>Many Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are also designated as sites of international importance and will be protected accordingly. Those that are not, or those features of SSSIs not covered by an international designation, should be given a high degree of protection. All National Nature Reserves are notified as SSSIs.</p>	<p>The following sites are scoped into the EIA, as reported in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B, due to their proximity to the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longhoughton Quarry SSSI; • Hulme Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS); • Littlemill Quarry LWS; • Ratcheugh Crag-Pepper Moor LWS; • Cawledge Burn LWS; • River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI; • Coquet River Felton Park LWS; • Longhorsley Moor (SSSI); • Davies Wood (LNR); • Bracken Bank (LNR); • Scotch Gill Wood (LNR); • Carlisle Park (LNR); • Ulgham Meadow (LNR); • Borough Wood (LNR); • Coquet River Felton Park (LWS); • Cotting Woods (LWS); • Font River Woods (LWS); • Coquet River Moldshaugh (LWS); • Longhorsley Moor (LWS); • Wansbeck and Hartburn Woods (LWS); • Cocklaw Dene (LWS); • Cawledge Burn (LWS); • Coney Garth Pond (LWS); and • Bothal Burn and River Wansbeck (LWS). <p>Table 9-24 in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A states the Scheme is expected to have a “<i>very large adverse</i>” impact on River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI and “<i>moderate adverse</i>” impact on the Coquet River Felton Park LWS in construction, with a “<i>neutral</i>” (not significant) impact in operation.</p> <p>Table 9-13 in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part B states the Scheme is expected to have a “<i>neutral</i>” impact on Statutory designated sites during both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regard to Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.28 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.29	<p>Where a proposed development on land within or outside a SSSI is likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments), development consent should not normally be granted. Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should be made only where the benefits of the development at this site clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs. The Secretary of State should ensure that the applicant's proposals to mitigate the harmful aspects of the development and, where possible, to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the site's biodiversity or geological interest, are acceptable. Where necessary, requirements and/or planning obligations should be used to ensure these proposals are delivered.</p>	<p>The River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodland SSSI is located within and adjacent to Part A.</p> <p>Section 9 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) states that Part A would result in an indirect, permanent adverse effects of removal of elements of Ancient Woodland in the SSSI and impacts to the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI as a result of changes in air quality. The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) sets out the pressing national case for the Scheme and the benefits that it would deliver and sets out the reasons why the impact on the SSSI is unavoidable. From a physical perspective, the entire length of the River Coquet is designated as comprising the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI. Overall there is no practical means of dualling the A1 between Morpeth and Felton that would avoid this SSSI.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A sets out individual mitigation for species that are either subject of the SSSI citation or are present in the SSSI habitat. These are referred to in the REAC contained within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) and as such will be secured through Requirement 4 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1). As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-356) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>Further certainty will be provided through the submission of applications for, and receipt of, all necessary permits and assents prior to the commencement of works. These would include, but not limited to, an Environment Agency Permit for works in and around watercourses and SSSI Assent from Natural England for works within and adjacent to the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI.</p> <p>The design of the diverted PRoW footpath to the south of the River Coquet, at detailed design, would enclose the footpath and deter access into the SSSI, this design can also be controlled by submission of details for a requirement within the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1).</p> <p>The mitigation strategy that provides compensatory woodland planting (on a 12:1 ratio as agreed with Natural England) within the Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21 of Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7)) would also provide certainty that can be enforced and upheld through requirements.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that Longhoughton Quarry SSSI and the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI (including Duke's Bank Wood) are within 2 km of Part B. Chapter 9: Biodiversity concludes that Part B would have a "neutral" impact on the site both the construction and operation.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>With regard to Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.29 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.31	<p>Sites of regional and local biodiversity and geological interest (which include Local Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites and Nature Improvement Areas) have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets, in contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community, and in supporting research and education. The Secretary of State should give due consideration to such regional or local designations. However, given the need for new infrastructure, these designations should not be used in themselves to refuse development consent.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A states that it is considered that Part A would, at worst, result in an indirect, permanent adverse effect of Slight significance (not significant) to on regional and local sites of biodiversity and geological interest.</p> <p>As an online widening of an existing A road, Part B tends to avoid effects on Local Sites as far as possible. Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that Part B is expected to have a “neutral” impact on Statutory and non-Statutory designated sites during both the construction and operational phases of Part B.</p> <p>With regard to Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.31 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.32	<p>Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for its diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Once lost it cannot be recreated. The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the national need for and benefits of the development, in that location, clearly outweigh the loss. Aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland are also particularly valuable for biodiversity and their loss should be avoided. Where such trees would be affected by development proposals, the applicant should set out proposals for their conservation or, where their loss is unavoidable, the reasons for this.</p>	<p>There is designated Ancient Woodland within Part A known as Dukes Bank Wood. This is located in the valley of the River Coquet Valley SSSI. The citation for the River Coquet SSSI indicates that components of the site include semi-natural and Ancient Woodland areas. Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A has assessed the effects to this designated site and mitigation and compensation measures required.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms that Part A would result in the loss of 0.27 ha of Ancient Woodland associated with the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI. The mitigation strategy provides compensatory woodland planting (12:1 ratio) as agreed with Natural England within the Ancient Woodland Strategy (see Appendix 9.21, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7)). However, given that Ancient Woodland is an irreplaceable habitat and the time to re-establish a woodland of similar ecological function, Part A would incur a direct, permanent adverse effect of Very Large significance to the River Coquet and Coquet Valley SSSI (encompassing Dukes Bank Wood Ancient Woodland).</p> <p>Appendix 7.5: Arboricultural Report, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A, details the mitigation proposed in order to reduce adverse impacts proposed by Part A upon the Duke’s Bank ancient woodland within the River Coquet valley.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) sets out the pressing national case for the Scheme and the reasons why the loss of Ancient Woodland is unavoidable. This document sets out that the Ancient Woodland runs over 600m to the west of the existing A1, that would require a significant length of additional dual carriageway, estimated in Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1), to be between 4 and 5 miles, to avoid.</p> <p>Aside from the potential environmental impacts that this additional length of highway would have, the longer journey times and further cost of building a substantial amount of additional carriageway would inevitably seriously weaken the economic case for the Scheme.</p> <p>From a physical perspective, the entire length of the River Coquet is designated as comprising the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI. Overall there is no practical means of dualling the A1 between Morpeth and Felton that would avoid this SSSI.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that there is no Ancient Woodland, as listed on the Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI), within Part B.</p> <p>There are no designated sites or areas of ancient woodland within 200 m of the Part B ARN. Acknowledging a lack of hydrological connectivity and no potential for air quality impacts as a result of Part B in isolation, ancient woodland is not considered further within Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3). However, as detailed in Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES for Part B, there are two statutory designated sites and 20 non-statutory and ancient woodland sites within 200 m of the Cumulative Scenario ARN. The combined effect on these sites are assessed in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects, Volume 4 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.4), which concludes there would be a combined effect of slight adverse significance (not significant) on ecological receptors during construction.</p> <p><u>With regard to Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.32 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.33	Development proposals potentially provide many opportunities for building in beneficial biodiversity or geological features as part of good design. When considering proposals, the Secretary of State should consider whether the applicant has maximised such opportunities in and around developments. The Secretary of State may use requirements or planning obligations where appropriate in order to ensure that such beneficial features are delivered.	<u>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.33, can be found in response to Para 5.22 and 5.23 of the NPS NN.</u>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.35	<p>Other species and habitats have been identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England and Wales and therefore requiring conservation action. The Secretary of State should ensure that applicants have taken measures to ensure these species and habitats are protected from the adverse effects of development. Where appropriate, requirements or planning obligations may be used in order to deliver this protection. The Secretary of State should refuse consent where harm to the habitats or species and their habitats would result, unless the benefits of the development (including need) clearly outweigh that harm.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures are proposed that will reduce adverse effects through: replacing lost habitat; timing of construction works to avoid the most sensitive times of year; translocation / displacement of relevant protected species before the start of works to move them outside of the footprint of Part A and Part B; e.g. the landscape planting designed to discourage barn owls from hunting within the road corridor in Part A or translocation of bat boxes in Part B; and pollution control measures to prevent damage and degradation to habitats in both.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A considers all species and habitats, identifies those that are of principal importance and proposes appropriate measures to mitigate the significance of adverse effects.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2), Part A would result in some loss of habitats within the landscape that currently provides connectivity and dispersal routes for species (faunal and floral), including arable, scrub, semi-improved grassland, species poor hedgerows, watercourses and ditches. Wildlife will be at risk of disturbance, direct mortality and pollution, as well as fragmentation and severance of their habitat. Measures have been designed to mitigate these effects as described in this chapter.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity of Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms that the construction of Part A would result in the loss of habitat, for which compensatory habitat creation would be required. Habitat creation has been developed and incorporated into Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5). The landscape design incorporates ecological mitigation measures to reduce the significance of effects, maintain and improve connectivity along and around Part A and to mitigate the effects of fragmentation and displacement.</p> <p>Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5) for Part A includes the following habitat creation to mitigate and compensate for the loss of Habitats of principal Importance (HPI):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadleaved woodland – semi-natural; • Mixed woodland – semi-natural; • Neutral grassland – semi-improved; • Arable field margins; • Standing water; • Hedgerow. <p>Created habitats would be managed so that they develop into their respective HPI quality and condition, in accordance with the biodiversity no net loss calculations, (see Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report (Appendix 9.20, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7)).</p> <p>A REAC, which documents these measures, is provided in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3). Requirement 4 in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) for a CEMP to be prepared in accordance with the Outline CEMP and approved in writing by the Secretary of State prior to works commencing.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>Part B has been designed where possible to avoid direct effects on species and habitats of importance for the conservation of biodiversity. Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B considers all species and habitats, identifies those that are of principal importance and proposes appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that the construction of Part B would result in the loss of habitat, for which compensatory habitat creation would be required. Habitat creation has been developed and incorporated into Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.6) for Part B. The landscape design incorporates ecological mitigation measures to reduce the significance of effects, maintain and improve connectivity along and around Part B and to mitigate the effects of fragmentation and displacement.</p> <p>Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.6) for Part B (includes the following habitat creation to mitigate and compensate for the loss of Habitats of principal Importance (HPI):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad-leaved semi-natural woodland; • Hedgerows; • Running water <p>Created habitats would be managed so that they develop into their respective HPI quality and condition, in accordance with the biodiversity no net loss calculations, (see Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8).</p> <p>A REAC, which documents these measures, is provided in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3). Requirement 4 in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) for a CEMP to be prepared in accordance with the Outline CEMP and approved in writing by the Secretary of State prior to works commencing.</p> <p>With regard to Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.35 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.36	Applicants should include appropriate mitigation measures as an integral part of their proposed development, including identifying where and how that:	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.36, can also be found in response to Para 5.35 of the NPS NN.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> during construction, they will seek to ensure that activities will be confined to the minimum areas required for the works; during construction and operation, best practice will be followed to ensure that risk of disturbance or damage to species or habitats is minimised (including as a consequence of transport access arrangements); habitats will, where practicable, be restored after construction works have finished; developments will be designed and landscaped to provide green corridors and minimise habitat fragmentation where reasonable. opportunities will be taken to enhance existing habitats and, where practicable, to create new habitats of value within the site landscaping proposals, for example through techniques such as the 'greening' of existing network crossing points, the use of green bridges and the habitat improvement of the network verge. 	<p>The design of Part A incorporates measures to prevent habitat fragmentation. For example, an amphibian underpass has been incorporated into the design beneath the east-west road of the Burgham Park underbridge (NZ 1784 9681) to improve connectivity for GCN in ponds A11 and A12 to retained and created habitats to the south of the road. In addition, a culvert (Wildlife Eshott Burn Culvert) will be constructed at chainage 18,300 as part of bat mitigation, with an internal diameter of 1.5 m.</p> <p>To avoid fragmentation for Part B, site/vegetation clearance and tree felling would be kept to a minimum and only where essential to facilitate construction, to reduce the impacts of habitat loss and fragmentation. Areas of clearance, particularly those within temporary works, shall be identified within a method statement and agreed with the appointed Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW).</p> <p>Site clearance of dense vegetation would be undertaken carefully (use of hand tools) and by experienced contractors to reduce the risk of mortality to wildlife. Care should be afforded to dense stands of bramble or similar vegetation, which may be used by sheltering hedgehog or other wildlife, particularly during the winter months.</p>
5.37	The Secretary of State should consider what appropriate requirements should be attached to any consent and/or in any planning obligations entered into in order to ensure that mitigation measures are delivered.	<p>Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) includes proposed requirements to be attached to any consent. No requirement for planning obligations has been identified.</p> <p>The Application includes an Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3). It details the environmental mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction, why they are required, who is responsible for delivering them and any ongoing maintenance and monitoring arrangements.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.38	The Secretary of State will need to take account of what mitigation measures may have been agreed between the applicant and Natural England and/or the MMO, and whether Natural England and/or or the MMO has granted or refused, or intends to grant or refuse, any relevant licences, including protected species mitigation licences.	<p>Natural England have been consulted with regard to protected species and the requirement for any protected species licenses as set out in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) and the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.3).</p> <p>A draft Statement of Common Ground is also being developed with Natural England to record the matters that have been agreed between both parties and to identify any matters where comments still need to be resolved.</p>
5.42	The applicant should set out the arrangements that are proposed for managing any waste produced. The arrangements described should include information on the proposed waste recovery and disposal system for all waste generated by the development. The applicant should seek to minimise the volume of waste produced and the volume	Measures for managing waste and materials are proposed and information on their implementation, measuring and monitoring are detailed in Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. These chapters summarise the general mitigation tools and processes that would be adopted for the Scheme in relation to managing material resources and waste. This includes a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) secured via the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) . A SWMP will be

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>of waste sent for disposal unless it can be demonstrated that the alternative is the best overall environmental outcome.</p>	<p>produced and maintained by the main contractor and is secured through the Requirement 4, Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1). As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>With regard to Materials and Waste for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.36 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.42 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.43	<p>The Secretary of State should consider the extent to which the applicant has proposed an effective process that will be followed to ensure effective management of hazardous and non-hazardous waste arising from the construction and operation of the proposed development. The Secretary of State should be satisfied that the process sets out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any such waste will be properly managed, both on-site and off-site; the waste from the proposed facility can be dealt with appropriately by the waste infrastructure which is, or is likely to be, available. Such waste arising's should not have an adverse effect on the capacity of existing waste management facilities to deal with other waste arising's in the area; and adequate steps have been taken to minimise the volume of waste arisings, and of the volume of waste arisings sent to disposal, except where an alternative is the most sustainable outcome overall. 	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.43, can also be found in response to Para 5.42 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>The Application includes an Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) that details the environmental mitigation measures that would be implemented during the management of hazardous and non-hazardous waste arising from construction and operation of the Scheme. It also sets out why they are required, who is responsible for delivering them and any ongoing maintenance and monitoring arrangements. As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>Minimising the production of waste has been considered throughout the design process of the Scheme. Any contamination identified may require soils to be treated on-site or taken off-site for treatment or disposal. Any asphalt waste containing coal tar waste identified when removing the old road and hard standing sections would be taken off-site for disposal at a suitable licensed facility. Information on the location of waste management facilities has been identified in Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. The Scheme would apply the waste hierarchy in order to move waste management practices as far up the hierarchy as possible, minimising disposal and maximising re-use and recycling.</p> <p>A Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE) Material Management Plan would be implemented to mitigate the risks arising from the re-use of materials. The CL:AIRE process is documented in Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 13: Material Resources, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B.</p> <p>With regard to Materials and Waste, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.36 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.43 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.44	Where necessary, the Secretary of State should use requirements or planning obligations to ensure that appropriate measures for waste management are applied.	Measures for waste management are set out in a REAC, which is included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) . There is a requirement in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) for the CEMP to be prepared in accordance with the Outline CEMP and approved in writing by the Secretary of State prior to works commencing. As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
5.45	Where the project will be subject to the Environment Agency's environmental permitting regime, waste management arrangements during operations will be covered by the permit and the considerations set out in paragraphs 4.48 to 4.56 will apply.	Any necessary waste management permits will be obtained as set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) and the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.3) . As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
5.46	Civil and military aerodromes, aviation technical sites, and other types of defence interests (both onshore and offshore) can be affected by new national networks infrastructure development.	Consultation has been undertaken with the relevant bodies (Ministry of Defence, Civil Aviation Authority, National Air Traffic Services and any aerodrome, licensed or otherwise) likely to be affected by the Scheme. Based on these discussions it is not expected that the Scheme will result in significant effects on any civil or military aviation interests. Further details can be found in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) . Measures such as the landscaping scheme being designed to discourage usage of the habitats by birds, have been incorporated into Part A to ensure that it will not affect any aerodromes, including the nearby Eshott Airfield, or other aviation technical sites.
5.62	Where, after reasonable mitigation, operational changes and planning obligations and requirements have been proposed, development consent should not be granted if the Secretary of State considers that: a) development would prevent a licensed aerodrome from maintaining its licence; b) the benefits of the proposed development are outweighed by the harm to aerodromes serving business, training or emergency service needs; or c) the development would significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of defence assets or significantly limit military training.	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.62, can be found in response to Para 5.46 of the NPS NN.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.71 - 5.74	<p>Applications for development in a Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA) should make it clear why there is a need for it to be located in a CCMA. For developments in a CCMA, applicants should undertake an assessment of the vulnerability of the proposed development to coastal change, taking account of climate change, during the project's operational life.</p> <p>For any projects involving dredging or disposal into the sea, the applicant should consult the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), and where appropriate, for cross-boundary impacts, Natural Resource Wales and Scottish Natural Heritage, at an early stage. The applicant should also consult the MMO on projects which could impact on coastal change, since the MMO may also be involved in considering other projects which may have related coastal impacts.</p>	<p>The Scheme is not within a CCMA.</p>
5.82	<p>Because of the potential effects of these emissions and in view of the availability of the defence of statutory authority against nuisance claims s.104 of the Planning Act 2008 described previously, it is important that the potential for these impacts is considered by the applicant in their application, by the Examining Authority in examining applications and by the Secretary of State in taking decisions on development consents.</p>	<p>The EIA undertaken for the Scheme assesses compliance with this policy to the extent that it is relevant to the Scheme. There is no potential for odour, smoke and steam resulting from the Scheme and these are not assessed.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B considers construction dust impacts whilst Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES for Part A and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES considers noise and its impact on residential receptors. Lighting is assessed in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES for Part A and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES for Part B.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) details the mitigation measures that would be implemented during the construction of the Scheme. The Outline CEMP will be developed into the final CEMP and would be secured through Requirement 4 in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1). Further details on statutory nuisance are set out in the Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.15).</p> <p>In relation to dust, the following measures (not exhaustive) are documented in the REAC which forms part of the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposed soils will be protected from winds until sealed or re-vegetated; • Dust generating activities will be minimised, particularly near residential receptors/sensitive ecosystems during prolonged dry, dusty weather unless damping/other suppressants are used; • An adequate water supply to site will be ensured and water will be used as dust suppressant where applicable; • Any site machinery will be well maintained and in full working order; • Sand and aggregates will be stored away from sensitive receptors and screened/shielded. Similarly, concrete batching will take place away from receptors.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>In relation to noise, the REAC contained within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) states that the main contractor will develop a noise and vibration management plan, including method statements and any monitoring and reporting protocols that demonstrate that no significant impact will result from their construction works. The method statements will also specify how immediate neighbours will be kept informed of the measures taken to achieve this requirement.</p> <p>The REAC within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) also includes measures relating to the control of construction effects from light pollution, such as: work during hours of darkness being avoided as far as practicable; use of directed lighting where necessary to minimise light pollution/glare; and keeping lighting levels to the minimum necessary for security and safety.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 have been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>In relation to Noise and Vibration, these documents concludeconclude the impacts do notchange the conclusions of the original assessment and do not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.82 of the NPS NN.</u></p> <p><u>With regard to Landscape and Visual, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request does not affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.82 of the NPS NN.</u></p> <p><u>With regard to Air Quality, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.82 of the NPS NN.</u></p> <p><u>Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.83	For nationally significant infrastructure projects of the type covered by this NPS, some impact on amenity for local communities is likely to be unavoidable. Impacts should be kept to a minimum and should be at a level that is acceptable.	The impact of the Scheme on the amenity of local communities is set out in the Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. The assessment reported in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES for Part A and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES for Part B considers local areas of high-quality open spaces, which have been identified within the baseline under 'Effects on Communities' of the chapters.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms that Part A would not have a significant negative impact on the provision and use of both formal and informal open space as the land impacted is not utilised for recreational purposes or designated as formal open space.</p> <p>For Part B Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that there are a number of open and recreational spaces in the area around the Scheme, mainly located in Alnwick (sport clubs, school playing fields, play areas). During construction, traffic management systems and diversion routes would be put in place to maintain access to community facilities and recreational and open spaces. During operation, the impacts on these spaces would be negligible due to the proximity of the Scheme to these spaces.</p> <p>With regard to Population and Health, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.83 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.84 - 5.86	<p>Where the development is subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment, the applicant should assess any likely significant effects on amenity from emissions of odour, dust, steam, smoke and artificial light and describe these in the Environmental Statement. In particular, the assessment provided by the applicant should describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the type and quantity of emissions; • aspects of the development which may give rise to emissions during construction, operation and decommissioning; • remises or locations that may be affected by the emissions; • effects of the emission on identified premises or locations; and • measures to be employed in preventing or mitigating the emissions. <p>The applicant is advised to consult the relevant local planning authority and, where appropriate, the Environment Agency about the scope and methodology of the assessment.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.84 – 5.86, can also be found in response to Para 5.82 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Consultation has taken place with NCC and the Environment Agency and further details can be found in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) and Appendix 6.3: Noise and Airborne Vibration Nuisance Assessment, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 6.3: Noise and Airborne Vibration Nuisance Assessment, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B with regard to scope and methodology of the EIA. The EIA prepared for the Scheme assesses the likely significant effects. There is no potential for odour, smoke and steam resulting from the operation of the Scheme and these are therefore not assessed.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A, Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES for Part A and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES for Part B consider potential construction related effects to sensitive receptors from dust and artificial light. Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 2 of the ES for Part A and Chapter 5: Air Quality, Volume 3 of the ES for Part B concludes that with mitigation, no significant effects from emissions of dust are likely to occur.</p> <p>With regard to Air Quality for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.6 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.84 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B considers the visual receptors which could experience potential adverse impacts during the construction of the Scheme as a result of increase in light pollution from vehicles and artificial lighting at construction compounds at night. Further</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>details can be found in the Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.15)</p> <p>With regard to Landscape, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.86 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>The REAC, which is included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) details the mitigation measures that would be implemented during the construction of the Scheme to address adverse effects during construction from dust and light pollution.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.87	<p>The Secretary of State should be satisfied that all reasonable steps have been taken, and will be taken, to minimise any detrimental impact on amenity from emissions of odour, dust, steam, smoke and artificial light. This includes the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.87, can also be found in response to Para 5.82 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B assesses potential effects from lighting including indirect effects and proposes appropriate mitigation where a potential adverse effect has been identified. No additional lighting columns are proposed along the length of the A1.</p> <p>Along the online section of Part A, and along the route of Part B, at a local level, illumination from car headlights would result in additional light spill due to the widened route, however, in the context of the wider character areas these would not be considered as significant given their scale, and the presence of existing roads in the wider character area generating similar effects. Whilst illumination from vehicle movement would result in light spill into previously un-lit areas of countryside, along the offline section of Part A, within the context of the wider character areas these would not be considered as significant given their scale, in combination with the presence of existing roads within the wider character area generating similar effects, reducing overall magnitude of change. Therefore, there are no significant night time visual effects arising from either Part A or Part B of during operation.</p> <p>Visual receptors could experience potential adverse impacts during the construction of Part A and Part B as a result of increase in light pollution from vehicles and construction compounds at night. The significance of these effects would be mitigated through sensitive layout of site compounds and use of temporary soil mounds to screen views of construction activities and light pollution within the surrounding area.</p> <p>With regard to Landscape, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.87 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
5.88	<p>If development consent is granted for a project, the Secretary of State should consider whether there is a justification for all of the authorised project (including any associated development) being covered by a defence of statutory authority against nuisance claims. If the Secretary of State cannot conclude that this is justified, then the defence should be disapplied, in whole or in part, through a provision in the Development Consent Order.</p>	<p>The draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) contains the defence of statutory authority against nuisance claims. This includes the construction or maintenance of the authorised development and nuisance which is attributable to the carrying out of the authorised development which cannot reasonably be avoided.</p>
5.89	<p>The Secretary of State should ensure the applicant has provided sufficient information to show that any necessary mitigation will be put into place. In particular, the Secretary of State should consider whether to require the applicant to abide by a scheme of management and mitigation concerning emissions of odour, dust, steam, smoke, artificial light from the development to reduce any loss to amenity which might arise during the construction and operation of the development. A construction management plan may help codify mitigation.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.89, can be found in response to Para 5.82 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.91	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 100 to 104) makes clear that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. But where development is necessary, it should be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The guidance supporting the National Planning Policy Framework explains that essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes), which has to cross the area at risk, is permissible in areas of high flood risk, subject to the requirements of the Exception Test.</p>	<p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1 Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A confirms that Part A is classed as Essential Infrastructure under the NPPF. Essential Infrastructure within Flood Zone 3 requires the Sequential Test and Exception Test to be passed before it is considered to be acceptable. Part A is required to improve the A1 between Morpeth and Felton. Improvements are required to improve traffic flow, journey time reliability and safety, amongst other reasons, within this area and there are no reasonable alternatives, as considered in Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1), that could meet these objectives. Part A is therefore deemed to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests in this instance. In terms of the Exception Test, this FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES demonstrates that Part A would remain safe throughout its design life and that flood risk would not be increased elsewhere.</p> <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) has considered the risk from all sources of flooding to and from Part A. The Drainage Strategy Report (see Appendix 10.5, Volume 7 of the ES) outlines how Part A will deal with surface water via combined kerb and drainage units, gullies, filter drains, combined surface and sub-surface drainage, surface water channels and slotted linear drainage channels. Attenuation ponds are proposed at various locations along the length of Part A. The attenuation ponds will capture all the water drained from the catchment. This would reduce the rate of the surface water run-off and the ponds would do this by storing surface water run-off during peak flow (i.e. heavy rainfall) and slowly releasing the water after the peak flow has passed.</p> <p>For Part B, the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) confirms that the majority of the Part B's alignment is located in the low-risk Flood Zone 1 where the risk of flooding from fluvial sources is less than 1 in 1000 (0.1 %) in any year. Part B does however include sections located in close proximity to</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>the medium-risk Flood Zone 2 and the high-risk Flood Zone 3 and encompasses a small area within fluvial flood risk (Flood Zones 2 and 3a) where Denwick Burn crosses the existing A1. Part B is classed as 'Essential Infrastructure' under the NPPF. Essential Infrastructure within Flood Zone 1 does not require the exception test to be met. Given the majority of Part B falls within Flood Zone 1 and the only part within Flood Zone 2 and 3a is where Denwick Burn crosses the existing A1 it is considered that the sequential and exception tests are met.</p> <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) concludes that based on current flood risk understanding and the incorporation of specific flood risk mitigation measures and considerations, Part B would be at an acceptable level of flood risk and would not increase flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>With regard to Road Drainage and Water Environment, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, to the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.91 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.92 - 5.93	<p>Applications for projects in the following locations should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment (FRA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Zones 2 and 3, medium and high probability of river and sea flooding; • Flood Zone 1 (low probability of river and sea flooding) for projects of 1 hectare or greater, projects which may be subject to other sources of flooding (local watercourses, surface water, groundwater or reservoirs), or where the Environment Agency has notified the local planning authority that there are critical drainage problems. <p>This should identify and assess the risks of all forms of flooding to and from the project and demonstrate how these flood risks will be managed, taking climate change into account.</p>	<p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A has considered the risk from all sources of flooding to and from Part A.</p> <p>Part A crosses ten watercourses and associated tributaries and a review of the Environment Agency's Flood Risk from Surface Water map indicates that sections of Part A are at high, medium and low risk of flooding from surface water sources.</p> <p>The majority of the Part A's alignment is located in Flood Zone 1 which has a low risk of flooding from fluvial and coastal sources (an annual probability of less than 1 in 1000). However, Part A does include sections located in Flood Zone 2 which equates to an annual probability of fluvial flooding of between 1 in 1000 and 1 in 100 (0.1-1%) and Flood Zone 3 which equates to an annual probability of fluvial flooding of greater than 1 in 100 (>1%).</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) assesses the potential effects of climate change on Part A. The allowances used in the assessment and design of Part A and taking into account the development's vulnerability are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 % increase in peak river flow for the assessment of risk to Part A's assessment of risk to third parties, design of the watercourse crossings and design of other required mitigation if required; • 50 % increase in peak river flow or the 1000-year peak flow (whichever is greatest) for the residual risk assessments to understand risks to the Scheme and third parties in the event of a more extreme event or uncertainty in climate change predictions. <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B confirms that detailed 1D hydraulic modelling has been undertaken for Denwick Burn and its tributaries, White House Burn, tributaries of Kittycarter Burn, and Shipperton Burn. A hydraulic assessment has been undertaken for the other watercourses and surface water flow paths. The modelling shows that there would be no increase in fluvial flood risk to any upstream or downstream receptors or to Part B.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) has considered the risk from all sources of flooding to and from Part B and demonstrates how the risks will be managed, taking account of climate change.</p> <p>The proposed drainage strategy restricts surface water runoff rates to the existing greenfield runoff values for the equivalent storm event. Highway drainage would be designed to accommodate a 1 in 1 year design flow without surcharging and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). Attenuation controls would be provided for the 1 in 1, 30 and 100 year plus climate change scenarios.</p> <p>During a 1000 year flood event, no watercourse crossing, culvert or surface water flow path overtops the highway crest. Blockage scenarios on the watercourse crossings show that the highway crest is not overtopped when the inlet capacity is reduced. Regular maintenance should ensure that residual flood risk from any watercourse crossing, culvert or surface water flow path is minimal and no further flood risk mitigation measures are considered necessary.</p> <p><u>With regard to Road Drainage and Water Environment, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is not considered to affect compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.92 and 5.93 of the NPS NN. Policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.94	<p>In preparing an FRA the applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consider the risk of all forms of flooding arising from the project (including in adjacent parts of the United Kingdom), in addition to the risk of flooding to the project, and demonstrate how these risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ will be managed and, where relevant, mitigated, so that the development remains safe throughout its lifetime; ○ take the impacts of climate change into account, clearly stating the development lifetime over which the assessment has been made; ○ consider the vulnerability of those using the infrastructure including arrangements for safe access and exit; ○ include the assessment of the remaining (known as 'residual') risk after risk reduction measures have been taken into account and demonstrate that this is acceptable for the particular project; ○ consider if there is a need to remain operational during a worst case flood event over the development's lifetime; 	<p><u>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.94, can also be found in response to Para 5.92 and 5.93 of the NPS NN.</u></p> <p>The overall Scheme is classed as Essential Infrastructure under the NPPF. Essential Infrastructure within Flood Zone 3 requires the Sequential Test and Exception Test to be passed before it is considered to be acceptable (See response to NPS NN paragraph 5.91 above)</p> <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A has considered the risk from all sources of flooding to and from Part A. Management of the increased impermeable area will restrict surface water runoff to greenfield rates and ultimately reduce the discharge rate of surface water into the receiving water bodies. The drainage strategy, contained in the Drainage Strategy Report (see Appendix 10.5 in Volume 7 of the ES), includes SuDS and an allowance of 20% increase in rainfall relating to climate change in accordance with DMRB guidelines.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A assesses the potential effects of climate change. This chapter notes that any proposed mitigation measures would need to make any allowance for climate change within the design. The majority of the Part A's alignment is located in the low-risk Flood Zone 1. However, Part A does include sections located in the medium risk Flood Zone 2 and the high-risk Flood Zone 3.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ provide the evidence for the Secretary of State to apply the Sequential Test and Exception Test, as appropriate. 	<p>Part A crosses ten watercourses and associated tributaries and a review of the Environment Agency's Flood Risk from Surface Water map indicates that sections of Part A are at high, medium and low risk of flooding from surface water sources.</p> <p>The proposed drainage strategy restricts surface water runoff rates to the existing greenfield runoff values for the equivalent storm event. Highway drainage would be designed to accommodate a 1 in 1 year design flow without surcharging and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change). Attenuation controls would be provided for the 1 in 1, 30 and 100 year plus climate change scenarios.</p> <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6,8) for Part B has considered the risk from all sources of flooding to and from Part B. Management of the increased impermeable area will restrict surface water runoff to greenfield rates and ultimately reduce the discharge rate of surface water into the receiving water bodies. The drainage strategy, contained in the Drainage Strategy Report (see Appendix 10.5, Volume 7 of the ES), includes SuDS and an allowance of 20% increase in rainfall relating to climate change in accordance with DMRB guidelines.</p> <p>Part B is located in the low-risk Flood Zone 1. However, within the Order Limits there are two areas located within the medium risk Flood Zone 2, and the high-risk Flood Zone 3. There is one area located to the south within the Part B Order Limits and the identified fluvial flood risk is associated with Denwick Burn. The other area is located to the north within the Part B Order Limits and the identified fluvial flood risk is associated with Shipperton Burn.</p> <p>Part B crosses five watercourses and associated tributaries (listed from south to north): Denwick Burn and its tributaries; White House Burn; two tributaries of Kitty Carter Burn; tributary of Embleton Burn; and Shipperton Burn. A review of the Environment Agency's Flood Risk from Surface Water map indicates that sections of the Part B are at high, medium and low risk of flooding from surface water sources. Existing surface water flow paths have been incorporated into Part B.</p> <p>The drainage strategy contained in the Drainage Strategy Report (see Appendix 10.4, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8)) for Part B restricts surface water runoff rates to the existing greenfield runoff values for the equivalent storm event. Highway drainage would be designed to accommodate a 1 in 1 year design flow without surcharging and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20 % allowance for climate change). Attenuation controls would be provided for the 1 in 1, 30 and 100 year plus climate change scenarios.</p> <p><u>With regard to Road Drainage and Water Environment, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.94 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.96	<p>Applicants for projects which may be affected by, or may add to, flood risk are advised to seek sufficiently early pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency, and, where relevant, other flood risk management bodies such as lead local flood authorities, Internal Drainage Boards, sewerage undertakers, highways authorities and reservoir owners and operators. Such discussions can be used to identify the likelihood and possible extent and nature of the flood risk, to help</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A demonstrates that the Environment Agency has been consulted directly in relation to Part A regarding the drainage designs, flood risk, water quality and potential effects on aquatic habitats. In addition, the Environment Agency has provided recommendations regarding the scope of the environmental assessments and the proposed mitigation measures. These are set out in Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES, the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Appendix 10.2 (Water Framework Directive Assessment) and Appendix 10.3 (Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment) Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>scope the FRA, and identify the information that will be required by the Secretary of State to reach a decision on the application once it has been submitted and examined. If the Environment Agency has concerns about the proposal on flood risk grounds, the applicant is encouraged to discuss these concerns with the Environment Agency and look to agree ways in which the proposal might be amended, or additional information provided, which would satisfy the Environment Agency's concerns, preferably before the application for development consent is submitted.</p>	<p>Consultation has also been undertaken in relation to Part A with NCC as LLFA as set out in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) and within Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A, four meetings in respect of Part A were held with the EA in 2018, at which the following issues were addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of stakeholder requirements and review the available WFD information and agree (in principle) the methodology, appropriate mitigation and management options during both construction and operation; • A review of the methodology, Part A's proposals and proposed mitigation and discussion to address specific areas of concern; • A discussion regarding Part A's proposals for the new River Coquet bridge crossing; • Two meetings to discuss the geomorphological assessment requirements for the new River Coquet bridge crossing. <p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B sets out the details of the discussions that have been with stakeholders on Part B, including the Environment Agency and NCC as the LLFA. Further details on the discussions held can be found in Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8).</p> <p>Areas discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the available flood information; • Agreement (in principle) of appropriate mitigation and management options during the construction and operation phases; • Discussion regarding the results of the hydraulic modelling undertaken and review of the Part B proposals and proposed mitigation; Discussions to address specific areas of concern, in particular the Part B proposals along the tributaries of Kittycarter Burn. • Follow up discussion regarding the sensitivity testing hydraulic model results for the tributaries of Kittycarter Burn and appropriate mitigation measures. <p><u>With regard to Road Drainage and Water Environment, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.96 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.97	For local flood risk (surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourse flooding), local flood risk management strategies and surface water	<u>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.97, can also be found in response to Para 5.91 of the NPS NN.</u>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>management plans provide useful sources of information for consideration in Flood Risk Assessments. Surface water flood issues need to be understood and then account of these issues can be taken, for example flow routes should be clearly identified and managed.</p>	<p>For Part A, The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) summarises the minor watercourses, drainage ditches and identified surface water flow paths crossed by the Scheme a simpler approach has been undertaken which reflects the lower risk associated with these structures. A detailed description of the surface water drainage strategy is provided in Appendix 10.5: Drainage Strategy Report of Volume 3 (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) of the ES.</p> <p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B both confirm that Northumberland's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) has been considered. The LFRMS sets out five local objectives and details a number of measures and an action plan that will be implemented to achieve the objectives. The second objective has been considered relevant to the assessment of flood risk for the Scheme.</p> <p>The five local objectives are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improve knowledge and understanding of flood risk throughout Northumberland. b. Promote sustainable development to reduce local flood risk with consideration to the anticipated impact of climate change. c. Actively manage flood risk and drainage infrastructure to reduce likelihood of flooding throughout Northumberland. d. Encourage communities to become more resilient to flooding by increasing public awareness and understanding their concerns. e. Be better prepared for flood events and post flood recovery. <p>For Part B, the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B summarises the minor watercourses, drainage ditches and identified surface water flow paths crossed by Part B. It also considers whether the culverts are existing or new and for existing culverts provides a summary of their current condition. The Drainage Strategy at Appendix 10.4: Drainage Strategy Report of Volume 8 of the ES goes on to list the control measures embedded in the design to take account of this. These measures are also summarised in Section 5.8 of the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES. Such measures include (not exhaustive);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Runoff from the Part B is discharged into the existing watercourses via grassed detention basins where required; • Allowable runoff rates are restricted to the existing greenfield runoff values for the equivalent storm event; • Highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1 year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20% allowance for climate change); • Attenuation controls would be provided for the 1 in 1, 30 and 100 year events plus climate change. <p><u>With regard to Road Drainage and Water Environment, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.97 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.98	<p>Where flood risk is a factor in determining an application for development consent, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that, where relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the application is supported by an appropriate FRA; the Sequential Test (see the National Planning Policy Framework) has been applied as part of site selection and, if required, the Exception Test (see the National Planning Policy Framework). 	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.98, can be found in response to Para 5.91 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.99	<p>When determining an application, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where (informed by a flood risk assessment, following the Sequential Test and, if required, the Exception Test), it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; and development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and that any residual risk can be safely managed, including by emergency planning; and priority is given to the use of sustainable drainage systems. 	<p>The Scheme's adherence to the requirements of the Exception Test is detailed in the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B. The drainage strategy details the volumes and peak flow rates and demonstrates how they would not increase flood risk elsewhere. The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 and Volume 8 of the ES details the embedded mitigation measures as part of the Scheme to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>A sequential approach has been followed to ensure that the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk. For example, the detention basins are not located in the 1 in 100 year + 25% climate change allowance flood extent.</p> <p>The final CEMP will include an Emergency Response Plan.</p>
5.100	<p>For construction work which has drainage implications, approval for the project's drainage system will form part of any development consent issued by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will therefore need to be satisfied that the proposed drainage system complies with any National Standards published by Ministers under Paragraph 5(1) of Schedule 3 to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. In addition, the development consent order, or any associated planning obligations, will need to make provision for the adoption and maintenance of any Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), including any necessary access rights to property. The Secretary of State, should be satisfied that the most appropriate body is being given the responsibility for maintaining any SuDS, taking into account the nature and security of the infrastructure on the proposed site. The responsible body could include, for example, the applicant, the landowner, the relevant local authority, or another body such as the Internal Drainage Board.</p>	<p>The proposed drainage system complies with National Standards published by Ministers under Paragraph 5(1) of Schedule 3 to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.</p> <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B notes that the drainage scheme has been designed according to national SuDS best practice. The Applicant will be responsible (as necessary) for the maintenance of these features. The requirements of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) are considered sufficient to meet the criteria of NPS NN Paragraph 5.100. For example, written details of the surface and foul water drainage system, reflecting the mitigation measures set out in the REAC contained within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3), including means of pollution control, must be submitted and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority, before works can commence.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.102	<p>The Secretary of State should expect that reasonable steps have been taken to avoid, limit and reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.102, can be found in response to Para 5.91 and 5.94 of the NPS NN.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>infrastructure and others. However, the nature of linear infrastructure means that there will be cases where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upgrades are made to existing infrastructure in an area at risk of flooding; • infrastructure in a flood risk area is being replaced; • infrastructure is being provided to serve a flood risk area; and • infrastructure is being provided connecting two points that are not in flood risk areas, but where the most viable route between the two passes through such an area. 	
5.103	<p>The design of linear infrastructure and the use of embankments in particular, may mean that linear infrastructure can reduce the risk of flooding for the surrounding area. In such cases the Secretary of State should take account of any positive benefit to placing linear infrastructure in a flood risk area.</p>	<p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B considers the risk from all sources of flooding to and from the Scheme and considers opportunities to reduce flood risk. Attenuation ponds are proposed at various locations along the length of the Scheme. The attenuation ponds will capture all the water drained from the catchment. This would reduce the rate of the surface water run-off and the ponds would do this by storing surface water run-off during peak flow (i.e. heavy rainfall) and slowly releasing the water after the peak flow has passed. These measures are set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3).</p>
5.104	<p>Where linear infrastructure has been proposed in a flood risk area, the Secretary of State should expect reasonable mitigation measures to have been made, to ensure that the infrastructure remains functional in the event of predicted flooding.</p>	<p>A review of the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) indicates that the majority of the Part A alignment is located in the low-risk Flood Zone 1. However, Part A does include sections located in the medium risk Flood Zone 2, and the high-risk Flood Zone 3. The identified fluvial flood risk is associated with the following watercourses: River Lyne; Earsdon Burn; Longdike Burn (and the Poxtondean Burn that discharges into the Longdike Burn); and River Coquet. Appropriate mitigation measures (see comments in response to NPS NN para 5.92 - 5.93 above) are proposed in the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A to ensure that the infrastructure remains functional and to prevent increased flood risk elsewhere as a result of Part A.</p> <p>The majority of Part B is located in Flood Zone 1, with the exception being an area within fluvial flood risk (Flood Zones 2 and 3a) where Denwick Burn crosses the existing A1. Appropriate mitigation measures (see comments in response to NPS NN para 5.92 - 5.93 above) are proposed in the FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) to ensure that the infrastructure remains functional and to prevent increased flood risk elsewhere as a result of Part B.</p> <p>The surface water drainage strategy for Parts A and B of the Scheme is summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Runoff would be discharged into the existing watercourses via storage swales/detention basins/tanks, where required; • Highway drainage is designed to accommodate a 1 in 1 year design flow without surcharging; and a 1 in 5 year flow without surface flooding of the running carriageways (with a 20 % allowance for climate change); • Attenuation controls would be provided for the 1 in 1, 30 and 100 year events plus climate change.
5.109	<p>In addition, any project that is classified as 'essential infrastructure' and proposed to be in Flood Zone 3a or b should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; and any project</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms that Part A would be classified as essential infrastructure in accordance with NPPF, as it would provide an important transport link that should remain operational in times of flooding.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>in Zone 3b should result in no net loss of floodplain storage and not impede water flows.</p>	<p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1 of Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) confirms that during a 1000-year flood event, no watercourse crossing, culvert or surface water flow path overtops the highway crest. Blockage scenarios on the watercourse crossings show that the highway crest is not overtopped when the inlet capacity is reduced. Regular maintenance should ensure that residual flood risk from any watercourse crossing, culvert or surface water flow path is minimal and no further flood risk mitigation measures are considered necessary.</p> <p>A review of the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea indicates that the majority of the Part A alignment is located in the low-risk Flood Zone 1. However, Part A does include sections located in the medium risk Flood Zone 2, and the high-risk Flood Zone 3. The identified fluvial flood risk is associated with the following watercourses: River Lyne; Earsdon Burn; Longdike Burn (and the Poxtondean Burn that discharges into the Longdike Burn); and River Coquet.</p> <p>Part A is not at risk of tidal flooding as the tidal limits for the River Coquet is downstream of the 1 km Study Area. The tidal limit for the River Coquet is on the outskirts of Warkworth which is located approximately 9 km to the east of Part A. The lowest elevation along Part A alignment is at the River Coquet which is in a deep valley at approximately 35 m AOD, but the majority of Part A is between 80 to 150 m AOD.</p> <p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that Part B would be classified as essential infrastructure in accordance with NPPF, as it would provide an important transport link that should remain operational in times of flooding. The majority of Part B is located in Flood Zone 1, with the exception being an area within fluvial flood risk (Flood Zones 2 and 3a) where Denwick Burn crosses the existing A1. The FRA (Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) confirms that Part B would remain operational and safe for users in times of flood.</p> <p>The FRA at Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B confirms that during a 1000 year flood event, no watercourse crossing, culvert or surface water flow path overtops the highway crest. Blockage scenarios on the watercourse crossings show that the highway crest is not overtopped when the inlet capacity is reduced, and that regular maintenance should ensure that residual flood risk from any watercourse crossing, culvert or surface water flow path is minimal and no further flood risk mitigation measures are considered necessary.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) details the mitigation measures that would be implemented both during construction and operation of the Scheme, why they are required, who is responsible for delivering them and any ongoing maintenance and monitoring arrangements. They include ensuring that the Scheme would result in no net loss of floodplain storage and would not impede water flows.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>With regard to Road Drainage and Water Environment, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.109 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
<p>5.112 - 5.115</p>	<p>Site layout and surface water drainage systems should cope with events that exceed the design capacity of the system, so that excess water can be safely stored on or conveyed from the site without adverse impacts.</p> <p>The surface water drainage arrangements for any project should be such that the volumes and peak flow rates of surface water leaving the site are no greater than the rates prior to the proposed project, unless specific off-site arrangements are made and result in the same net effect.</p> <p>It may be necessary to provide surface water storage and infiltration to limit and reduce both the peak rate of discharge from the site and the total volume discharged from the site. There may be circumstances where it is appropriate for infiltration attenuation storage to be provided outside the project site, if necessary, through the use of a planning obligation.</p> <p>The sequential approach should be applied to the layout and design of the project. Vulnerable uses should be located on parts of the site at lower probability and residual risk of flooding. Applicants should seek opportunities to use open space for multiple purposes such as amenity, wildlife habitat and flood storage uses. Opportunities can be taken to lower flood risk by improving flow routes, flood storage capacity and using SuDS.</p>	<p>The Scheme is classed as 'Essential Infrastructure' and is partly located within Flood Zone 3. The Sequential Test must therefore be passed before it is considered to be acceptable. The Scheme is required to improve the A1 between Morpeth and Ellingham, Improvements are required to improve traffic flow, journey safety and reliability, amongst other reasons, within this area and there are no reasonable alternatives, as considered in Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1), that could meet these objectives. The Scheme is therefore deemed to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests in this instance.</p> <p>The Drainage Strategy Report at Appendix 10.5, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A details the volumes and peak flow rates and demonstrates how they would not be increased. It also details the SuDS components that have been incorporated into the design.</p> <p>The potential impacts of spillages and routine runoff have been assessed in the Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment at Appendix 10.3, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7). for Part A The assessment demonstrates how Part A will not impact water quality from surface water runoff.</p> <p>As part of the surface water drainage strategy, runoff would be discharged into the existing watercourses via storage swales/detention basins/tanks, where required.</p> <p>For Part B, the FRA (Appendix 10.1, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8)) has been prepared which includes a Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 10.4, Volume 8 of the ES). The drainage strategy details the volumes and peak flow rates and demonstrates how they would not be increased as well as the SUDS components that have been incorporated into design of Part B.</p> <p>Runoff from Part B would be discharged into the existing watercourses via grassed detention basins. The potential impacts of spillages and routine runoff have been assessed in the Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment (Appendix 10.3, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8)). The assessment demonstrates how Part B would not impact water quality from surface water runoff.</p> <p>With regard to Road Drainage and Water Environment for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.112 - 5.115 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.116	<p>The effects of land instability may result in landslides, subsidence or ground heave. Failing to deal with this issue could cause harm to human health, local property and associated infrastructure, and the wider</p>	<p>An assessment of the ground conditions is set out in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B to ensure that the infrastructure remains functional. This Chapter concludes that with suitable mitigation included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>environment. They occur in different circumstances for different reasons and vary in their predictability and in their effect on development.</p>	<p>TR010059/APP/7.3), including the preparation of a document to ensure mitigation measures such as temporary shoring is incorporated into excavations should there be a risk of loose or unstable ground, the impacts will be negligible.</p> <p>Further intrusive ground investigation would be required at the detailed design stage to assess for the presence of shallow workings and inform and enable any grout stabilisation requirements for mitigation of ground instability. Following the completion of ground investigation works the following additional measures will be employed as necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The incorporation of a high strength basal geogrid beneath new earthworks to control settlement in the case of surface movement due to collapse of any unrecorded workings, if required, subject to further detailed assessment as part of the detailed design; • Additional capacity to be designed into the rigid inclusions and load transfer platform / distribution mat combination to further increase its ability to tolerate minor ground movements resulting from shallow working collapse associated with embankments in areas considered to be at risk from collapse, if required, subject to further ground investigation data undertaken to support the detailed design; • If grouting is required, grouting pressure checks to be undertaken when pumping any grout into the ground to monitor whether any anomalies in pressure are noted which could signify that grouting may be reaching areas outside those intended; • Where required, a grout curtain would be installed to restrict the flow of grout beyond the treatment boundaries and inhibit the impact upon any surrounding shaft walls; and • Mine shafts / adits located within the Order Limits of the Scheme would be fenced off for the duration of the works with adequate signage. <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 has been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40). In relation to Geology and Soil, these documents conclude the impacts to not change the original assessment. It is therefore not considered that the change request would affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.116 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.117 – 5.118	<p>Where necessary, land stability should be considered in respect of new development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and supporting planning guidance. Specifically, proposals should be</p>	<p><u>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.117 and 5.118, can also be found in response to Para 5.116 of the NPS NN.</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>appropriate for the location, including preventing unacceptable risks from land instability. If land stability could be an issue, applicants should seek appropriate technical and environmental expert advice to assess the likely consequences of proposed developments on sites where subsidence, landslides and ground compression is known or suspected. Applicants should liaise with the Coal Authority if necessary. A preliminary assessment of ground instability should be carried out at the earliest possible stage before a detailed application for development consent is prepared. Applicants should ensure that any necessary investigations are undertaken to ascertain that their sites are and will remain stable or can be made so as part of the development. The site needs to be assessed in context of surrounding areas where subsidence, landslides and land compression could threaten the development during its anticipated life or damage neighbouring land or property. This could be in the form of a land stability or slope stability risk assessment report.</p>	<p>Appropriate assessment of the ground conditions and conclusions are set out in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B to ensure that the infrastructure remains functional. The Scheme has the potential to impact ground stability and release pollutants into the environment. However, based on the approach set out in these chapters it is not anticipated that policy objectives would be compromised based on the mitigation measures advocating the implementation of best practice measures in line with current UK guidance.</p> <p>An assessment of the risks posed by historic coal mining is provided in the Coal Mining Risk Assessment at Appendix 11.4, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 11.5, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B.</p> <p>With regard to Geology and Soils, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.116 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.117 and 5.118 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.119	<p>Applicants have a range of mechanisms available to mitigate and minimise risks of land instability. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing the principle and layout of new development, for example avoiding mine entries and other hazards. • Ensuring proper design of structures to cope with any movement expected, and other hazards such as mine and/or ground gases; or • Requiring ground improvement techniques, usually involving the removal of poor material and its replacement with suitable inert and stable material. For development on land previously affected by mining activity, this may mean prior extraction of any remaining mineral resource. 	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.119, can also be found in response to Para 5.116 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Ensuring the proper design of structures to cope with any movement expected and making use of ground improvement techniques, where necessary, is a routine part of geotechnical engineering design and is subject to design certification under Volume 4 of DMRB.</p> <p>Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A describes the mitigation measures included to avoid ground collapse and structural damage for Part A and Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) does likewise for Part B.</p> <p>To address ground instability for Part A and Part B, a Risk Assessment Method Statement (RAMS) will be carried out to ensure mitigation measures, such as temporary shoring is incorporated into excavations should there be a risk of loose or unstable ground, would be implemented during the construction stage. The following measures as recommended in Appendix 11.4: Coal Mining Risk Assessment, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 11.6: Coal Mining Risk Assessment, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B will be undertaken to minimise risks associated with ground collapse and ground related structural damage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The incorporation of a high strength basal geogrid beneath new earthworks to control settlement in the case of surface movement due to collapse of any unrecorded workings, if required, subject to further detailed assessment as part of the detailed design.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional capacity to be designed into the rigid inclusions and load transfer platform / distribution mat combination to further increase its ability to tolerate minor ground movements resulting from any shallow working collapse associated with embankments in areas considered to be as risks from collapse, if required subject to further ground investigation data undertaken to support the detailed design. • If grouting is required, grouting pressure checks to be undertaken when pumping any grout into the ground to monitor whether any anomalies in pressure are noted which could signify that grouting may be reaching areas outside those intended. • Where required, a grout curtain would be installed to restrict the flow of grout beyond the treatment boundaries and inhibit the impact upon any surrounding shaft walls. • Mine shafts / adits located within the Order Limits would be fenced off for the duration of the works with adequate signage. <p>With suitable mitigation, it is assessed that the impacts of Part A and Part B on land instability are likely to be a direct, permanent, long term neutral or slight adverse effect (not significant).</p> <p><u>With regard to Geology and Soils, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.116 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.119 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.122 – 5.125	<p>Those elements of the historic environment that hold value to this and future generations because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest are called ‘heritage assets’. Heritage assets may be buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes. The sum of the heritage interests that a heritage asset holds is referred to as its significance.</p> <p>Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. Some heritage assets have a level of significance that justifies official designation. Categories of designated heritage assets are: World Heritage Sites; Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Protected Wreck Sites; Protected Military Remains; Registered Parks and Gardens; and Registered Battlefields; Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets. The absence of designation for such heritage assets does not indicate lower significance.</p> <p>The Secretary of State should also consider the impacts on other non-designated heritage assets (as identified either through the development plan process by local authorities, including ‘local listing’, or through the nationally significant infrastructure project examination and decision-making process) on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merit consideration in that process, even though those assets are of lesser value than designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B assesses the value of heritage assets, including the relevance of setting with regard to specific assets and describes the value of designated and non-designated assets. Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 and Volume 3 of the ES considers the effects, including an assessment of significance, on the assets as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 has been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40). In relation to Cultural Heritage, these documents assess the potential for a change in impacts against the original assessment. During construction there is potential for additional direct adverse impacts on currently unknown below ground heritage assets located within the Order limits during construction. However following the successful implementation of mitigation, the significance of effect would be neutral (not significant) However it is not considered that the change request will affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.122 and 5.125 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.126 – 5.127	<p>Where the development is subject to EIA the applicant should undertake an assessment of any likely significant heritage impacts of the proposed project as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and describe these in the environmental statement. The applicant should describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset’s importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant Historic Environment Record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise.</p> <p>Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, the applicant should include an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.</p>	<p>The Scheme has the potential to disturb known and unknown archaeological remains and the potential to impact the setting of nearby cultural heritage assets. Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B address the value of archaeological assets, including the relevance of setting with regard to specific assets and assesses the potential impact of the Scheme. The level of assessment is proportionate to the importance of each asset and the likely impact of the Scheme, including an assessment of the significance of the impacts on below ground remains, built heritage assets and historic landscapes during the construction and operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>In addition to the Historic Environment Record, a variety of other sources were consulted to establish the baseline for cultural heritage assessments. These include archival materials, historic mapping, reports of previous investigations within the study area, and site visits to assess the conditions and settings of heritage assets.</p> <p>With regard to Cultural Heritage, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.126 and 5.127 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		(Document Reference: 6.38) ; and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
5.128	<p>In determining applications, the Secretary of State should seek to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the proposed development (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset), taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise from:</p> <p>U8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevant information provided with the application and, where applicable, relevant information submitted during examination of the application; • any designation records; • the relevant Historic Environment Record(s), and similar sources of information; • representations made by interested parties during the examination; and • expert advice, where appropriate, and when the need to understand the significance of the heritage asset demands it. 	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.128, can also be found in response to Para 5.126 and 5.127 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B describes the data sources accessed to understand the baseline conditions, and the value and significance of each heritage asset considered.</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B also details the consultation undertaken in relation to cultural heritage, including data requests that have been made to relevant stakeholders and agreed methodology.</p> <p>The Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) provides a summary of responses provided by stakeholders such as Historic England and NCC on heritage matters during statutory consultation</p> <p>With regard to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.128 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.129	<p>In considering the impact of a proposed development on any heritage assets, the Secretary of State should take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset and the value that they hold for this and future generations. This understanding should be used to avoid or minimise conflict between their conservation and any aspect of the proposal.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B reports the assessment of effects on heritage assets. Effects on heritage assets as a result of the Scheme range between slight-adverse to moderate-adverse resulting in effects to both built and natural heritage assets.</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B details the measures proposed to mitigate the significance of effects as far as possible. These measures are listed in the REAC which is included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3).</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>With regards to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.129 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.130	<p>The Secretary of State should take into account the desirability of sustaining and, where appropriate, enhancing the significance of heritage assets, the contribution of their settings and the positive contribution that their conservation can make to sustainable communities - including their economic vitality. The Secretary of State should also take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height; massing, alignment, materials, use and landscaping (for example, screen planting).</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B reports the assessment of likely effects on heritage assets. Effects during the construction range between slight-adverse to moderate adverse resulting effects to both built and natural heritage assessments.</p> <p>Any work undertaken around a designated heritage asset would adhere to the measures contained within the CEMP, to be developed from the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3), to ensure adverse impacts are mitigated. Impacts on built heritage assets during operation would be mitigated through the use of visual screening (landscape planting). With mitigation set out in the Outline CEMP the Scheme is considered to preserve the value of heritage assets.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>With regard to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.130 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.131	<p>When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give great weight to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable, harm or loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II Listed Building or a grade II Registered Park or Garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, grade I and II* Listed Buildings, Registered Battlefields, and grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) reports the assessment of likely significant effects on heritage assets for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) does the same for Part B</p> <p>Effects during construction range between slight-adverse to moderate-adverse resulting in effects to both built and natural heritage assets. The REAC records mitigation measures proposed to mitigate the significance of effects as far as possible. The REAC is included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3).</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms that the operation of Part A would not lead to any significant effects on designated or non-designated heritage assets. Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) likewise confirms that the operation of Part B would not lead to any significant effects on designated or non-designated heritage assets apart from The Grade II Listed Building Dovecote to the east of Heckley Fence Farmhouse with Attached Wall (NHL 1371059) which solely will have a moderate adverse impact.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>A suitable mitigation strategy for any hitherto unknown archaeological remains for the Scheme overall would be devised in consultation with NCC and set out in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), as set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3). Monitoring measures for managing temporary impacts on the setting of heritage assets are also detailed in the Outline CEMP.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>With regard to Cultural Heritage, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.131 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.132	Any harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefit of development, recognising that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the justification that will be needed for any loss.	<p>The impacts of the Scheme on designated heritage assets are assessed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that the benefits of the Scheme, as set out in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1), outweigh the likely adverse impacts on designated heritage assets.</p> <p><u>With regard to Cultural Heritage, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.132 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is based on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.133	Where the proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss or harm, or alternatively that all of the following apply:	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that the Scheme will not result in substantial harm to, or the total loss of significance, of a designated heritage asset.</p> <p><u>With regard to Cultural Heritage, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.133 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use. 	<p>(Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.134	<p>Where the proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A confirms that seven designated assets would be subject to permanent impacts resulting in Less than Substantial Harm (slight adverse (not significant) effects) as a result of Part A. Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B assesses the impacts that Part B would have on designated heritage assets. For the most part these impacts would be minor adverse.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that the benefits of the Scheme, as set out in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1), outweigh the likely adverse impacts on designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Chapters 4 and 5 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) concludes that the Scheme will improve journey times; improve safety; increase resilience; improve connectivity between Morpeth and Ellingham, which is part of the SRN in the North-East region; provide better transport links; and improve opportunities for economic activity. The dualling of the A1 enjoys support at local, regional and national level and is supported in both the Northumberland Economic Strategy 2015 – 2020 and the Northumberland Local Transport Plan. On this basis, the benefits of the Scheme are considered to outweigh on the less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets.</p> <p>With regards to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.134 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.135	<p>Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. The Secretary of State should treat the loss of a building (or other element) that makes a positive contribution to the site's significance either as substantial harm or less than substantial harm, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the elements affected and their contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site.</p>	<p>The Scheme would not result in any effects on any World Heritage Sites or Conservation Areas.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.136	<p>Where the loss of significance of any heritage asset has been justified by the applicant based on the merits of the new development and the significance of the asset in question, the Secretary of State should consider imposing a requirement that the applicant will prevent the loss occurring until the relevant development or part of development has commenced.</p>	<p>The draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) makes provision for the protection of heritage assets to prevent their loss occurring during construction of the Scheme. For example, no part of the authorised development may commence until for that part a written scheme for the investigation (WSI) of areas of archaeological interest, reflecting the relevant mitigation measures set out in the REAC contained within the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority on matters related to its function.</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) confirms that no existing heritage assets will be lost due to Part A. In relation to Part B, Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) confirms that the construction of the Charlton Mires Junction would require the demolition of Charlton Mires Farm, which is judged to be of low importance based on the evidence currently available. A programme of historic building recording would be undertaken post DCO-consent and prior to the demolition of Charlton Mires Farm to ensure it is preserved by record. A Level 3 Survey would be undertaken, in accordance with Historic England's 2016 guide, titled 'Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice'.</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B state that a programme of post DCO consent investigations is set out in the draft Written Scheme of Investigations (WSIs) at Appendix 8.5, and Appendix 8.6, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 8.5, and Appendix 8.6, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B, which will inform a suitable mitigation and monitoring strategy for any unknown archaeological remains. This requirement is presented in the draft WSI, the implementation of which is the subject of a requirement in the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1).</p> <p>With regards to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.136 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.137	<p>Applicants should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that the Scheme would not directly impact on any Conservation Areas or World Heritage Sites. Impacts on the setting of built heritage assets during operation would be mitigated through the use of visual screening (landscape planting).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>With regards to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.137 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.138	Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the Secretary of State should not take its deteriorated state into account in any decision.	There has not been and will be no deliberate neglect or damage by the Applicant on heritage assets.
5.139 – 5.140	<p>A documentary record of our past is not as valuable as retaining the heritage asset and therefore the ability to record evidence of the asset should not be a factor in deciding whether consent should be given.</p> <p>Where the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset's significance is justified, the Secretary of State should require the applicant to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost (wholly or in part). The extent of the requirement should be proportionate to the importance and the impact.</p> <p>Applicants should be required to deposit copies of the reports with the relevant Historic Environment Record. They should also be required to deposit the archive generated in a local museum or other public depository willing to receive it.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B state that a programme of post DCO consent investigations is set out in the draft Written Scheme of Investigations (WSIs) at Appendix 8.5, and Appendix 8.6, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 8.5, and Appendix 8.6, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B, which will inform a suitable mitigation and monitoring strategy for any unknown archaeological remains.</p> <p>A HEDBA (Appendix 8.1, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7), Geophysical Survey (Appendix 8.2, Volume 7 of the ES), and LiDAR Assessment (Appendix 8.3, Volume 7 of the ES) for Part A have indicated the potential for the presence of archaeological assets within the Order Limits. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for post-consent trial trenching is provided in Appendix 8.5, and a separate WSI for archaeological mitigation for an advanced package of works is presented in Appendix 8.6, both contained in Volume 7 of the ES for Part A.</p> <p>If any unknown buried archaeology is perceived to be of international or national importance it may require preservation in situ, whilst those of lesser importance may undergo archive recording, where they are of Regional / County or Local / Borough importance.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation in the form of trial trenching was carried out in support of the assessment reported in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. The evaluation did not identify any archaeological remains in the twelve trial trenches. The geophysical anomalies identified are thought to relate to collections of stones in the topsoil. The bowl-shaped depression was observed to contain a deep colluvium deposit and no evidence for any human activity, so is assumed to be natural glacial feature. Full details of the intrusive investigation are presented in Appendix 8.3: West Linkhall intrusive survey information, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Ref. TR010059/APP/6.8).</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that a programme of post DCO consent investigations is set out in the draft WSI. The draft WSI is contained at Appendix 8.5, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) which will inform a suitable mitigation and monitoring strategy for any unknown archaeological remains. A further draft WSI at Appendix 8.6, Volume 8 of the ES includes for a programme of historic building recording to be undertaken post DCO-consent and prior to the demolition of Charlton Mires Farm to ensure it is preserved by record.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>If any unknown buried archaeology is perceived to be of international or national importance it may require preservation in situ, whilst those of lesser importance may undergo archive recording, where they are of Regional/County or Local / Borough importance.</p> <p>The requirements contained within Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) make provision for the protection and recording of heritage assets and unknown buried archaeology where appropriate for Part A and Part B.</p> <p><u>With regards to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.139 and 5.140 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.142	<p>Where there is a high probability that a development site may include as yet undiscovered heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Secretary of State should consider requirements to ensure that appropriate procedures are in place for the identification and treatment of such assets discovered during construction.</p>	<p>The requirements contained in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) make provision for the protection of heritage assets and unknown buried archaeology where appropriate. The position in relation to the potential for undiscovered heritage assets within Part A and Part B is set out below:</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A also acknowledges that there is a potential for currently unknown below ground archaeological features dating to the Prehistoric to Modern era to be encountered during construction. This potential is supported by the geophysical survey, which has identified 16 areas which contain anomalies of possible archaeological origin. The nature of the anomalies can only be confirmed through archaeological investigation, which is outlined in the draft WSIs at Appendix 8.5 and Appendix 8.6, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7).</p> <p>Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A confirms that pre-application discussions have been carried out with NCC and with Historic England. At these meetings the conclusions of the Historic Environment desk-based assessment were reviewed and approved, and it was concluded that no further assessment work would be required prior to the DCO application.</p> <p>A programme of post-consent archaeological trial trenching for Part B is presented in the draft WSI (Appendix 8.5, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8)). This draft WSI outlines the approach to post-excavation assessment, reporting, dissemination of the results of the work and archiving. This draft WSI has been prepared in consultation with the NCC County Archaeologist. This draft WSI includes a requirement for the production of detailed method statements, which would supersede the draft WSI at Appendix 8.5, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) submitted with the application. Further mitigation work, as recommended by the outcome of the evaluation, would be implemented by the main contractor during construction, in consultation with NCC County Archaeologist and Historic England as appropriate.</p> <p>Pre-application discussions have been held with Historic England's Inspector of Ancient Monuments. For example, following discussions with Historic England, the detention basin within the vicinity of the Prehistoric Burial Mound 420m north-west of</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>East Linkhall was relocated to allow the Scheduled Monument and the field in which it is located to be removed from the Order Limits of Part B. As a result, there is no potential for impacts and effects on the Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>With regards to Cultural Heritage for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.122 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.142 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.144 - 5.146	<p>Where the development is subject to EIA the applicant should undertake an assessment of any likely significant landscape and visual impacts in the environmental impact assessment and describe these in the environmental assessment. A number of guides have been produced to assist in addressing landscape issues. The landscape and visual assessment should include reference to any landscape character assessment and associated studies, as a means of assessing landscape impacts relevant to the proposed project.</p> <p>The applicant's assessment should also take account of any relevant policies based on these assessments in local development documents in England.</p> <p>The applicant's assessment should include any significant effects during construction of the project and/or the significant effects of the completed development and its operation on landscape components and landscape character (including historic landscape characterisation).</p> <p>The assessment should include the visibility and conspicuousness of the project during construction and of the presence and operation of the project and potential impacts on views and visual amenity. This should include any noise and light pollution effects, including on local amenity, tranquillity and nature conservation.</p>	<p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A reports on the methodology, baseline conditions and findings of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA was carried out in accordance with guidance in DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 5, Interim Advice Note (IAN) 135/10 Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment, and the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The LVIA also takes account of local development plan policies in respect of landscape and visual effects. The southern section of Part A is located within Green Belt and the LVIA takes account of national and local planning policies in this regard.</p> <p>The assessment considers both construction phase and operational phase impacts of Part A. The assessment includes a detailed matrix of effects on key receptors including selected viewpoints, residential properties and PRoW.</p> <p>Table 7-21 - Significant Visual Effects on Residential Properties within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A identifies that the assessment of residential views identifies that 30 property locations, or groups of properties, would experience a significant adverse visual effect during the construction phase, this is either a significant visual effect from the property itself, or from the access / egress to the property. Half this number (15) would be subject to a "large" adverse effect.</p> <p>Upon completion of the construction phase, the number of properties, or groups of properties anticipated to be subject to a significant effect would have reduced to 19. This is anticipated to have reduced further in the summer of the Design Year, Year 15 to ten all of which are anticipated to be subject to a significant effect at the lower end of the scale, that being "moderate adverse (significant)".</p> <p>A total of 10 PRoW have been identified as being subject to a significant effect during the construction phase, of these 9 would be at the upper end of the scale and be subject to a large adverse effect. The users of the remaining 6 PRoW would be subject to a moderate adverse effect. Upon completion of the construction phase the users of 5 PRoW would be subject to a significant effect, 4 of these at the upper end of the scale and subject to a large adverse effect. The users of the remaining 5 PRoW would be subject to a moderate adverse effect.</p> <p>Upon the establishment of the mitigation strategy, the number of PRoW, whose users would be subject to a significant effect would reduce, with 3 subject to a significant effect at the lower end of the scale, moderate adverse.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B sets out that the chapter has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), Interim Advice Note (IAN) 135/10 Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment, Guidelines for Landscape</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>and Visual Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) (2013) and Natural England's, An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (October 2014). The LVIA also takes account of local development plan policies in respect of landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>Table 7-22 – Visual Residual Effects on Occupants of Residential Receptors – Construction identifies that the assessment of residential views identifies that 17 property locations, or groups of properties, would experience a significant adverse visual effect during the construction phase, this is either a significant visual effect from the property itself, or from the access / egress to the property. Eight of the properties would be subject to a “large” adverse effect during the construction stage.</p> <p>Table 7-22 - Visual Residual Effects on Occupants of Residential Receptors - Operation within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) identifies that a total of 10 PRoW would be impacted during the construction phase for Part B.</p> <p>The assessment of residential views identifies that the 32 receptors would experience a significant adverse visual effect during the construction phase, this is either a significant visual effect from the property itself, or from the access / egress to the property.</p> <p>At year one, all but one receptor (Receptor 17 - people living in properties with south eastern facing views) would experience a ‘moderate’ or ‘major’ adverse visual effect. By Year Fifteen only two receptors (Receptors 3, 4, 5 & 8 - People living in properties with eastern facing views; and Receptors 6, 7 & 10 - People living in properties with close proximity eastern facing views) would experience a significant adverse visual effect.</p> <p>During construction, Table 7-24 - Significant Effects on Users of Public Rights of Way – Construction within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that 8 of the ten recreational receptors (PRoW users) assessed would experience ‘moderate’ or ‘major’ adverse visual effects. By year fifteen none of the receptors would experience significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The assessment of visual effects carried out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms 1 transport receptor (Receptor 37 - People travelling along main roads) would experience significant adverse effects in construction and at year one with the effect reducing in significance to slight adverse by year fifteen.</p> <p>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.144 and 5.146 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.147-5.148	Any statutory undertaker commissioning or undertaking works in relation to, or so as to affect land in a National Park or Areas of Outstanding	Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3)

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>Natural Beauty, would need to comply with the respective duties in section 11A of the National Parks and Access to Countryside Act 1949 and section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.</p> <p>For significant road widening or the building of new roads in National Parks and the Broads applicants also need to fulfil the requirements set out in Defra's English national parks and the broads: UK government vision and circular 2010 or successor documents. These requirements should also be complied with for significant road widening or the building of new roads in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>	<p>for Part B confirms that the Scheme would have no effect on any National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</p> <p>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.147 and 5.148 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.149	<p>Landscape effects depend on the nature of the existing landscape likely to be affected and nature of the effect likely to occur. Both of these factors need to be considered in judging the impact of a project on landscape. Projects need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints, the aim should be to avoid or minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate.</p>	<p>Much of the southern section of Part A is located in the existing Green Belt as defined in the Northumberland Structure Plan. (July 2008). The existing soft verge also fulfils a function as green infrastructure. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A reports on the design measures that have been taken to minimise harm to the landscape and any additional mitigation required.</p> <p>Mitigation measures would be applied during construction of Part A, in order to reduce the magnitude and duration of impacts. The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3). It includes the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance and retention of existing established vegetation wherever possible, as identified on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan of Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5). The roots of vegetation that enter the construction corridor shall be protected in accordance with BS5837: 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.' • No works, including temporary works such as the creation of topsoil mounds would be carried out within the canopy spread of existing retained trees. • Construction compounds would be laid out such that temporary soil bunds would be utilised to screen views of construction activities and light pollution within the surrounding area. • Upon completion areas used as construction compounds would be returned to their original use. • The construction programme would be kept to the minimum practicable time to reduce the duration of any landscape and visual impacts. Areas would be cleared for construction as close as possible to works commencing and top-soiling, reseeding and planting would be undertaken during the next available season after sections of work are complete. • As far as practicable, plant and material storage areas would be sited so as to avoid landscape and visual impact. • Construction compounds and working areas would be kept tidy (e.g. free of litter and debris) through robust construction compound management. • Work during hours of darkness would be avoided as far as practicable and where necessary directed lighting would be used to minimise light pollution/glare. Lighting levels would be kept to the minimum necessary for security and safety. <p>During the operational phase of Part A, a number of specific mitigation measures relating to landscape have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of some existing landscape features to facilitate the construction of Part A would result in a high magnitude of impact upon the local landscape. The subsequent establishment of the mitigation measures identified within the landscape mitigation masterplan would result in a reduction in the potential for significant landscape effects;

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where replacement of removed planting would be carried out it would be in keeping with the existing landscape, avoiding the extensive use of mass planting of woodland trees (which over time would screen longer views) in order to retain an open, permeable character to the wider landscape; Shrub planting along Part A would be restricted to those areas on either side of culverts and mammal underpasses, in order to encourage usage of the structures by the respective species. This would be extended to include sections of shrub planting on either side of the bridges which cross the mainline in and around the junctions to discourage flight paths of bats too close to vehicle updrafts. <p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B reports on the baseline conditions and the nature of the existing landscape against which landscape effects have been assessed, the design measures that have been taken to minimise harm to the landscape and any additional mitigation required. Examples (not exhaustive) of mitigation measures relevant to landscape and visual issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where appropriate, existing vegetation within the Order Limits of Part B would be retained to reduce potential impacts relating to screening and landscape integration. Where replacement planting is carried out it would be in keeping with the existing landscape. Throughout the extent of the Order Limits of Part B, where existing vegetation has been lost to facilitate the construction of Part B (including vegetation clearance works to accommodate the site compounds), replacement woodland blocks, hedgerows, agricultural land use, and individual trees would be required for the restoration of the land, with the aim of conserving landscape character and associated views. <p>In addition to the embedded mitigation a number of further specific measures required to reduce the significance of landscape or visual effects were identified during the assessment phase of the EIA (refer to Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.6) for Part B. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain existing pedestrian routes as far as reasonably practical with traffic control measures; Surrounding roads and pavements to be maintained free of excessive dust and mud; Compound and demolition areas to be surrounded by hoarding of 2.4 m height; Retain and enhance the existing hedgerow to the west of Rock South Farm access track; Advanced planting near Charlton Mires junction to assist with visual screening for nearby visual receptors. <p>The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) details the mitigation measures that would be implemented both during construction and operation of the Scheme, why they are required, who is responsible for delivering them and any ongoing maintenance and monitoring arrangements.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.149 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums:</u></p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).
5.150 5.151	<p>Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in nationally designated areas. National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Each of these designated areas has specific statutory purposes which help ensure their continued protection and which the Secretary of State has a statutory duty to have regard to in decisions.</p> <p>The Secretary of State should refuse development consent in these areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of consenting, or not consenting it, upon the local economy; • the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and • any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated. <p>There is a strong presumption against any significant road widening or the building of new roads and strategic rail freight interchanges in a National Park, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, unless it can be shown there are compelling reasons for the new or enhanced capacity and with any benefits outweighing the costs very significantly. Planning of the Strategic Road Network should encourage routes that avoid National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.150 and 5.151, can be found in response to Para 5.147 and 5.148 of the NPS NN.
5.152	<p>There is a strong presumption against any significant road widening or the building of new roads and strategic rail freight interchanges in a National Park, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, unless it can be shown there are compelling reasons for the new or enhanced capacity and with any benefits outweighing the costs very significantly. Planning of the Strategic Road Network should encourage</p>	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.152, can be found in response to Para 5.147 and 5.148 of the NPS NN.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	routes that avoid National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	
5.153	Where consent is given in these areas, the Secretary of State should be satisfied that the applicant has ensured that the project will be carried out to high environmental standards and where possible includes measures to enhance other aspects of the environment. Where necessary, the Secretary of State should consider the imposition of appropriate requirements to ensure these standards are delivered.	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.153, can be found in response to Para 5.147 and 5.148 of the NPS NN.
5.154 – 5.155	The duty to have regard to the purposes of nationally designated areas also applies when considering applications for projects outside the boundaries of these areas which may have impacts within them. The aim should be to avoid compromising the purposes of designation and such projects should be designed sensitively given the various siting, operational, and other relevant constraints. This should include projects in England which may have impacts on designated areas in Wales or on National Scenic Areas in Scotland. The fact that a proposed project will be visible from within a designated area should not in itself be a reason for refusing consent.	The information required for the conformance of Para 5.154 and 5.155, can be found in response to Para 5.147 and 5.148 of the NPS NN. The Scheme will not impact on designated areas in Wales or on National Scenic Areas in Scotland.
5.156	Outside nationally designated areas, there are local landscapes that may be highly valued locally and protected by local designation. Where a local development document in England has policies based on landscape character assessment, these should be given particular consideration. However, local landscape designations should not be used in themselves as reasons to refuse consent, as this may unduly restrict acceptable development.	As set out in Chapter 2: The Scheme, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1) the southern extent of Part B is located approximately 15 km north of the northern extent of Part A, meaning that the Parts A and B will impact upon a different set of local landscape areas and receptors. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A confirms that within the Study Area there are a number of 'Areas of High Landscape Value', which is a local plan policy designation. Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES takes these designations into account when considering the sensitivity of landscape character areas affected by Part A. Part A would potentially impact designated landscapes, in the following ways during operation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of High Landscape Value – following construction, Part A would give rise to landscape impacts to those Areas of High Landscape Value, on either side of the River Coquet, due to Part A being an addition to and alteration of an existing feature within the Study Area. • Conservation areas – Part A would not directly impact on the two Conservation areas, recorded at the northern end of the Study Area, located within the settlements of Felton and West Thirston. This is discussed in more detail within Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage, of the ES. • Green Belt – Part A would result in the direct loss of an area of open countryside within an area of Green Belt Extension, through the provision of the offline section of Part A. The physical loss of the land would represent an erosion of the designated area, and there would be a perceptible change in the landscape character, and sense of openness, a key characteristic of Green Belt policy areas. Further discussion on the Green Belt is within the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1). • Statutory Designations - Given the distance of separation between Part A and the Northumberland National Park, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast, no impacts have been identified as arising during the construction phase of Part A on these statutory designations.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B sets out that Part B would potentially impact designated landscapes, in the following ways during operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of High Landscape Value – the former Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Local Plan designated the Kylee Hills and Glendale AHLV, located to the north and west of Part B near Glanton and Brownieside. The former Alnwick District Wide Local Plan designated an AHLV which runs in close proximity to the west of Part B and to the south. No direct landscape effects are anticipated on the AHLV. • Conservation areas – Part B is not identified as directly visually impacting on any Conservation areas; • Statutory Designations – Part B lies approximately 3 km to the west of the Northumberland Coast AONB at its closest point, but Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that due to the lack of intervisibility between the AHLV and Part B no visual receptors have been identified. <p>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.156 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.157	<p>In taking decisions, the Secretary of State should consider whether the project has been designed carefully, taking account of environmental effects on the landscape and siting, operational and other relevant constraints, to avoid adverse effects on landscape or to minimise harm to the landscape, including by reasonable mitigation.</p>	<p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B addresses how the Scheme has been designed to minimise harm to the landscape and the environmental measures provided as part of the Scheme and mitigation proposed.</p> <p>The REAC records mitigation measures proposed to mitigate the significance of landscape and visual effects as far as possible. The REAC is included in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.157 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.158	<p>The Secretary of State will have to judge whether the visual effects on sensitive receptors, such as local residents, and other receptors, such as visitors to the local area, outweigh the benefits of the development. Coastal areas are particularly vulnerable to visual intrusion because of the potential high visibility of development on the foreshore, on the skyline and affecting views along stretches of undeveloped coast, especially those defined as Heritage Coast.</p>	<p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A considers the visual effects of Part A on sensitive receptors, including local residents. This chapter also confirms that Part A is located c.8.5 km to the west of Northumberland’s coastline.</p> <p>It would not be possible to mitigate all significant effects during the construction phase, due to operations that would require vegetation clearance and works to form the new features of Part A, including the off-line section that would give rise to new conspicuous elements within the landscape and/or views from sensitive receptors. In particular, those defined as being of high sensitivity as identified in IAN 135/10 and where relatively modest impacts would give rise to a significant effect (moderate adverse or greater).</p> <p>The assessment of residential views identifies that 30 property locations, or groups of properties, would experience a significant visual effect during the construction phase. This is either a significant visual effect from the property itself, or from the access / egress to the property. Half this number (15) would be subject to a significant effect at the upper end of the scale, that being large adverse (significant).</p> <p>Upon completion of the construction phase, the number of properties, or groups of properties anticipated to be subject to a significant effect would have reduced to 19. This is anticipated to have reduced further to 10 in the summer of the Design Year (2039), Year 15, all of which are anticipated to be subject to a significant adverse effect at the lower end of the scale, that being moderate adverse (significant).</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that a number of properties would experience a significant change to a view or views, considering the location of Part A it is not considered that any of these properties would suffer unduly from negative visual effects such as visual over- dominance, overbearance, or blocking of light, which collectively may affect the overall visual amenity from the residential property. Table 7-21: Significant Visual Effects on Residential Properties within Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A summarises the significance of effect for each sensitive residential receptor assessed.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) considers the visual effects of Part B on sensitive receptors, including local residents. This concludes that there would be significant adverse effects during construction and slight to moderate adverse effects during operation. However, these effects would reduce in significance once planting has established and at year fifteen only two receptors (Receptors 3, 4, 5 & 8 - People living in properties with eastern facing views; and Receptors 6, 7 & 10 - People living in properties with close proximity eastern facing views) would experience a significant adverse visual effect.</p> <p>Whilst Northumberland Coast AONB lies approximately 5 km to the east of Part B, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) scopes effects relating to it out of the assessment, due to the lack of intervisibility between the AONB and Part B.</p> <p>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.158 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.159	<p>Reducing the scale of a project or making changes to its operation can help to avoid or mitigate the visual and landscape effects of a proposed project. However, reducing the scale or otherwise amending the design or changing the operation of a proposed development may result in a significant operational constraint and reduction in function. There may, be exceptional circumstances, where mitigation could have a very significant benefit and warrant a small reduction in scale or function. In these circumstances, the Secretary of State may decide that the benefits of the mitigation to reduce the landscape effects outweigh the marginal loss of scale or function.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.159, can also be found in response to Para 5.157 and 5.158 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>The Scheme is a linear highways project and there is accordingly limited scope to reduce scale.</p> <p>The Scheme design is reflective of the adjacent landform and includes appropriate measures to mitigate potentially harmful effects on views associated with the Scheme. These are set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B, on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5) for Part A and on Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.6) for Part B.</p> <p>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.159 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.160	<p>Adverse landscape and visual effects may be minimised through appropriate siting of infrastructure, design (including choice of materials), and landscaping Schemes, depending on the size and type of proposed project. Materials and designs for infrastructure should always be given careful consideration.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.160, can be found in response to Para 5.157, 5.158 and 5.159 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.161	<p>Depending on the topography of the surrounding terrain and areas of population it may be appropriate to undertake landscaping off site, although if such landscaping was proposed to be consented by the development consent order, it would have to be included within the order limits for that application. For example, filling in gaps in existing tree and hedge lines would mitigate the impact when viewed from a more distant vista.</p>	<p>The Order Limits do not include for off-site landscape mitigation as sufficient mitigation can be delivered within the Scheme. Proposed landscape mitigation is shown on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5) for Part A and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.6) for Part B.</p> <p>With regards to Landscape and Visual for the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.28 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.161 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.164	<p>Green Belts, defined in a development plan, are situated around certain cities and large built-up areas. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the</p>	<p>Part A is located within an area of Green Belt extension, that extends from the south of Part A and around Morpeth, extending to the north immediately beyond the Lindon Hall Golf and Country Club, Burgham Park Golf and Leisure Club to the west of the existing A1 and Earsdon Hill to the east of the existing A1.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. For further information on the purposes and protection of Green Belt see the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Further discussion on the Green Belt is within the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1). The Case for the Scheme considers the extent of potential harm to the Green Belt arising from the construction and operation of Part A and provides a view on whether very special circumstances apply. It concludes that whilst there would be harm to two of the fundamental aims of the Green Belt (openness and protecting the countryside from encroachment), the extent of the harm would be limited. It is concluded that the limited degree of harm identified is considered to be outweighed by the very special circumstances that exist in relation to the need for Part A and the benefits it delivers.</p> <p>Part B does not lie within Green Belt.</p>
<p>5.165 - 5.167</p>	<p>The applicant should identify existing and proposed land uses near the project, any effects of replacing an existing development or use of the site with the proposed project or preventing a development or use on a neighbouring site from continuing. Applicants should also assess any effects of precluding a new development or use proposed in the development plan. The assessment should be proportionate.</p> <p>Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be developed unless the land is surplus to requirements or the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location. Applicants considering proposals which would involve developing such land should have regard to any local authority's assessment of need for such types of land and buildings.</p> <p>During any pre-application discussions with the applicant, the local planning authority should identify any concerns it has about the impacts of the application on land-use, having regard to the development plan and relevant applications, and including, where relevant, whether it agrees with any independent assessment that the land is surplus to requirements. These are also matters that local authorities may wish to include in their Local Impact Report which can be submitted after an application for development consent has been accepted.</p>	<p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B identifies existing land uses in the vicinity of the Scheme and assesses the potential effects of the Scheme on land use and recreation, including new development and uses proposed in the Development Plan.</p> <p>Discussions have taken place with NCC as detailed in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1) and have not identified any concerns about the impacts of the Scheme on land use.</p> <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B states that land take (temporary and permanent) will be required. No land designated as public open space needs to be acquired to facilitate the Scheme.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above, the change request will not impact directly on any areas of existing open or recreational space, therefore it not considered the change request to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.165 and 5.167 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
<p>5.168</p>	<p>Applicants should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification). Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, applicants should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. Applicants should also identify any effects, and seek to minimise impacts, on soil quality, taking into account any mitigation measures proposed. Where possible, developments should be on previously developed (brownfield) sites provided that it is not of high environmental value. For developments on previously developed land, applicants should ensure that they have considered the risk posed by land contamination and how it is proposed to address this.</p>	<p>An Agricultural Land Classification Report is provided at Appendix 11.3, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and the loss of agricultural land is assessed in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A.</p> <p>Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A confirms that no Grade 1 agricultural land will be lost to Part A, and that Part A will require the use of 2.28 hectares of Grade 2 land on a temporary basis, of which 0.69 will be taken permanently for Part A. Following construction, temporary land take areas would be reinstated back to agriculture in line with the Soil Handling Strategy (to be secured through the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3)), although it is acknowledged not all land would be restored to the soil quality prior to construction. A landscape mitigation plan will be produced and will determine where land will be returned to agricultural use.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>For Part A, the breakdown of the grade of soils in agricultural use is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 1 (Excellent quality): No land has been categorised as this grade; • Grade 2 (very good quality): Two small areas of Grade 2 land identified, occupying 2.28 ha, or 1.3%, of the agricultural area of the Order Limits. These are located in the north to the southeast of the River Coquet and in the south on the foot-slopes of Hebron Hill. This land is categorised as best and most versatile (BMV) and is very good quality, capable of producing consistently high yields of a wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops; • Subgrade 3a (good quality): Subgrade 3a soils were mapped across 12.84 ha, or 7.5% of the agricultural area of the Order Limits. This land is also categorised as BMV, of good quality and capable of producing consistently high yields of a narrower range of agricultural crops including cereals, oilseed rape, root crops and/or grass and will be suited to spring cropping. In wetter years the land is likely to be prone to workability and root crop quality issues which may moderate yields and flexibility; • Subgrade 3b (moderate quality): Subgrade 3b is mapped over 111 ha, or 64.7 %, of the agricultural area of the Order Limits. This Subgrade occupies land of moderate quality with limitations imposed by soil wetness and workability. It will be suited to a relatively narrow range of mainly winter sown combinable crops and grassland. In dry years, yields of combinable crops are likely to be good but when wet, cultivations, sowing, maintenance and harvesting are likely to be more variable, increasing costs and decreasing yields. • Grade 4 (poor quality) This grade has been mapped across 44.4ha, or 25.9%, of the agricultural land within the Order Limits. This land is poor quality with severe limitations imposed by soil wetness and workability due to the heavy topsoil texture, slowly permeable and occasionally disturbed subsoils. The land requires intensive artificial underdrainage schemes to be productive and it will be most suited to winter sown combinable crops of oilseed rape and cereals or to grass used for conservation and grazing. Spring arable cropping is unlikely to be feasible in all but the very driest years. • Grade 5 (very poor quality): No land has been categorised as this grade. • Not Surveyed Two small parcels of land measuring 1.12 ha (0.7%) of the Order Limits were not surveyed because of site access. <p>Part B involves the permanent loss of agricultural land that is required for the construction of embankments, additional carriageway and temporary access tracks required to facilitate construction. Part B has been designed to minimise the amount of land take within agricultural areas.</p> <p>An Agricultural Land Classification Report is provided at Appendix 11.4, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B and the loss of agricultural land is assessed in Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. The soils within the Part B Study Area, are classified as Grade 3 agricultural land based on the ALC Provisional Map for the North East Region.</p> <p>The Agricultural Land Classification Report at Appendix 11.4, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B also assesses the need for mitigation measures to minimise the reduction of soil quality within the study area during construction of Part B. As set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3), agricultural soils would be stripped as part of the preparation and construction phases and would be sustainably managed and reused where possible. A suitable soil handling strategy would be developed to help preserve the soil and retain soil functions such as water and carbon storage.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms there is potential for Part B to impact soils and geology, and mobilise contaminants present, however, it outlines mitigation measures in Section 11.9 to ensure the policy objectives are not compromised.</p> <p>The temporary and permanent land take associated with Part B would comprise a total area of approximately 171.97 ha, of which approximately 66.78 ha is currently in agricultural use. The permanent land take associated with Part B would comprise an area of approximately 69.41 ha of which approximately 25.40 ha is in agricultural use. The temporary land take associated with Part B comprises an area of approximately 102.56 ha of which approximately 41.38 ha is in agricultural use.</p> <p>In terms of the breakdown of the grade of soils in agricultural use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No land has been categorised as Grade 1 (excellent quality) agricultural land. • Several small areas of Grade 2 (very good quality) land have been identified, occupying 5.94 hectares, or 8.9%, of the agricultural area of the Order Limits of Part B. • Subgrade 3a (good quality) soils were mapped across 22.98 hectares, or 34.4%, of the agricultural area of the Order Limits of Part B. • Subgrade 3b (moderate quality) soils were mapped across 35.70 hectares, or 53.5%, of the agricultural area of the Order Limits of Part B. • Grade 4 (poor quality) soils were mapped across 2.16 hectares, or 3.2%, of the agricultural area of the Order Limits of Part B. • No land has been categorised as Grade 5 (very poor quality) • An area of land in the vicinity of Charlton Mires measuring 33.15 ha (19.3%) of the Order Limits of Part B was not surveyed because site access was restricted. <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>With regards to Geology and Soils for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.97 above the above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.168 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.169	Applicants should safeguard any mineral resources on the proposed site as far as possible.	<p>Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A considers mining and mineral extraction and concludes shallow worked coal seams and a number of historical mine shafts have been identified within the Order Limits of Part A, which if left untreated could pose a below ground collapse risk if built upon.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>The Coal Mining Risk Assessment in Appendix 11.4, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A includes measures to be implemented during the construction phase to minimise risks associated with ground collapse and ground related structural damage.</p> <p>The nature of Part A is such that it is not considered that it will impact on the integrity of Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA).</p> <p>Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B states that the southernmost extent of Part B northwards up to National Grid Reference (NGR) 419651, 615429 contains a sand and gravel MSA located to the west of the A1 northbound carriageway and to the east of the A1 southbound carriageway. There is also a limestone MSA to the east of the A1 southbound carriageway. From Rock Lodge northwards to the northernmost extent of Part B, there is a sand and gravel MSA to the west of the A1 northbound carriageway and to the east of the A1 southbound carriageway. There is also a limestone MSA to the east of the A1 southbound carriageway. MSAs relating to coal reserves are present throughout Part B wherever coal seams are present.</p> <p>The construction of Part B would result in the sterilisation of mineral resources due to permanent land take. Approximately 33 hectares of mineral resource including sand and gravel, limestone and coal located within MSAs would be affected by permanent land take. 20 hectares of sand and gravel MSA, 7 hectares of limestone MSA and 6 hectares of coal MSA would be affected. This relates to 0.3%, 0.9% and 1% respectively of the total area of each MSA. Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) concludes that the magnitude of change is negligible due to the size of the area due to be sterilised and as such a slight adverse effect on mineral resources (not significant) is predicted.</p> <p>With regards to mineral resources, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.97 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.169 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.170 - 5.171	<p>The general policies controlling development in the countryside apply with equal force in Green Belts but there is, in addition, a general presumption against inappropriate development within them. Such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Applicants should therefore determine whether their proposal, or any part of it, is within an established Green Belt and, if so, whether their proposal may be considered inappropriate development within the meaning of Green Belt policy. Metropolitan Open Land, and land designated as Local Green Space in a local or neighbourhood plan, are subject to the same policies of protection as Green Belt, and inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p>	<p>Much of Part A is located within or adjacent to designated Green Belt as shown on Figure 8.2, Non-Designated Heritage Assets, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5).</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) confirms the policy need for Part A, and Chapter 6 of the Case for the Scheme assesses the conformity of Part A with national and local planning policy. In respect of Green Belt policy, the Case for the Scheme concludes that Part A comprises inappropriate development in the Green Belt, as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>However, the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) concludes that the current Development Plan includes planning policy support for the dualling of the A1, and that this policy is promoted equally and in parallel with Green Belt policy. There is also specific support for the delivery of the 'Scheme' in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan and it is not considered that there is any inherent contradiction between Green Belt policy and Part A.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>Linear infrastructure linking an area near a Green Belt with other locations will often have to pass through Green Belt land. The identification of a policy need for linear infrastructure will take account of the fact that there will be an impact on the Green Belt and as far as possible, of the need to contribute to the achievement of the objectives for the use of land in Green Belts.</p>	<p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) concludes that Part A can demonstrate very special circumstances exist which override the limited harm to the Green Belt, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of government policy and programmes; • Conformity with local development plan policy and allocations for delivery of the transport infrastructure; • Availability of alternatives. <p>Chapter 6 of the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) confirms that the Scheme (of which Part A forms part of) forms part of the Government’s vision and strategic objectives for improving the UK’s transport infrastructure. The Scheme would meet the identified need to provide safe, expeditious and resilient networks that better support social and economic activity; and to provide a transport network that can stimulate and supporting economic growth as set out in the NPS NN. There is a requirement in the Infrastructure Act 2015 for both the Applicant and the SoS to comply with the RIS, which includes the dualling of the A1 between Morpeth and Ellingham as a ‘committed’ scheme. The Scheme is similarly required to fulfil the aims of the Highways England Delivery Plan and the NIDP.</p> <p>The Scheme will also deliver the aims of the existing development plan and will also deliver development plan policies. It is one of the “Key Objectives” of the emerging Northumberland Local Plan. As set out below, this is the only viable means of delivering the dualling of the A1 and fulfilling the planning policy objectives of both the current and emerging development plan. It should also be noted that the designation of the Green Belt to the north of Morpeth was made in parallel with the support for the dualling of the A1, so there is not considered to be an inherent conflict between the two policies that were promoted equally and in parallel in the Northumberland Structure Plan.</p> <p>There is no available route option for the dualling of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton that avoids the Green Belt. As such, Part A can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location.</p> <p>Part B is not within an area of Green Belt.</p>
5.174	<p>The Secretary of State should not grant consent for development on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, unless an assessment has been undertaken either by the local authority or independently, which has shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements, or the Secretary of State determines that the benefits of the project (including need) outweigh the potential loss of such facilities, taking into account any positive proposals made by the applicant to provide new, improved or compensatory land or facilities.</p>	<p>The Scheme does not include proposals to acquire land designated as open space.</p>
5.175	<p>Where networks of green infrastructure have been identified in development plans, they should normally be protected from development, and, where possible, strengthened by or integrated within it. The value of linear infrastructure and its footprint in supporting biodiversity and ecosystems should also be considered when assessing the impact on green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B assesses the value of the Scheme in terms of supporting green infrastructure. The landscape design (see Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5 for Part A and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan, Volume 6 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6/6) for Part B) has incorporated linear and connective habitat throughout to maintain and where possible, improve connectivity of habitats and green infrastructure. This has included, where possible: retention of habitats; reinstatement following potential temporary</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>loss during construction; and compensation for habitats of principal importance. The Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Part A and the Landscape Mitigation Plan for Part B, incorporates ecological mitigation measures to reduce the significance of effects, maintain and improve connectivity along and around the Scheme and to mitigate the effects of fragmentation and displacement.</p> <p>With regards to Biodiversity for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.175 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.176	<p>The decision-maker should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The decision maker should give little weight to the loss of agricultural land in grades 3b, 4 and 5, except in areas (such as uplands) where particular agricultural practices may themselves contribute to the quality and character of the environment or the local economy.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.176, can also be found in response to Para 5.168 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Some loss of agricultural land is necessary to deliver the Scheme (see response to NPS para 5.168 above for areas of agricultural land in each grade lost as a result of the Scheme). Land take adjacent to the existing highway boundary is necessary to facilitate construction of embankments, additional carriageway and access tracks needed to construct the Scheme. However, the Scheme has been designed to minimise the amount of land take within agricultural areas. This has been achieved through online widening, keeping areas of land take for mitigation purposes close to the new carriageway and by undertaking discussions with landowners to highlight preferences with regard to land take areas.</p>
5.177	<p>In considering the impact on maintaining coastal recreation sites and features, the Secretary of State should expect applicants to have taken advantage of opportunities to maintain and enhance access to the coast. In doing so the Secretary of State should consider the implications for development of the creation of a continuous signed and managed route around the coast, as proposed in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.</p>	<p>There are no coastal recreation sites or features impacted by the Scheme.</p>
5.178	<p>When located in the Green Belt national networks infrastructure projects may comprise inappropriate development. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and there is a presumption against it except in very special circumstances. The Secretary of State will need to assess whether there are very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In view of the presumption against inappropriate development, the Secretary of State will attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt, when considering any application for such development.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.178, can be found in response to Para 5.170 and 5.171 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.180	<p>Where green infrastructure is affected, applicants should aim to ensure the functionality and connectivity of the green infrastructure network is</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A confirms that the landscape design for Part A has incorporated linear and connective habitat throughout to maintain and, where</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
	<p>maintained and any necessary works are undertaken, where possible, to mitigate any adverse impact and, where appropriate, to improve that network and other areas of open space, including appropriate access to new coastal access routes, National Trails and other public rights of way.</p>	<p>possible, improve connectivity of habitats and green infrastructure. Connectivity has also been considered within the ecological mitigation plan, informing the design of Part A, such as maintaining passage for fish and mammals through culverts.</p> <p>With regards to Biodiversity for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.180 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A identifies existing land uses in the vicinity of Part A and addresses the potential effects of Part A on green infrastructure including PRowS. Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES shows that 18 bridleways and PRow networks would be “<i>Moderately adversely</i>” affected by Part A.</p> <p>Once Part A is operational, the proposed PRow routes would improve user safety, enhance Access and improve community connectivity to the wider footpath network</p> <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B identifies existing land uses in the vicinity of Part B and addresses the potential effects of Part B on green infrastructure including PRow. Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES demonstrates that Part B aims to accommodate WCH users. WCH provision is proposed over the new Heckley Fence Accommodation Overbridge and new Charlton Mires Junction. Although these facilities are an improvement to the existing cycle and footpath provision, lengthy diversions of existing PRow are required for WCH users to access these.</p> <p>In addition, a number of PRow would be temporarily closed and/or diverted during the construction period resulting in temporary disturbance to PRow users as a result of Part B.</p> <p>With regards to Population and Human Health for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.180 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.181	<p>The Secretary of State should also consider whether mitigation of any adverse effects on green infrastructure or open space is adequately provided for by means of any planning obligations, for example, to provide exchange land and provide for appropriate management and maintenance agreements. Any exchange land should be at least as good in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness, quality and accessibility. Alternatively, where Sections 131 and 132 of the Planning Act 2008 apply, any replacement land provided under those sections will need to conform to the requirements of those sections.</p>	<p>No exchange of land is considered necessary for this Scheme as no acquisition of open space land or land required to mitigate adverse effects on green infrastructure is proposed.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.182	Where a proposed development has an impact on a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA), the Secretary of State should ensure that the applicant has put forward appropriate mitigation measures to safeguard mineral resources.	<p>MSAs are located in the vicinity of Causey Park Bridge (coal), Hebron (sand and gravel) and the northern extent of Part A in the vicinity of West Thirston (coal and sand and gravel). MSAs are illustrated on Figure 11.4: Mineral Safeguarding Areas, Volume 5 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.5).</p> <p>Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A concludes that MSAs are not anticipated to be subject to long-term impacts from Part A. Given the location of the existing highway and the linear nature of Part A it is not considered that Part A will lead to the sterilisation of mineral resource and is compatible with Mineral Safeguarding policies</p> <p>Chapter 11: Geology and Soils, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that 20 hectares of sand and gravel MSA, 7 hectares of limestone MSA and 6 hectares of coal MSA would be affected by Part B. This relates to 0.3%, 0.9% and 1% respectively of the total area of each MSA. The sensitivity of mineral resources within the Order Limits of Part B is high and the magnitude of change is negligible due to the size of the area due to be sterilised. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, slight adverse effect on mineral resources (not significant). To mitigate the impacts of Part B on potential mineral resources located within MSAs in the Order Limits of Part B, consideration would be given to the incorporation of site won materials from these MSAs into Part B where possible.</p> <p>The construction of Part B would result in the sterilisation of mineral resources due to permanent land take. Approximately 33 hectares of mineral resource including sand and gravel, limestone and coal located within MSAs would be affected by permanent land take.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.97 above, the change request is therefore not considered to have a material effect on the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.182 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.184 – 5.185	<p>Public rights of way, National Trails, and other rights of access to land (e.g. open access land) are important recreational facilities for walkers, cyclists and equestrians. Applicants are expected to take appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse effects on coastal access, National Trails, other public rights of way and open access land and, where appropriate, to consider what opportunities there may be to improve access. In considering revisions to an existing right of way consideration needs to be given to the use, character, attractiveness and convenience of the right of way. The Secretary of State should consider whether the mitigation measures put forward by an applicant are acceptable and whether requirements in respect of these measures might be attached to any grant of development consent.</p> <p>Public rights of way can be extinguished under Section 136 of the Act if the Secretary of State is satisfied that an alternative has been or will be provided or is not required.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.184 and 5.185, can also be found in response to Para 5.180 of the NPS NN.</p> <p>The assessment in Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B is informed by a WCH Assessment Report (WCHAR) which considers utilisation of the existing PRoW network. Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 and Volume 3 of the ES also considers the sensitivity of each PRoW affected by the Scheme according to level of use, amenities/facilities served and use by vulnerable travellers, surrounding landscape (rural or urban), specification, barriers, signage and provision of crossings. The sensitivity of PRoW affected by the Scheme varies between low and medium. Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 and Volume 3 of the ES confirms that use of best practice design, with regards to safety of WCH users, would improve the amenity of users of footpaths in the surrounding areas, particularly in those areas where diversions of PRoW are proposed.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>As set out in the response to Para 3.15 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.184 and 5.185 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.186	<p>Excessive noise can have wide-ranging impacts on the quality of human life and health (e.g. owing to annoyance or sleep disturbance), use and enjoyment of areas of value (such as quiet places) and areas with high landscape quality. The Government's policy is set out in the Noise Policy Statement for England. It promotes good health and good quality of life through effective noise management. Similar considerations apply to vibration, which can also cause damage to buildings. In this section, in line with current legislation, references below to "noise" apply equally to assessment of impacts of vibration.</p>	<p>Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) considers the potential noise and vibration effects arising from Part A.</p> <p>The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the British Standards 5228 parts 1 and 2 and DMRB, HD 213/11 which covers the various aspects required by NPS NN paragraph 5.186. The assessment covers daytime and night-time periods.</p> <p>There are residential properties and other noise sensitive receptors located in proximity to the existing A1. These properties currently experience noise, with road traffic dominating.</p> <p>Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) identifies that current Noise Action Plan for major roads (Defra, 2014) identifies two NIAs within the study area for Part A: Northgate Farm and Causey Park, comprising five residential properties in total.</p> <p>The key area of large-scale residential development and noise sensitive receptors is in the Northgate Farm area, at the southern end of Part A. As part of the mitigation, a 70 m long, 3 m high, reflective noise barrier has been specified at the southern end of Part A, immediately east of the A1. This short section of acoustic barrier is anticipated to provide meaningful benefits to residents (i.e. the change in noise is unlikely to be perceived by residents).</p> <p>During the construction phase it is modelled that noise levels above the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) would still be experienced. Where it is possible that significant construction noise levels will be experienced for short durations, working durations would be limited so as to avoid the potential for significant effects, and where exceeding the above durations cannot be avoided, temporary re-housing would be offered to residents.</p> <p>During the operational phase, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) concludes that Part A would in the short-term, Part A is predicted to decrease the number of properties equal to or above the SOAEL which indicates a slight beneficial effect as a result of Part A. This is due to the offline section of the A1 moving away from a number of properties. Overall, Part A has a slight beneficial effect in the short-term and a slight adverse effect in the long-term (mainly due to the number of properties exceeding the LOAEL).</p> <p>Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) considers the potential impacts of Part B on noise and vibration. As with Part A, the assessment for Part has been carried out in accordance with the British Standards 5228 parts 1 and 2 and DMRB, HD 213/11.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>The Study Area for Part B covers the A1 between Alnwick in the south to Ellingham in the north, running through a rural landscape with predominantly agricultural land uses either side of the road. There are relatively few dwellings in close proximity to the A1 and where these do exist, they are typically isolated or grouped in small clusters.</p> <p>Given the predicted construction noise levels presented in Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3), it is likely that, even with best practice mitigation in place, noise levels above the SOAEL would still be experienced. Depending on the duration of exposure to such noise levels, it is therefore also likely that significant adverse effects would remain for the closest receptors to Part B. For such receptors, to reduce potential effects such that they are not significant, it is necessary that Level 2 mitigation as described in Appendix 6.9: Construction Noise and Vibration Mitigation Clauses, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) is implemented in its entirety. This would include, limiting the duration of relevant activities to no more than 10 days/nights in any 15 consecutive days/nights and no more than 40 days/nights in any consecutive six months and the offer of temporary rehousing where these durations need to be exceeded. With these measures in place, no significant residual effects (in terms of the EIA Regulations) are predicted for construction noise.</p> <p>In operation, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) concludes that Part B would result in beneficial effects for receptors, ranging from major to slight, due to the application of Low Noise Surface (apart from bridge decks where Hot Rolled Asphalt would be laid). The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) contains measures to control noise and vibration during construction.</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p><u>As set out in the response to Para 5.82 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.186 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.187	Noise resulting from a proposed development can also have adverse impacts on wildlife and biodiversity. Noise effects of the proposed development on ecological receptors should be assessed in accordance with the Biodiversity and Geological Conservation section of this NPS.	Noise and vibration effects to ecological receptors are assessed and reported in Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration and Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A. Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES concludes that, in terms of impact on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI, in a small area of this site to the east of the new River Coquet Bridge, noise levels in the short-term are predicted to result in a minor adverse magnitude of impact. There are also some very small areas of moderate adverse impact in the short-term. However, in combination these make up a very small percentage of the designated site as a whole. For the majority of the site falling within the Calculation Area the short-term change is predicted to be either negligible decrease or increase in magnitude. The predicted long-term change in noise level follows a similar pattern, with a small area of minor adverse impact, but predominantly a negligible increase or decrease. Therefore, the change in noise level caused by Part A is deemed not significant for the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>Ecology is considered a sensitive receptor that could be affected by changes in the levels of noise and vibration. Impacts on wildlife and biodiversity from noise have been assessed in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES concludes that species present beyond the existing single carriageway boundary will be used to noise associated with the passage of traffic. As there would minimal discernible variation in noise levels in operation as a result of Part B. Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES concludes that impacts on species would be neutral.</p> <p>With regards to the noise impacts of the Scheme on wildlife and biodiversity, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.20 above the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.187 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.189	<p>Where a development is subject to EIA and significant noise impacts are likely to arise from the proposed development, the applicant should include the following in the noise assessment, which should form part of the environment statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a description of the noise sources including likely usage in terms of number of movements, fleet mix and diurnal pattern. For any associated fixed structures, such as ventilation fans for tunnels, information about the noise sources including the identification of any distinctive tonal, impulsive or low frequency characteristics of the noise. • identification of noise sensitive premises and noise sensitive areas that may be affected. • the characteristics of the existing noise environment. • a prediction on how the noise environment will change with the proposed development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the shorter term such as during the construction period; • in the longer term during the operating life of the infrastructure; • at particular times of the day, evening and night as appropriate; • an assessment of the effect of predicted changes in the noise environment on any noise sensitive premises and noise sensitive areas; • measures to be employed in mitigating the effects of noise. Applicants should consider using best available techniques to reduce noise impacts; • the nature and extent of the noise assessment should be proportionate to the likely noise impact. 	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.189, can be found in response to Para 5.186 of the NPS NN.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.190	The potential noise impact elsewhere that is directly associated with the development, such as changes in road and rail traffic movements elsewhere on the national networks, should be considered as appropriate.	There are not expected to be any changes elsewhere on the national networks as a result of construction or operation of the Scheme.
5.191	Operational noise, with respect to human receptors, should be assessed using the principles of the relevant British Standards and other guidance. The prediction of road traffic noise should be based on the method described in Calculation of Road Traffic Noise. For the prediction, assessment and management of construction noise, reference should be made to any relevant British Standards and other guidance which also give examples of mitigation strategies.	<p>The assessment undertaken in Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B uses the relevant British Standards in relation to both construction and operation noise impacts.</p> <p>The impact of the request for changes made at Deadline 4 have been assessed in the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p> <p>With regards to the noise and vibration impacts of the Scheme on human receptors, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.191 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.192	The applicant should consult Natural England with regard to assessment of noise on designated nature conservation sites, protected landscapes, protected species or other wildlife. The results of any noise surveys and predictions may inform the ecological assessment. The seasonality of potentially affected species in nearby sites may also need to be taken into account.	<p>Consultation with Natural England has been undertaken as reported in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 9: Biodiversity, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B. Consultation and engagement with Natural England is also set out in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1). The requested changes do not alter the conclusions of the assessment and monetisation of expected economic, environmental and social benefits associated with the Scheme that has been undertaken in accordance with DfT guidelines and is contained in the Case for the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to the Noise and Vibration impacts of the Scheme on nature conservation and protected landscapes as set out in Para 5.192, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.191 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.193	Developments must be undertaken in accordance with statutory requirements for noise. Due regard must have been given to the relevant sections of the Noise Policy Statement for England, National Planning Policy Framework and the Government's associated planning guidance on noise.	Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B identifies the legislation, policy, regulations, guidance and standards that are relevant to this assessment, including the Noise Policy Statement for England. The chapter also addresses how each relevant national policy has been addressed as part of the Scheme assessment.

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>With regards to Noise and Vibration for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.193 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.191 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.194	<p>The project should demonstrate good design through optimisation of scheme layout to minimise noise emissions and, where possible, the use of landscaping, bunds or noise barriers to reduce noise transmission. The project should also consider the need for the mitigation of impacts elsewhere on the road and rail networks that have been identified as arising from the development, according to Government policy.</p>	<p>Details of the Scheme’s development and alternative options considered are set out in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) and Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives, Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.1).</p> <p>In operation, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR01004/APP/6.3) for Part B concludes that the Scheme would result in beneficial effects for receptors, ranging from major to slight, due to the application of Low Noise Surface (apart from bridge decks where Hot Rolled Asphalt would be laid).</p> <p>There are not expected to be any adaptations required elsewhere on the national networks as a result of construction or operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Details of the consultation undertaken with local residents in nearby properties and the Applicant’s response with regard to the Scheme design are described in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1).</p> <p>The requested changes are not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.194 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.195	<p>The Secretary of State should not grant development consent unless satisfied that the proposals will meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible. 	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.195, can be found in response to Para 5.186 of the NPS NN.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.199	<p>For most national network projects, the relevant Noise Insulation Regulations will apply. These place a duty on and provide powers to the relevant authority to offer noise mitigation through improved sound insulation to dwellings, with associated ventilation to deal with both construction and operational noise. An indication of the likely eligibility for such compensation should be included in the assessment. In extreme cases, the applicant may consider it appropriate to provide noise mitigation through the compulsory acquisition of affected properties in order to gain consent for what might otherwise be unacceptable development. Where mitigation is proposed to be dealt with through compulsory acquisition, such properties would have to be included within the development consent order land in relation to which compulsory acquisition powers are being sought.</p>	<p>Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B covers noise and vibration impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment confirms that, based on the consideration of mitigation and noise level predictions, the Scheme is deemed to be policy compliant and there is no requirement to use compulsory acquisition powers to make the Scheme acceptable. Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 and Volume 3 of the ES confirms that there are no receptors that would be eligible for noise insulation as a result of the Scheme as no properties meet the criteria set out in the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (as amended).</p> <p>With regards to Noise and Vibration for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.191 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.199 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.200	<p>Applicants should consider opportunities to address the noise issues associated with the Important Areas as identified through the noise action planning process.</p>	<p>Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A confirms that the two properties within NIA 10002 are expected to experience lower noise levels as a result of Part A. This is because the route of the A1 is moving approximately 250 m to the west, away from these properties.</p> <p>Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for part B confirms that there are no NIAs falling within the study area. The closest NIA is located at a distance of approximately 3.8 km to the north of the northern study area extents and there would be no impact on it as a result of Part B.</p> <p>With regards to Noise and Vibration, for the reasons set out in the response to Para 5.191, the change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.200 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.203 5.205	<p>Applicants should have regard to the policies set out in local plans, for example, policies on demand management being undertaken at the local level.</p> <p>Applicants should consult the relevant highway authority, and local planning authority, as appropriate, on the assessment of transport impacts. Applicants should consider reasonable opportunities to support other transport modes in developing infrastructure. As part of this, consistent with paragraph 3.19-3.22 above, the applicant should provide evidence that as part of the project they have used reasonable endeavours to address any existing severance issues that act as a barrier to non-motorised users.</p>	<p>Assessments undertaken in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) reviewed the public transport services available and confirmed that there are no significant public transport interchanges in proximity to Part A, although some journeys to access the national rail network will make use of the A1. Part A is unlikely to have a major impact upon transport interchanges.</p> <p>The existing public transport networks mainly run north / south on the A1 and are focused east of the A1 within southeast Northumberland. The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) states that in general, Part A is forecast to significantly reduce the traffic flows along the de-trunked old A1 and reduce delays for the section that is upgraded to dual carriageway. These factors should contribute to improved bus journey times and service reliability through this section.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) also confirms that two meetings have taken place with the local bus service provider, Arriva Bus, to discuss existing and proposed bus routes along and around</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>the A1 between Morpeth and Felton. Overall the proposed creation of a new bus stop at Causey Park will increase the accessibility of the X15 service to the locations where it is most used, and the realignment of the West Moor Junction will reduce journey times through this location as the bus route will no longer require a right turn off the A1.</p> <p>Assessments undertaken and set out in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) reviewed the public transport services available and confirmed that there are no significant public transport interchanges in proximity to Part B, although some journeys to access the national rail network will make use of the A1. Part B is unlikely to have a major impact upon transport interchanges.</p> <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B confirms that the exact location of temporary bus provision during construction would be developed at the detailed design stage in conjunction with the bus operators and NCC in order to mitigate the effects of community severance.</p> <p>Reasonable endeavours have been made to address existing severance issues that act as a barrier to WCH users. For example, a meeting was held with Arriva Bus, the local bus service provider to discuss the bus routes affected by Part B. There are existing bus stops on the A1 at the Charlton Mires junction which are not used by bus passengers and passengers are more often collected at an informal bus stop nearby at the junction of the B6341 and B6347 (outside of Rock Lodge). As part of Part B, the existing stops will be combined into northbound and southbound stops at the current informal stop location on the B6341. Relocating the bus stops will improve the visibility of this stop to users with a bus stop flag to mark the location. Additionally, Part B is forecast to reduce delays which should contribute to improved bus journey times and service reliability.</p> <p>With regards to Population and Health for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.203 and 5.205 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.206	<p>For road and rail developments, if a development is subject to EIA and is likely to have significant environmental impacts arising from impacts on transport networks, the applicant's environmental statement should describe those impacts and mitigating commitments. In all other cases the applicant's assessment should include a proportionate assessment of the transport impacts on other networks as part of the application.</p>	<p>Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B has been prepared for the Scheme) which documents the outcome of the EIA and includes a description of impacts and mitigation using a proportionate approach.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) provides information about the transport assessment undertaken as part of the development of the Scheme. The overall impact of the Scheme on traffic flows and journey times have been derived from traffic models.</p>
5.208	<p>Where appropriate, the applicant should prepare a travel plan including management measures to mitigate transport impacts. The applicant should also provide details of the proposed measures to improve access by public transport and sustainable modes where relevant, to reduce the need for parking associated with the proposal and to mitigate transport impacts.</p>	<p>A travel plan has not been prepared to support the Application due to the nature of the Scheme not being a generator of additional traffic in itself, but is re-distributing existing and future traffic flows.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
5.209	For schemes impacting on the Strategic Road Network, applicants should have regard to DfT Circular 02/2013. The Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development (or prevailing policy) which sets out the way in which the highway authority for the Strategic Road Network, will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth, whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the Strategic Road Network.	<p>An extensive programme of statutory and non-statutory public consultations has been carried out, as set out in the Consultation Report (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/5.1).</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with NCC as the relevant Highway Authority. The Scheme design has taken account of both the existing Development Plan and also the emerging Northumberland Local Plan in the forecast modelling which is compliant with the principles of DfT 02/2013.</p> <p>The Scheme is consistent with the Northumberland Economic Plan 2015 – 2020 and also has planning policy support in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan.</p>
5.210	If new transport infrastructure is proposed, applicants should discuss with network providers the possibility of co-funding by Government for any third-party benefits. Guidance has been issued in England which explains the circumstances where this may be possible. The Government cannot guarantee in advance that funding will be available for any given uncommitted scheme at any specified time, and cannot provide financial support to a scheme that solely mitigates the impacts of a specific development. Any decisions on co-funded transport infrastructure will need to be taken in the context of the Government's wider policy of transport improvements.	Third party funding is not required as the Scheme has funding committed through the Government's RIS. Funding sources are described in the Funding Statement (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/4.2) .
5.211	The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State should give due consideration to impacts on local transport networks and policies set out in local plans, for example, policies on demand management being undertaken at the local level.	Where relevant, analysis has been included in this document and is provided in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) . The Northumberland Local Transport Plan and the Economic Strategy of the Northumberland Local Transport Plan both support the dualling of the A1 in Northumberland.
5.212	Schemes should be developed, and options considered in the light of relevant local policies and local plans, taking into account local models where appropriate, however the Scheme must be decided in accordance with the NPS except to the extent that one or more of sub-sections 104(4) to 104(8) of the Planning Act 2008 applies.	The consideration of policies as set out in local plans is provided in the Case for the Scheme (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.1) .
5.216	Where development would worsen accessibility, such impacts should be mitigated so far as reasonably possible. There is a very strong expectation that impacts on accessibility for non-motorised users should be mitigated.	<p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A states that Part A aims to accommodate WCHs, and either retain or improve access arrangements to both residential and commercial properties and community facilities.</p> <p>For Part A the following measures are incorporated in the design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed footways at the three new junctions link into the existing side roads. Pedestrians are accommodated by footpaths immediately to each side of the proposed junctions and across the new bridges. This increases linkages and provides safer pedestrian access across the A1; • The proposed Causey Park overbridge would be designed to safely carry both pedestrians and vehicular traffic; • The proposed Burgham Underbridge would be designed with access for pedestrians using hardened verges, and vehicular traffic, with clear visibility for all users; A new segregated 3 m wide footway / cycleway would be provided

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>along the length of the eastern side of the proposed link road, between the de-trunked A1 and Felton Road. This improves access and safety for cyclists alongside the A1;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of best practice design with regards to the safety of WCHs would improve the amenity of users of the footpaths in the surrounding areas. Additionally, landscape planting that can provide screening of the road where possible and reduce noise level for the wider network of PRoW would also improve amenity for users. <p>Chapter 12: Population and Human Health, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B states that Part B aims to accommodate WCHs, and either retain or improve access arrangements to both residential and commercial properties and community facilities. WCH provision is proposed over the new Heckley Fence Accommodation Overbridge and new Charlton Mires Junction. Although these facilities are an improvement to the existing cycle and footpath provision, lengthy diversions of existing PRoW are required for WCH users to access these.</p> <p>A number of PRoW would be temporarily closed during the construction period resulting in temporary disturbance to PRoW users as a result of Part B. Temporary effects would be mitigated as far as reasonably possible through appropriate temporary diversions, as set out in the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3).</p> <p><u>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference:APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p> <p>The design for Part B also includes the following elements which are considered to be beneficial for WCH users:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A footway to facilitate safe pedestrian access across Charlton Mires Junction would be provided. As outlined in Table 12-39 the footway would link the diverted Footpath 129/004, to the east of Part B, extend across the A1 and along the improved B6341, to the west of Part B, to approximately Rock Lodge. • A footway to facilitate safe pedestrian access across the proposed Heckley Fence Accommodation Overbridge would be provided. As outlined in Table 12-39, the footway would link to the diverted PRoW 110/004, to the east of Part B across the A1 to PRoW 129/023. • Use of best practice design with regards to the safety of WCHs would improve the amenity of users of the footpaths in the surrounding areas. Additionally, landscape planting would provide screening of the road. <p><u>With regards to Population and Health for the reasons set out in the response to Para 3.15 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.216 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</u></p>
5.220	Where applicable, an application for a development consent order has to contain a plan with accompanying information identifying water bodies in a River Basin Management Plan.	Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment of Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment of Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B identify a number of water receptors present within the study area for the Scheme. A figure identifying them can be found on Figure 10.1: Water Constraints Plan, Volume 2 of

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) and Figure 10.1: Water Constraints Plan, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3).</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.220 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.221	<p>Applicants should make early contact with the relevant regulators, including the Environment Agency, for abstraction licensing and with water supply companies likely to supply the water. Where a development is subject to EIA and the development is likely to have significant adverse effects on the water environment, the applicant should ascertain the existing status of, and carry out an assessment of the impacts of the proposed project on water quality, water resources and physical characteristics as part of the environmental statement.</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B describes consultation carried out with the Environment Agency and appropriate stakeholders (including NCC as the LLFA). The chapter confirms that meetings have taken place with the Environment Agency and it is anticipated that it will be possible to secure an abstraction license and reach agreement with water supply companies likely to supply the water. No significant adverse impacts on the water environment are predicted from the Scheme.</p> <p>The change request has been the subject of a consultation with statutory consultees, including the Environment Agency, as set out in the Consultation Statement submitted at Deadline 4 of the Examination (Document Reference: 7.20). The change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.221 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.222	<p>For those projects that are improvements to the existing infrastructure, such as road widening, opportunities should be taken, where feasible, to improve upon the quality of existing discharges where these are identified and shown to contribute towards Water Framework Directive commitments.</p>	<p>The mitigation described in detail in Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B concludes that for both Part A and Part B “<i>is compliant with WFD Objectives</i>” which is made on the following basis:</p> <p>A Highways Agency [now Highways England] Water Risk Assessment Tool (HAWRAT) Assessment for Part A can be found at Appendix 10.3, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7). The document confirms that: “<i>The existing highway drainage infrastructure that currently serves the A1 is thought to have a number of defects across the system. It is not considered feasible to re-use the existing drainage infrastructure as part of the Scheme.</i>” The HAWRAT Assessment confirms that it is therefore proposed “<i>to install a new surface water drainage system to ensure that the Scheme does not increase flood risk to the Scheme and to people and places elsewhere and provides appropriate treatment.</i>”</p> <p>An assessment of the quality of waters, existing water resources affected by Part B and impacts of Part B on water resources is provided in the HAWRAT: Appendix 10.3 and Water Framework Directive Assessment: Appendix 10.2, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8). The Water Framework Directive Assessment: Appendix 10.2, Volume 8 of the ES also considers the impacts of Part B on water bodies or protected areas under the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the response to Para 4.43 above, the change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.222 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>(Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.223	<p>Any environmental statement should describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the existing quality of waters affected by the proposed project; existing water resources affected by the proposed project and the impacts of the proposed project on water resources; existing physical characteristics of the water environment (including quantity and dynamics of flow) affected by the proposed project, and any impact of physical modifications to these characteristics; any impacts of the proposed project on water bodies or protected areas under the Water Framework Directive and source protection zones (SPZs) around potable groundwater abstractions; and any cumulative effects. 	<p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A describes the existing water environment. This chapter identifies the existing quality of water affected by Part A, and the impacts of Part A on water resources.</p> <p>The nearest Zone One SPZ is located approximately 1.3 km to the east of Part A from Cotting Burn, and there are no piling works proposed within the Zone Three SPZ within the Study Area. The effect during the construction phase arising from pollution risks are identified in Table 10.12, Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) including on the Zone One SPZ and groundwater resources generally and are categorised as “neutral”.</p> <p>An assessment of the quality of waters, existing water resources affected by Part B and impacts of Part B on water resources is provided in the HAWRAT: Appendix 10.3 and Water Framework Directive Assessment: Appendix 10.2, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8). The Water Framework Directive Assessment: Appendix 10.2, Volume 8 of the ES also considers the impacts of Part B on water bodies or protected areas under the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) for Part B describes the existing physical characteristics of the water environment. The chapter also confirms there are no SPZs located within the Study Area for Part B.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement and the addenda comply with the requirements of Para 5.223 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.224	<p>Activities that discharge to the water environment are subject to pollution control. The considerations set out in paragraphs 4.48-4.56 on the interface between planning and pollution control therefore apply. These considerations will also apply in an analogous way to the abstraction licensing regime regulating activities that take water from the water environment, and to the control regimes relating to works to, and structures in, on, or under a controlled water.</p>	<p>The Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.3) provides details of the various consents that may be required as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>At this point (i.e. the submission of the application) the majority of consents and all of the powers required have been included, or addressed, within the DCO as permitted by various provisions of the 2008 Act. However, not all consents/permits/licenses required to deliver the Scheme are included and the following (inter alia) may be sought out with the DCO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Water abstraction license; Environmental Permits relating to Flood Risk Activities; Ordinary watercourse consent; Trade effluent consent.
5.225	<p>The Secretary of State will generally need to give impacts on the water environment more weight where a project would have adverse effects on the achievement of the environmental objectives established under the Water Framework Directive.</p>	<p>A WFD Assessment has been undertaken and can be found at Appendix 10.2, Volume 7 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.7) for Part A and Appendix 10.2, Volume 8 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.8) for Part B. The assessment does not identify any adverse impacts on the achievement of the environmental objectives established under the Water Framework Directive.</p>

NPS NN Paragraph Number	Requirement of the NPS NN	Compliance with the NPS NN
		<p>The change request is not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.225 of the NPS NN. The WFD assessment concludes that the proposed Stabilisation Works and Southern Access Works will not result in water body element degradation and therefore water body status degradation. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.226	<p>The Secretary of State should be satisfied that a proposal has had regard to the River Basin Management Plans and the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (including Article 4.7) and its daughter directives, including those on priority substances and groundwater. The specific objectives for particular river basins are set out in River Basin Management Plans. In terms of Water Framework Directive compliance, the overall aim of projects should be no deterioration of ecological status in watercourses, ensuring that Article 4.7 of the Water Framework Directive Regulations does not need to be applied.</p>	<p>The information required for the conformance of Para 5.226, can be found in response to Para 5.225 of the NPS NN.</p>
5.227	<p>The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State should consider proposals put forward by the applicant to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment and whether appropriate requirements should be attached to any development consent and/or planning obligations. If the Environment Agency continues to have concerns and objects to the grant of development consent on the grounds of impacts on water quality/resources, the Secretary of State can grant consent, but will need to be satisfied before deciding whether or not to do so that all reasonable steps have been taken by the applicant and the Environment Agency to try to resolve the concerns, and that the Environment Agency is satisfied with the outcome.</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 2 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.2) for Part A and Chapter 10: Road Drainage and the Water Environment, Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/6.3) describes consultation carried out with the Environment Agency and appropriate stakeholders (including NCC as LLFA). Requirements are set out in the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1) to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment and planning obligations are not considered necessary.</p> <p>In response to Para 4.43 it was established as a result of earthworks it will also cause a slight non-significant adverse effect on local hydrology, specifically cohesive alluvium, glaciofluvial sand and gravel, sandstone and limestone bedrock. The change request is therefore not considered to affect the compliance of the Scheme with Para 5.227 of the NPS NN. The policy conformance of the statement is reliant on the mitigation measures defined in the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>
5.229	<p>The Secretary of State should consider whether the mitigation measures put forward by the applicant which are needed for operation and construction (and which are over and above any which may form part of the project application) are acceptable. A construction management plan may help codify mitigation.</p>	<p>The Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/7.3) sets out the mitigation measures that are proposed for the Scheme. The submission and agreement of a detailed CEMP with the local planning authority is a requirement of the draft DCO (Application Document Reference: TR010059/APP/3.1).</p> <p>As stated in accordance with Para 3.2 of this table, following the approval of the design changes, the Outline CEMP (Application Document Reference: APP-346) will be updated to contain all of the mitigation measures defined by the REAC from each of the following ES Addendums: Earthworks Amendments for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.36) ES Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.38); and ES Addendum: Southern Access Works for Change Request (Document Reference: 6.40).</p>