



**Application by Highways England for the A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham  
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)  
Issued on 19 March 2021.**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) second round of written questions and requests for information – ExQ2. Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as **Annex C** to the Rule 6 letter of 19 November 2020. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with an alphabetical code and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on general matters is identified as GEN.2.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [A1inNorthumberland@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:A1inNorthumberland@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'A1 in Northumberland' in the subject line of your email.

**Responses are due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021.**



**Abbreviations used:**

<b>ARN</b>	Affected Road Network	<b>NCC</b>	Northumberland County Council
<b>Art</b>	Article	<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>NNNPS</b>	National Networks National Policy Statement
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>CEMP</b>	Construction Environmental Management Plan	<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft DCO	<b>PRoW</b>	Public Right of Way
<b>DMRB</b>	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges	<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency	<b>REAC</b>	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	<b>RIS</b>	Road Investment Strategy
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>Sch.</b>	Schedule
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>SoCG</b>	Statement of Common Ground
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SoR</b>	Statement of Reasons
<b>HRA</b>	Habitats Regulations Assessment	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>HEMP</b>	Handover Environmental Management Plan	<b>SPA</b>	Special Protection Area
<b>IP(s)</b>	Interested Party (Parties)	<b>TP</b>	Temporary Possession
<b>LEMP</b>	Landscape and Environmental Management Plan	<b>TRA</b>	Traffic Reliability Area
<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report	<b>WCH</b>	Walkers, cyclists and horse riders
<b>LWS</b>	Local Wildlife Site	<b>WSI</b>	Written Scheme of Investigation
<b>MoU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding		



### **The Examination Library**

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010059/TR010059-000838-A1%20Northumberland%20Examination%20Library%20Morpeth%20to%20Ellingham.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

### **Citation of Questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg GEN.2.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



## Contents

GENERAL QUESTIONS	5
AIR QUALITY AND EMISSIONS	8
BIODIVERSITY AND HABITATS REGULATION ASSESSMENTS	9
CARBON EMISSIONS	12
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION/TEMPORARY POSSESSION	12
DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER	13
GEOLOGY AND SOILS	16
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	17
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL	17
MATERIAL RESOURCES	22
NOISE AND VIBRATION	22
POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH	23
TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT	26
WATER ENVIRONMENT	27

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>GENERAL QUESTIONS</b>		
GEN.2.1	Applicant	Certain sections of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) have been recently updated or updated following the preparation of the some of the documents that accompany the application. Paragraph 3.4 of Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Hearings – ISH2 [REP4-025] states that appropriate parts of the DMRB that are relevant are extracted from the DMRB and appended to the Outline CEMP at D4. The Applicant is asked to provide a full list of the sections of the DMRB that have been superseded since the preparation of the documents in support of the application and to append this to the next version of the outline CEMP.
GEN.2.2	Applicant	Are there any changes to Government Policy or Guidance, resulting from the United Kingdom's departure from the European Union which have implications for the Application?
GEN.2.3	Applicant	At Deadline 1 the Applicant submitted a revised version of the Denwick Burn Culvert Structural DCO Drawing [REP1-004]. The key indicates that the revision reflects amendments in response to relevant representation. The Applicant is asked to confirm to which relevant representation this relates.
GEN.2.4	Applicant	The Applicant's response to GEN.1.21 [REP1-032] indicated that the outline CEMP [APP-346] requires a Landscape Management Plan to be implemented once the scheme is operational. Why is there not a requirement to produce a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan prior to construction?
GEN.2.5	Applicant	The Applicant's response to GEN.1.35 [REP1-032] indicated that Appendix GEN.4 [REP1-036] provides justification for the significant residual adverse effects shown in Chapter 5 to Chapter 17 [APP-040 to 062] of the ES and confirms that no further measures can be introduced. Have the potential measures been discussed with individual receptors and/ or IPs? If not, why not?
GEN.2.6	Applicant	In commenting on D1 submissions, NCC stated [REP2-025] in respect of Appendix GEN.4 [REP1-036] that it did not agree that there are no opportunities to improve mitigation for residents and road users at West Moor; and believed that this can be achieved without

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>blocking open views looking north from properties via planting in the area marked for topsoil storage to the west of the proposed junction. The Applicant responded [REP3-024] stating that should this additional block of woodland be provided, it was concerned that there would be an adverse effect on R35 as a result of the loss of the open aspect, currently afforded to views from the north facing elevation, and it was for this reason that the Applicant does not consider such provision to be appropriate.</p> <p>Has the Applicant discussed this with the individual receptor? If not, why not?</p>
GEN.2.7	NCC	<p>At D2 the Applicant submitted an update to the Rights of Way and Access Plan [REP2-003]. This was updated to address comments made by NCC at D1.</p> <p>What are NCC's comments on the updated plan?</p>
GEN.2.8	Millhouse Developments	<p>The submission by YoungsRPS on behalf of Millhouse Developments [REP2-027] included the statement that "the initial proposals put forward by the Highways Agency (sic) made no access provisions for any purpose to the land that is owned by our client but not required for the dualling works to the A1. A contrived access arrangement is now proposed through neighbouring land which is to be restricted for agricultural use only. This is inadequate for our clients purposes, particularly in view of the currently unrestricted access to their site from the A1 and the historic planning consent for 'Roadside service incorporating petrol filling station and shop' (reference CM/00/D/337 and CM/04/D.550)." The Applicant responded to this representation at D3 [REP3-024] and NCC also commented [REP3-029]. Further comments were provided in the Applicant's Response to D3 Submissions [REP4-024].</p> <p>Millhouse Developments is asked to respond to those comments.</p>
GEN.2.9	Applicant	<p>The Applicant confirmed [REP1-032] that at Lionheart Enterprise Park, they would require a smaller temporary land take than was assessed in the ES. The required area would occupy approximately 40,000m<sup>2</sup>. As set out in the Applicant's Comments on the LIR [REP3-025] this aspect was discussed with the landowner on 08/12/2020, when it was confirmed that it would be possible to reduce the scheme compound area so that there is no hindrance to the implementation of the landowner's recent planning permission. The Applicant considers that it is not anticipated that the scheme would impact on the wider policy aspiration for commercial development in this area as it is likely that the scheme would be completed before the land is required for commercial development.</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The Applicant is asked to explain how these matters can be secured through the DCO.
GEN.2.10	Applicant	<p>The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions relating to ISH2 (page 18) [REP4-025] states that the HE Design Panel was focused was on the Coquet Bridge and expressed the view that the new bridge should marry in with the existing structure as far as possible whilst taking on board the latest design requirements and looking to improve on operational safety. With regard to the rest of the scheme the Design Panel was content for this to be designed by the experts in delivering such schemes with the confines of the DMRB guidance. Appendix E – Bridge Design Philosophy [REP4-030] describes an early meeting with the HE Design Panel in 2015 which considered the scheme as a whole.</p> <p>Did the Design Panel consider Part A and Part B? The Applicant is asked to provide evidence of the Design Panel's deliberations about the Proposed Development.</p>
GEN.2.11	NCC	<p>In responding to NCC's Comments on D1 Submissions [REP2-025], in particular in respect of REP1-023, the Applicant stated [REP3-024] that: "The Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024] states that plant stock will be planted using a combination of whips and transplants which NCC does not agree with. The Applicant has therefore updated the Outline CEMP to include provision (refer to S-L5 in Table 3-1 - REACs: The Scheme) for the inclusion of standard and feathered trees within the detailed landscape design and is submitted at D3."</p> <p>Is NCC content with this proposed change?</p>
GEN.2.12	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 3.1.4 of the outline CEMP [REP4-013] states that each commitment contains a cross-reference to the relevant ES Chapter (and paragraph number) from which it derives and that proposed mitigation measures can also be searched for within the REAC tables for ease of navigation</p> <p>Are all Design and Mitigation Measures and their Delivery Mechanisms within the ES transferred to the outline CEMP? For example, DM001 in Table 9.23 of the ES [APP-048] is not readily apparent in the outline CEMP.</p>
GEN.2.13	Applicant	<p>The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Hearings [REP4-025] in respect of ISH2 outlined the approach to aesthetics with further details on the design of structures for the scheme provided as Appendix E: Bridge Design Philosophy [REP4-030].</p> <p>Why did the original application not include a design statement?</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
GEN.2.14	Applicant	Throughout the Examination the Applicant has provided SoCG in line with the Rule 6 Letter request. For clarity, the Applicant is asked that in future iterations, matters agreed, matters not agreed and matters subject to on-going discussion are clearly identified and the summary position recorded in the Statement of Commonality for SoCG.
<b>AIR QUALITY AND EMISSIONS</b>		
AQ.2.1	Applicant	Paragraph 5.8.19 of the ES for Part A [APP-040] and paragraph 5.8.12 of the ES for Part B [APP-041] both state that, at a regional level, the Proposed Development would increase emissions of all pollutants due to the increase in vehicle-km travelled, as it would have a greater effect than the improvements in traffic flows brought about by the scheme. How does this assist in the delivery of the objectives of the Environment Act and UK Air Quality Strategy?
AQ.2.2	NCC	Is NCC content that the Proposed Development will not significantly increase the levels of air pollution within the wider area by increasing the number of vehicles?
		<b>PART A</b>
AQ.2.3	Applicant	NE's Written Representation [REP2-029] confirms that the issue of the approach to air quality impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI remains unresolved. Both NE and the Applicant are asked to provide an update on discussions on the matter and an indication of how matters can be successfully resolved.
AQ.2.4	Applicant	Paragraph 5.6.3 of the ES [APP-040] refers to criteria being applied to only those road links that lie within the Traffic Reliability Area (TRA), in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 Air Quality. Can the Applicant provide more detail regarding what makes up a TRA and how it has influenced the determination of the Affected Road Network (ARN)? Can the Applicant also confirm the status of the DMRB guidance to which paragraph 5.6.3 refers?
AQ.2.5	Applicant	A significant number of sites included in Table 5-12 of the ES [APP-040] present values in excess of the critical level (30 µg/m <sup>3</sup> ) or lower critical load for the most sensitive features.



**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		How would the Proposed Development minimise or improve pollutant concentrations?
AQ.2.6	Applicant	Table 5-15 of the ES [APP-040] Summary of Notable Impacts on Annual NO <sub>x</sub> Concentrations (µg/m <sup>3</sup> ) for 2023 at Ecological Sites appears to indicate that in all but one of the sites previously identified there will be an increase in the Annual NO <sub>x</sub> Concentrations in the Do-something scenario when compared to the Do-minimum. Can the Applicant explain the reason for this increase and why it is predicted?
AQ.2.7	Applicant	Paragraph 5.7.21 of the ES [APP-040] states that with the forecast replacement of older, more polluting technologies in the vehicle fleet with cleaner technologies, pollutant concentrations in 2023 are predicted to be lower than in 2015. Considering the timescale for the Proposed Development, has such a tendency been observed?
<b>BIODIVERSITY AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT</b>		
BIO.2.1	Applicant	The Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Verification Survey Report [REP1-015] states that the 2020 survey identified 27 trees that were previously surveyed in 2016/17 and have increased in suitability to Moderate or High, or were additional trees recorded in 2020 that were classified as Moderate or High roosting suitability that will either be felled or subject to high levels of disturbance during construction. The Report states that further survey is proposed for the 27 individual trees and that the Applicant is arranging access for the completion of a climb and inspect survey during the winter/spring of 2020/21 as an alternative survey method to support the verification survey. The Applicant is asked to provide an update in respect of this proposed survey.
BIO.2.2	The Woodland Trust	ExQ1 BIO.1.6 asked the Woodland Trust to expand on the comment in paragraph 9.4.20 of the ES [APP-048] which states that it does not support ancient woodland translocation or salvage as this inherently requires the damage of ancient woodland. No response was received to BIO.1.6. The Woodland Trust is further asked to respond.
BIO.2.3	EA Applicant	The Applicant commented on responses to ExQ1 [REP2-020] including the EA's response to BIO.1.9 which focused on the impact of the Proposed Development on otters. The EA's

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>representation at D4 [REP4-076] also addressed the impact of the Proposed Development on otters.</p> <p>The EA is asked to respond to the Applicant's comment. The Applicant is asked to respond to the EA's comments.</p>
BIO.2.4	NE NCC	<p>The Applicant submitted an Updated Biodiversity Air Quality Assessment at D3 [REP3-010].</p> <p>NE is asked to comment on the report generally and particularly in respect of the impacts on the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI. Are NE's concerns resolved and if not, what are the consequences? NCC is also asked to comment on the findings of the report.</p>
BIO.2.5	NCC	<p>In its LIR [REP1-071] NCC stated (paragraph 5.48) that it was considered far from clear that the loss of ancient woodland was being addressed satisfactorily from a spatial point of view in terms of the wording of Policies ENV1 and QOP 4 in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan. It was recognised by NCC that while the policies cannot be given full weight, neither of the parts quoted is the subject of significant outstanding objections. The Applicant responded to the LIR at D3 [REP3-025].</p> <p>NCC is asked to comment on the Applicant's response within the context of NCC's statement that the overall ancient woodland strategy is welcomed (LIR 6.7.10).</p>
BIO.2.6	NCC	<p>The Applicant's Comments on the LIR [REP3-025] responding to paragraph 6.7.1 of the LIR indicate that the Applicant has issued additional assessment information comprising Updated HRA Reports [REP1-012 and REP1-013 ] and HRA Addendum Report [REP1-043]; Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment for the Scheme [REP2-009]; Annex A – Approach to the Assessment of Losses and Gains of Watercourse [REP2-010]; and Updated Biodiversity Air Quality DMRB Sensitivity Assessment [REP3-010].</p> <p>NCC has not yet commented on these documents and is asked to do so.</p>
BIO.2.7	NE	<p>In responding to HE's WR [REP2-029] the Applicant [REP3-026] confirmed that it was continuing to discuss with NE the update of Letters of No Impediment.</p> <p>Can NE provide an indication of when these revisions will be provided?</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
BIO.2.8	Applicant	Paragraph 4.5.12 of the Ancient Woodland Strategy [REP4-008] states that the proposed Woodland Creation Area would be retained as woodland in perpetuity. The Executive Summary notes that this is based on a comment from NE. How would the Woodland Creation Area be secured in perpetuity through the DCO? Is an amendment to R15 necessary?
BIO.2.9	EA	Appendix F – Proposed Woodland and Marginal Planting Plan [REP4-031] describes how the marginal planting and riparian woodland is proposed to offset the impacts to watercourses. The plan was produced in response to discussion at ISH2 involving the Applicant and the EA. The EA is asked to comment on the proposals and whether they adequately offset the impacts to watercourses.
BIO.2.10	Applicant	The Applicant submitted a Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment for the Scheme at D2 [REP2-009]. Can the Applicant comment on any responses received from IPs regarding the assessment?
		<b>HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT (HRA) REPORT</b>
BIO.2.11		The Applicant's response to BIO.1.38 explains that outdated figures were used in the HRA report [APP-342] to indicate traffic flows (annual average daily traffic), and these have now been updated to align with those presented in Tables 9 (Part A) and 18 (Part B) of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] (see revised HRA Report [REP1-012]). In light of this omission, the Applicant is requested to confirm that the affected road network (referred to in the screening tables and used to determine air quality impacts) is based on the Scheme as a whole, and that the HRA screening for air quality impacts was updated when Part A and Part B were combined.
BIO.2.12	NE	NE's response to BIO.1.47 states that "based on the submitted scheme NE has no concerns" regarding the issue of water pollution [REP1-076]". Can NE be explicit that it is content that the measures incorporated within the scheme to mitigate for pollution events and polluted surface water runoff (e.g. detention basins, filter strips, etc) are not necessary for a negative screening and that the intervening distance

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		and natural dilution and settlement rates are sufficient on their own to conclude no likely significant effect on the relevant European Sites?
BIO.2.13	Applicant	In responding to BIO.1.50 the Applicant has provided an assessment of the impacts from the Scheme alone to the black-headed gull feature of the Coquet Island SPA, as this was omitted from the original submission.  As with the assessment of the Northumberland Marine SPA (Table 2-4 [AS-003]) can the Applicant confirm that there are no known projects or schemes that would incur impacts to the black-headed gull population of the Coquet Island SPA or with loss of functional habitat (arable or wetland) that, in combination with the Scheme, would constitute a likely significant effect?
<b>CARBON EMISSIONS</b>		
		The ExA does not wish to ask any further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination.
<b>COMPULSORY ACQUISITION/TEMPORARY POSSESSION</b>		
CA.2.1	Applicant	In the Written Summary of Oral Submissions relating to CAH1 (page 13) [REP4-025] it is stated that the Applicant was to update paragraph 6.1.3 of the Statement of Reasons to ensure that the ownership position East Cottage and Charlton Mires Farmhouse was clear. No update to the Statement of Reasons was submitted at D4 and therefore the Applicant is asked to undertake this for Deadline 5.
CA.2.2	Applicant	In the Written Summary of Oral Submissions relating to CAH1 (page 16) [REP4-025] it is stated that discussions about the relocation of the 66kV cable with Northumberland Estates are ongoing.  The Applicant is asked to provide an update on these matters at Deadline 5.
CA.2.3	Applicant	The Written Summary of Oral Submissions relating to CAH1 (page 16) [REP4-025] states that the Applicant confirmed that the involvement of land owners in the drainage design would be recorded in a private agreement, with the reasonable costs of the contractors to

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>be met by the Applicant. As such no changes to the dDCO [REP3-004 and 005] would be required.</p> <p>How can the ExA/ SoS be assured that the Applicant will cover the reasonable costs of landowners in the drainage design if this is covered by a private agreement rather than the DCO?</p>
<b>DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER</b>		
		<p><b>References to the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) in this set of questions refer to Examination Library reference [REP4-004] and the reference is not repeated. Similarly, the Examination Library reference for the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [REP4-006] is not repeated in this series of questions.</b></p>
DCO.2.1	Applicant	<p>In commenting on NCC's response to DCO.1.44, the Applicant indicated [REP2-020] that the widths of the proposed Public Rights of Way (PRoW) have not been included in Schedule 4 of the dDCO due to potential on-site variances. However, the Applicant did confirm that the widths of the proposed PRoW would be specified in the PRoW Management Plan as part of the final CEMP.</p> <p>Where is this commitment confirmed?</p>
DCO.2.2	Applicant	<p>Sch. 1 The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions relating to ISH1 (page 9) [REP4-025] (2.19) states that the location of the footnotes has been changed in the latest iteration of the DCO so as to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Should the references be a) and b) instead of b) and d)?</p>
DCO.2.3	NCC	<p>The Applicant's Comments on Responses to ExQ1 – Appendix A PRoW Response [REP2-021] provides comments on NCC's response to DCO.1.44 and specifically proposed changes to Schedules 3 &amp; 4 of the dDCO.</p> <p>Can NCC confirm that it is content with the proposed changes to Schedules 3 &amp; 4 of the dDCO?</p>
DCO.2.4	Applicant	<p>Sch. 2 R1 – Interpretation. The definition of "culvert management plan" is described as 'the document of that description listed in Schedule 12 and certified as the <u>outline ancient woodland strategy</u> by the Secretary of State for the purposes of this Order'</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Change the underlined words to 'culvert management plan'.
DCO.2.5	Applicant	Sch. 2 R3 – Detailed Design. The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions relating to ISH1 (page 9) [REP4-025] states that R3 should be modified to include reference to 'general arrangements plans'. Should the amendment to R3 in the dDCO state 'arrangement' rather than 'arrangements'?
DCO.2.6	NCC Applicant	Point 25 of NCC's Response to Action Points from Hearings [REP4-074] stated that there may be alternative wording which could make R4 clearer, easier to follow and more explicit as there is potentially multiple cross-referencing between documents. NCC is asked to expand on its concerns about the drafting of R4 and to propose amended wording at Deadline 5. The Applicant is asked to respond to NCC's suggestion at Deadline 6 unless the matter is agreed between the parties in the meantime.
DCO.2.7	Applicant	The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Hearings (page 22) [REP4-025] in commenting on ISH2 (4.15) stated that R5 of the DCO has been revised to include reference to production of the LEMP. The Applicant is asked to confirm where this change occurs.
DCO.2.8	Applicant	Sch. 2 R8 of the dDCO has been amended to include reference to the local flood authority. Should this reference be to the 'lead local flood authority' and should this be defined in Article 2?
DCO.2.9	Applicant	The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions relating to ISH1 (page 10) [REP4-025] (4.12) states that the requirement for an archaeological control plan in R4(2)(xii) has been consolidated in R9. The Applicant is asked to clarify where/ how this has been done.
DCO.2.10	NCC Applicant	Point 25 of NCC's Response to Action Points from Hearings [REP4-074] stated that the Council was satisfied that R9 provides for archaeological remains to be identified and recorded but recognised that alternative wording could make the requirement clearer, easier to follow and more explicit.

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		NCC is asked to expand on its concerns about the drafting of R4 and to propose amended wording at D5. The Applicant is asked to respond to NCC's suggestion at D6 unless the matter is agreed between the parties in the meantime.
DCO.2.11	Applicant	Sch. 2 R10 of the dDCO is headed 'Safeguarding of listed milestones'. As the requirement also refers to a non-designated milestone should 'listed' be removed from the title? In addition, should the reference to local planning authority be changed to relevant planning authority?
DCO.2.12	Applicant	Sch. 2 R10 of the dDCO states that no part of the authorised development is to commence until a written scheme for the protection of the grade II listed milestones and the non-designated milestone has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in consultation with Historic England and the Milestone Society. How does this relate to Item A-CH2 of the REAC [REP4-013] which states that the Method Statement will be approved by the SoS following consultation with NCC as set out in R10?
DCO.2.13	Applicant	Sch. 2 R15(1) states that the ancient woodland strategy should be submitted to and approved in writing by the SoS, following consultation with NE and the relevant planning authority on matters related to <u>its</u> function. Should it be 'matters related to <u>their</u> functions'?
DCO.2.14	NCC	Sch. 4 - Permanent Stopping up of Streets, Public Rights of Way and Private Means of Access. Is NCC content with the Applicant's proposed changes to Sch. 4 at D4?
DCO.2.15	Applicant	Sch. 12. A number of documents in Sch. 12 have incomplete references. For example, the Noise Addendum is referenced 6.22 when the document itself is referenced TR010059/6.22. The Applicant is asked to provide comprehensive references where these are not currently provided.
DCO.2.16	Applicant	Sch. 12. The Rights of Way and Access Plans was revised at D2 [REP2-003] and the Vegetation Clearance Plans [REP4-003] were revised at D4. These revisions are not included in Sch. 12.

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The Applicant is asked to review all revisions including the use of revision 0. This has been used for documents submitted during the Examination but not for those which were in the application version of the dDCO.
DCO.2.17	Applicant	Sch. 12. Sch. 12 references environmental masterplans for Part A and Part B as certified documents. The Applicant is asked to explain where, if at all, these are referenced within the dDCO and in responding to this question to provide the Examination Library reference.
DCO.2.18	Applicant	At D2 and D3 the Applicant provided a Schedule of Changes to the dDCO. The Applicant did not provide such a document at D4 (although it is referenced in the document tracker [REP4-002]) and is requested to do so for any subsequent revisions to the dDCO.
DCO.2.19	Applicant	All plans/ drawings/ sections forming Volume 2 of the application appear to be included in Sch.12. Should Examination documents forming part of Volume 2 also be Certified Documents (Denwick Burn Culvert Structural DCO drawing [REP1-004], GEN.2 Existing and Proposed Carriageway Area Within Order Limits Plans WQ GEN 1.6 [REP1-034] and Proposed Highways Adoption & Maintenance Responsibilities [REP3-003])?
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>		
		<b>PART A</b>
GS.2.1	Applicant	Considering that the local geology of Part A is varied and given that it is not known exactly where all piling operations will be undertaken and therefore exact ground conditions, how can the Applicant be certain that, within the limits of the DCO, the impacts of the Proposed Development are as predicted?
GS.2.2	Applicant	Paragraph 11.7.38 of the ES [APP-052] states that crown holes have been recorded over Causey Park mine workings, which demonstrates a hazard of gradual surface ground settlement or sudden ground collapse is present.



**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Considering that the Mineral Safeguarding Area at Causey Park Bridge is within the Order Limits, although in an area of temporary works, how has this been taken into consideration?
		<b>PART B</b>
GS.2.3	Applicant	Paragraph 11.7.33 of the ES [APP-053] states that the Heckley Fence Development High Risk Area (DHRA) is located in close proximity to the proposed Heckley Fence Accommodation Overbridge which is due to be constructed using approach embankments and piled foundations. Furthermore, it also states that non-conclusive evidence of mine workings has been determined and that further investigation is completed at the Heckley Fence DHRA. How would this be secured through the DCO?
<b>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</b>		
		The ExA does not wish to ask any further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination.
<b>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>		
LV.2.1	Applicant	Paragraph 7.4.8 of the ES Part B [APP-045] states that DMRB IAN 135/10 Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment has been replaced by DMRB LA 107 Landscape and Visual Revision 2. As this version of the document was used in the preparation of the ES, the Applicant is requested to submit a copy of DMRB IAN 135/10 for reference.
LV.2.2	Applicant IPs	The plans which form Appendix LV.2 Trees to be Removed and Replaced at Coronation Avenue WQ LV.1.8 [REP1-044] are annotated 'Draft'. The Applicant is asked to explain how this relates to the requirement in R5(3) of the dDCO for the landscaping scheme to include a strategy for the replacement of trees which are to be removed at Coronation Avenue? IPs are asked to comment on the proposals for Coronation Avenue.

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.2.3	Applicant	<p>The dDCO [REP4-004] defines in Part 1 the “landscape mitigation masterplan” as the documents “comprising (first) landscape mitigation masterplan Part A; (second) (third) landscape mitigation plan including assessment parameter 3 being the documents of that description listed in Schedule 12 (documents to be certified) and certified as such by the SoS for the purposes of this Order”.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to clarify the position of the landscape mitigation masterplan for Part B.</p>
LV.2.4	Applicant	<p>Vegetation Clearance Plans [REP4-003] are representative of a “worst case scenario” and need to be considered alongside the Landscape Mitigation Masterplans [APP-095] and [APP-144] for both parts A and B. Nevertheless, a significant amount of vegetation, including a large number of established trees are identified as, potentially, being lost to the scheme.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide further certainty regarding how decisions will be made in relation to tree preservation and how the Applicant proposes to minimise loss of existing vegetation.</p>
LV.2.5	Applicant	<p>The Applicant has stated that there is possibility of using further mitigation measures to reduce landscape impacts, particularly in relation to receptors R35, R36, R37 and R93 (these could also be relevant for receptors R58, R59, R68, R70, R71 and R72). However, the Applicant states that further planting may result in adverse effects due to loss of openness.</p> <p>Has the Applicant assessed whether this would be the case and if so, can they explain who would be adversely affected by additional planting?</p>
LV.2.6	IPs	<p>Appendix LV3 Response to LV.1.13 [REP1-051] considers potential additional mitigation measures, their suitability and the prospect of potentially reducing significant effects to non-significant.</p> <p>What are the views of IPs in respect of these further potential mitigation measures?</p>
LV.2.7	Applicant	<p>Commenting on NCC’s response to LV.1.11, the Applicant stated [REP2-020] that in line with R5(1) of the updated dDCO the landscape strategy and supporting information, including the Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP), would be subject to approval by the SoS, in consultation with the LPA.</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Where within R5 is reference made to the LEMP? Why has an outline LEMP not been produced during the Examination?
LV.2.8	Applicant NCC	Reference 1.1.23 of the Applicant's response to Relevant Representations [REP1-064] suggests that matters are agreed in relation to the replacement of any vegetation and trees to restore Coronation Avenue. Could both the Applicant and NCC confirm that this position is resolved?
LV.2.9	NCC	The Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [REP3-024] noted that NCC has still to carry out a detailed review of Appendix LV.1 [REP1-050]. NCC is asked to respond.
LV.2.10	NCC	As defined within Policy S5 of the Northumberland County and National Park Joint Structure Plan, a specific section of the scheme lies within the Green Belt [REP1-071]. The emerging NCC Local Plan seeks to confirm the boundaries of the Green Belt. Could NCC confirm the status of the emerging policy and provide an update on when the emerging NCC Local Plan is expected to be adopted.
LV.2.11	Applicant	Item S-L4 of Table 3.1 of the outline CEMP [REP4-013] indicates that plant stock will be planted using a combination of whips, transplants, feathered and standard tree nursery stock. For Part A, the exception is the replacement trees identified along Coronation Avenue. Here, it is currently proposed to replace trees to be lost to the Scheme along Coronation Avenue with trees of advanced nursery stock sizes at the time of planting in order to better integrate the replacement plant stock with that of the existing trees. Can the Applicant clarify if planting for areas other than Coronation Avenue will use larger trees rather than all whips?
LV.2.12	Applicant	ES Appendix 7.5 (Arboricultural Report) (Part A) [APP-220] and ES Appendix 7.1 (Part B) [APP-286] include in Section 6 matters to address tree protection. Some of the statements are imprecise and permissive. The Applicant is asked to expand upon the statements in paragraphs 6.1.3-6.1.10 to provide greater precision and to explain how these principles for tree protection would be secured through the DCO.
LV.2.13	Applicant	In response to the ExA's question at ISH2 of how many trees would be lost within woodland groups the Applicant stated [REP4-025] that the assessment of woodlands

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>looked at the woodland parcel as a whole and the trees they contained. However, the assessment for woodlands was not presented on a tree by tree basis within the arboricultural reports.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that it is normal practice for the compensation value to be based on the area of habitat affected rather than individual trees, the Applicant is asked to clarify, if necessary within a range, the number of trees likely to be removed from each woodland area. In addition, demonstrate how the DCO can ensure that the number of trees to be removed both individually and within woodland it can be minimised.</p>
LV.2.14	Applicant	<p>In response to ExQ1 LV.1.11 NCC [REP1-073] made a number of criticisms of the Landscape Mitigation Masterplans. In response [REP2-020] the Applicant stated that it would include an action to prepare a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and set out what the contents of this document will comprise in the updated Outline CEMP at D3. Action ExA: S-L100 in the outline CEMP [REP4-013] confirms that the Applicant will prepare a LEMP for each of Part A and Part B, prior to construction commencing and will include a range of elements with other documents to support the production of the LEMP identified.</p> <p>Does not the range of supporting documents confirm NCC's concerns about the difficulty of having to review multiple plans? The Applicant is asked to consider the submission of a LEMP during the Examination which would also provide an opportunity for IPs to comment on it.</p>
LV.2.15	Applicant	<p>The justification for residual significant effects and no further mitigation measures in relation to "Effects on the perception of landscape character in LCA 38b Lowland Rolling Farmland –Longhorsley, 35a Broad Lowland Valley – Coquet Valley and 17 Coquet Valley" and "Local landscape area of the River Coquet bridge", included in GEN.4 Justification for Significant Residual Effects WQ GEN.1.35 [REP1-036] appears to be missing reference to the type of Significance of Environmental Effect identified.</p> <p>Could the text in the justification be corrected in order to reflect this?</p>
LV.2.16	Applicant NCC	<p>In response to [REP1-036], NCC has raised concerns [REP2-025] in relation to the mitigation measures for receptors at VP27 – View looking northeast from Howdens Glebe cottages, off West Moor Road, and also road users at West Moor.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide an update on this matter?</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.2.17	NCC	<p>[REP1-036] identifies that residential receptors at VP1, VP6, VP10 and VP36 will be subject to adverse visual effects. The justification provided states that these will typically arising where views would be experienced at close quarters or where existing open and expansive elevated views of open countryside would be impacted by the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Does NCC agree with this assessment and that no further mitigation measures are necessary?</p>
LV.2.18	NCC	<p>[REP1-036] identifies that PRoW users in relation to VP4, VP6, VP29, VP32, VP33, VP37 will be subject to large adverse visual effects. It also identifies that Users of Long Distance Path VP24 will too be subject to large adverse visual effects. The justification provided states that these will typically arising where views would be experienced at close quarters or where existing open and expansive elevated views of open countryside would be impacted by the construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>Does NCC agree with this assessment and that no further mitigation measures are necessary?</p>
LV.2.19	Applicant	<p>[REP1-036] states that residential receptors VP27, PRoW users of VP8, VP32, VP33, VP 37, Road users at VP27 will be subject to moderate adverse visual effects. The justification provided states that the Applicant considers that should additional mitigation measures be employed to reduce the visual impact of the Scheme they would remain subject to a significant effect as effects typically remaining due to the loss of an existing open aspect or wide-ranging views should dense belts of planting or screen fences be employed to screen views of the Scheme.</p> <p>Could the Applicant provide further justification for this assessment with particular reference to why dense belts of planting or screen fences would not be preferable to the residual view?</p>
		<b>PART A</b>
LV.2.20	Applicant	<p>The Landscape Mitigation Masterplan A was updated at D4 [REP4-010]. It is indicated in the cover letter [REP4-001] that it was submitted to reflect comments from CAH1.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to specify the changes which have been made at D4.</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>PART B</b>
LV.2.21	Applicant	Vegetation Clearance Plans [REP4-003] show the existing vegetation to be retained, the existing vegetation to be removed and also the results of the Arboricultural Survey. Can the Applicant confirm the intentions for vegetation removal in front of West Linkhall Farm and West Lodge at Charlton Hall? How would this be secured through the DCO?
<b>MATERIAL RESOURCES</b>		
MR.2.1	Applicant	The Applicant's Comments on the LIR [REP3-025] responding to paragraph 6.10.2 of the LIR indicate that all practicable efforts will be made to achieve sustainable resource management and that information on achievements in this context will, where appropriate, be made available to NCC during detailed design. What is the mechanism by which this information will be provided?
MR.2.2	NCC	The Applicant's Comments on the LIR [REP3-025] responding to paragraph 6.10.3 of the LIR address discrepancies raised by NCC in the potential capacity for inert landfill in the county as set out in Table 13-11 of the ES [APP-056] [APP-057]. Is NCC content with the Applicant's response?
<b>NOISE AND VIBRATION</b>		
NV.2.1	Applicant	There are a significant number of the Construction Receptors identified in ES Figure 5.4 Construction Receptors Part A [APP-078] and Part B [APP-126]. Considering the potential impacts of the Proposed Development, particularly at construction stage, and that some mitigation measures are still not defined and are proposed to be developed at design stage, how can the full impacts of the Proposed Development be assessed and how can appropriate mitigation be secured?
NV.2.2	Applicant	ES Figure 5.2 Human and Ecological Receptors Assessed Part A [APP-076] and Human Receptors Assessed Part B [APP-124] identified a significant number of receptors. Considering the potential impacts of the Proposed Development and that some mitigation measures are still not defined and are proposed to be developed at design stage, how can

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		the full impacts of the Proposed Development be assessed and how can appropriate mitigation be secured?
		<b>PART A</b>
NV.2.3	Applicant	Paragraph 6.5.18 of the ES [APP-042] states that the entire length of the A1, between the north and south extent of Part A, would be laid with a Low Noise Surface, apart from on structures (River Coquet Bridge, Parkwood Subway and Burgham Park Underbridge) where Hot Rolled Asphalt would be laid. Could the applicant provide further information regarding why Hot Rolled Asphalt would be laid on those structures rather than the lesser noise emitting Low Noise Surface?
NV.2.4	Applicant	Table 6-31 of the ES [APP-042] Specific Noise Sensitive Receptor Summary and Determination of Significance – Operational Road Traffic Noise identifies two groups of receptors as experiencing noise increases of a major magnitude of impact as a direct result of Part A, and one group as moderate magnitude. What measures have been put in place in order to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on these three groups?
NV.2.5	Applicant and IPs	Paragraph 6.9.32 of the ES [APP-042] states that reflective noise barriers are proposed for two locations. What other mitigation measures are being considered if these were not provided? Why are these only proposed and not agreed? How has the assessment of environmental impacts accommodated the uncertainty surrounding the proposed barriers?
		<b>PART B</b>
		There are no additional questions relating to Noise and Vibration for Part B at this point in the Examination.
<b>POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</b>		
PHH.2.1	Applicant	Paragraphs 12.10.59 of Part A [APP-054] and 12.10.39 of Part B [APP-055] state that the Proposed Development is estimated to generate employment opportunities for approximately 354 workers per year (Part A) and 226 workers per year (Part B), based on

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>estimated total construction costs of £173million over 30 months (Part A) and £81 million over 22 months (Part B).</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to set out how estimated employment opportunities were calculated.</p>
PHH.2.2	Applicant	<p>Human health receptors are assigned a sensitivity of 'medium' (paragraphs 12.7.85 [APP-054] &amp; [APP-055]).</p> <p>Applying Table 12-11 (Part A)[APP-054]/ Table 12-12 (Part B)[APP-055], can the Applicant explain why the sensitivity was not 'high' given the Proposed Development is in an area which experiences an inequality in health and has some areas of deprivation?</p>
PHH.2.3	Applicant	<p>Appendix PHH.3 submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-046], Table 1-2 "Residential Properties located within 500m of the Order Limits (Part A)" lists a number of properties that were missing from the original application (Tables 12-25 and 12-26 of [APP-054]): R116, R39, R19, R18, R10, R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R17, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26.</p> <p>As these are also absent from Table 12-39 [APP-054] can the Applicant confirm whether these properties were included in the original assessment?</p>
PHH.2.4	Applicant	<p>NCC [REP2-025], further to their initial comments which the Applicant has responded to (Applicant's response to 1.1.31 in [REP1-064]) continues to state that the impacts of the scheme on Population and Human Health have not been fully assessed. This is based on the view that the impact of the Proposed Development on the amenity and the quality of the user experience of the PRow network and local roads should have been included as a separate theme within the ES.</p> <p>What has the Applicant done to address this issue?</p>
		<b>PART A</b>
PHH.2.5	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.4.38 of Chapter 12 of the ES [APP-054] states that it is not considered that there would be a significant change in the level of existing severance as both WCH and vehicles would be able to access the same places as they currently do as the portion of the A1 which is not being widened would still be accessible. Nevertheless, the access route would change which could then impact accessibility.</p> <p>How has this factor been taken into account?</p>



**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
PHH.2.6	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.7.21 of the ES [APP-054] lists community facilities within Morpeth. The list does not appear to include Fairmoor Cemetery.</p> <p>Could the Applicant state how access to this community facility has been taken into consideration as part of the effects on communities?</p>
PHH.2.7	Applicant	<p>Table 12-23 of the ES [APP-054] includes a series of PRoW that provide access to public transport and other social and community facilities, such as schools.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm how continued access to these social and community facilities would be secured during both the construction and operational phases?</p>
PHH.2.8	Applicant	<p>Table 12-29 of the ES (Agricultural Land Holdings within the Order Limits) [APP-054] includes eight non-represented agricultural land holdings.</p> <p>How has the sensitivity of these been assessed and what efforts have been made by the Applicant to ascertain their sensitivity?</p>
PHH.2.9	Applicant	<p>The PHE health profile for Northumberland indicates that the health of the Northumberland population is slightly worse than the England average, including a higher number of fatalities or instances of being seriously injured on Roads in Northumberland (including the A1 and local road network).</p> <p>Considering that the Proposed Development is predicted to increase overall number of vehicles on the road, how has the higher number of fatalities or instances of being seriously injured in the area been taken into consideration? Also, considering that a number of diversions are proposed during the construction phase and that driver stress will be higher, how have proposals been adapted to take into consideration the higher number of collision risks?</p>
PHH.2.10	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.7.88 of the ES [APP-054] recognises that population trends over the next 25 years would see an increase in the older age population. Paragraph 12.7.89 states that older people are more likely to rely on vehicle transport (particularly bus services).</p> <p>Considering the existing provision of bus stops along Part A and the proposed removal of bus stops as described in paragraph 12.8.13, how has the Proposed Development taken into consideration the needs of the increasing older age population?</p>
PHH.2.11	Applicant	<p>Table 12-38 of the ES [APP-054] provides a summary of potential impacts (without mitigation, but with consideration of embedded mitigation, for example, permanent PRoW</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		diversions) on PRowS within the Study Area. For PRow 423/001, Part A would sever this route with no provision for WCHs travelling west, with users being diverted north to Fenrother Junction.  The Applicant is asked to provide further information regarding how safe and welcoming this route would be to WCHs?
PHH.2.12	Applicant	Paragraph 12.8.19 of the ES [APP-054] states that users of PRowS and other routes within the 500m Study Area could experience a reduction of amenity due to noise and air quality effects during both the construction and the operation periods.  How has this potential reduction of amenity been taken into consideration as part of the Proposed Development and how has it been mitigated against?
		<b>Part B</b>
PHH.2.13	Applicant	Table 1-5 "Residential Properties Located within 500m of Main Compound (Part B)" of The Applicant's Response to WQ PHH.1.10 and 18 [REP1-046] does not include property Ref. 47 which appears to border the study area of the Main Compound on revised Figure 12.3 [REP1-046].  The Applicant is requested to provide information concerning this property and its distance from the Main Compound.
<b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT</b>		
TT.2.1	Applicant NCC	At D1 the Applicant submitted a revised version of the Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-003]. The key indicates that the revision reflects amendments to Rights of Way Refs and details. This was further updated at D2 [REP2-003] with the description amended to 'Examination Deadline 02 Update'.  The Applicant is asked to explain the source of these updates? Do they incorporate changes proposed by NCC? Can NCC confirm the accuracy of the revised plans?
TT.2.2	Applicant NCC	The Applicant's Response to D3 Submissions [REP4-024] states that the Applicant's Comments on Responses to Written Questions - Appendix A - Public Rights of Way Response [REP2-021] retains a small number of minor amendments to references which would be communicated in writing.

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The Applicant and NCC are asked to provide an update on addressing these outstanding matters.
TT.2.3	NCC Applicant NE	The Applicant submitted a revised Construction Traffic management Plan at D1 [REP1-025] [REP1-026]. NCC is asked to confirm whether the document is acceptable in its current form. The Applicant is asked to confirm whether or not this is a draft document subject to approval through the DCO. NE is asked to comment on the advice regarding the use of the A1068 as a diversion route.
TT.2.4	NCC	Appendix TT.3 Maintenance Boundaries is provided in response to ExQ1 TT.1.23. Is NCC content with the material provided in in Appendix TT.3?
TT.2.5	Applicant	Point 12 of NCC's Response to Action Points from Hearings [REP4-074] addresses the nature of stopping up and the resultant status/ ownership of the stopped-up highway among other highways/ PRow matters. The Applicant is asked to respond to NCC's comments.
TT.2.6	Applicant	Point 36 of NCC's Response to Action Points from Hearings [REP4-074] summarises NCC's position on non-motorised transport. The Applicant is asked to respond.
<b>WATER ENVIRONMENT</b>		
WE.2.1	Applicant	In its Deadline 4 submission [REP4-076] the EA stated that it would welcome clarity regarding why and how the Cotting Burn, tributary of the Easrdon Burn, unnamed ditch (north of Longdike Burn) and tributary of Thirsdon Burn have been reassigned as dry ditches as part of Annex A – Approach to the Assessment of Losses and Gains of Watercourses [REP2-010]. The Applicant is asked to respond.
WE.2.2	EA	Can the EA confirm whether they are satisfied with the pollution control measures proposed within the outline CEMP [REP4-013] in relation to the impact of the Proposed Development on watercourses?

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>Part A</b>
WE.2.3	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 10.1.6.e. of the ES [APP-050] states that Part B contains detailed baseline information relating to existing drainage. Part A does not present the equivalent information as surveys of existing drainage will be undertaken at detailed design, although the information available is sufficient for the assessment.</p> <p>If sufficient information is available for the assessment, why has not the information been provided?</p>
WE.2.4	Applicant NCC	<p>The second bullet in Section 7 of Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report for Part A [APP-258] states that the maintenance of trunk and local drainage assets will be subject to a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Highways England and NCC. Nevertheless, MoU referenced in the SoCG [REP4-016] only makes reference to details of the de-trunking aspects of Part A.</p> <p>Could the Applicant provide confirmation that such a MoU is being developed and agreed. How would it be secured through the DCO? NCC is also invited to comment.</p>
WE.2.5	EA	<p>Paragraph 10.4.13 of the ES [APP-050] states that following consultation with the EA it was agreed that detailed hydraulic modelling of the River Coquet would not be required, as the proposed southern pier would be aligned with the existing pier. Annex B – Flood Risk Assessment Addendum [REP1-067] states that the potential movement of the southern pier would take this structure further towards the river channel and potentially within the estimated 1 in 1000 years flood extent.</p> <p>Is the EA content with the information and advice provided in light of changes detailed in Annex B – Flood Risk Assessment Addendum?</p>
WE.2.6	Applicant	<p>Table 10-9 of the ES [APP-050] provides a summary of the potential impacts associated with construction on the River Coquet based on the fact that the proposed construction activities would be located outside of the bankfull channel identified for the geomorphology assessment.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that the potential movement of the southern pier as detailed within the Annex B – Flood Risk Assessment Addendum [REP1-067] would not alter this assessment?</p>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021****Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
WE.2.7	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 10.8.15 of the ES [APP-050] states that Table 10-10 provides a summary of potential impacts on fluvial geomorphology of the River Coquet during the construction stage. Nevertheless, the heading of the above mentioned table refers to the operation stage, rather than the construction stage.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please clarify which stage does the table refer to?</p>
WE.2.8	Applicant	<p>Table 10-10 of the ES [APP-050] refers to the potential impacts on the fluvial geomorphology of River Coquet during the operation stage (please see WE.2.7 above).</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that the potential movement of the southern pier as detailed within the Annex B – Flood Risk Assessment Addendum [REP1-067] would not alter this assessment? In addition, can the Applicant provide further information on how the potential impact on erosion, which is dependent on the amount of bare earth exposed by vegetation clearance, has been assessed?</p>
WE.2.9	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 10.5.1 the ES [APP-050] states that, although it is unlikely that the design will change, further modelling used to inform the design of the watercourse crossings would be undertaken as the detailed design stage of Part A progresses.</p> <p>Should the further modelling result in changes in the design of watercourse crossings what would be the implications of such changes in EIA terms? How will the Applicant accommodate for changes in the modelling?</p>
WE.2.10	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 10.6.1 of the ES [APP-050] states that the study area has been defined taking into consideration, among other factors, the vegetation in the area.</p> <p>Considering the likely significant loss of trees and other vegetation as defined within the Vegetation Clearance Plans [REP4-003], how has this been accommodated within the definition of the study area?</p>
WE.2.11	Applicant	<p>Table 10-8 of the ES [APP-050] identified Ponds and Bradley Brook and Back Burn as receptors of High Importance. Nevertheless, no specific measures to protect these environments appear to be included within the outline CEMP.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm how this would be secured through the DCO?</p>
		<b>Part B</b>

**ExQ2: 19 March 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 5: 1 April 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
WE.2.12	Applicant	Paragraph 10.11.2 of the ES [APP-051] states that no monitoring during operation is required. Could the Applicant explain the reasoning for this, particularly in relation to water quality and the possibility of contamination?