

A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham

Scheme Number TR010059

7.6A Statement of Common Ground: Northumberland County Council

Rule 8 (1) (e)

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure
Rules) 2010

January 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

The A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham

Development Consent Order 20[]

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND:
NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

Regulation Number:	Rule 8 (1) (e)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010059
Application Document Ref	TR010059/APP/7.6A
Author:	A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	January 2021	Deadline 1 Submission

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) Highways England Company Limited and (2) Northumberland County Council

Signed.....

[NAME]

Project Manager

on behalf of Highways England

Date: [DATE]

Signed.....

[NAME]

[POSITION]

on behalf of Northumberland County Council

Date: [DATE]

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Purpose of this Document	1
1.2	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	1
1.3	Terminology	1
2	RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT	3
	Table 2-1- Record of Engagement in Relation to the Whole Scheme	3
	Table 2-2- Record of Engagement in Relation to Part A	8
	Table 2-3- Record of Engagement in Relation to Part B	24
3	ISSUES	31
	Table 3-1 - Issues related to the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	31
	Table 3-2 – Issues related to the Whole Scheme	31

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) relates to an application made by Highways England (the “Applicant”) on 7 July 2020 to the Secretary of State (SoS) for Transport via the Planning Inspectorate (the “Inspectorate”) under the Planning Act 2008 (the “2008 Act”) for a Development Consent Order (DCO). The DCO was accepted for examination by the Inspectorate on 4 August 2020.
- 1.1.2 If made, the DCO would grant consent for the A1 in Northumberland, Morpeth to Ellingham (the “Scheme”). The Scheme is formed of two parts as follows: A1 Morpeth to Felton (Part A) and A1 Alnwick to Ellingham (Part B). A detailed description of the Scheme can be found in **Chapter 2: The Scheme** of the Environmental Statement (ES) (**APP-037**).
- 1.1.3 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available on the Inspectorate website:
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/North%20East/A1-in-Northumberland---Morpeth-to-Ellingham/>
- 1.1.4 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) **Highways England** as the Applicant and (2) **Northumberland County Council (NCC)**.
- 1.2.2 Highways England became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the SoS. The legislation establishing Highways England made provision for all legal rights and obligations of the Highways Agency, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by Highways England.
- 1.2.3 NCC is the Local Authority for the Scheme falling within Category A of section 43(1) of the 2008 Act and is both the local planning authority and highway authority for the Scheme which falls entirely within the Council’s administrative area.

1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the tables in the Issues section of this SoCG, “Not Agreed” indicates a final position, and “Under discussion” indicates where these points will be the subject of on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties. “Agreed” indicates where the issue has been resolved.

- 1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues section of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to NCC, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as not being in dispute, to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to NCC in the determination of the Application.

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

2 RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

- 2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and NCC in relation to the Application is outlined in **Table 2-1**.
- 2.1.2 This table has been split to reflect discussions held on Part A, Part B and the Scheme as a whole. This reflects the history of the Scheme. Part A and Part B were originally proposed to be the subject of separate applications for DCOs but were combined into the current single Scheme.
- 2.1.3 Engagement detailed within the separate sections for Part A and Part B relates to discussions held prior to the combination of the Scheme. All engagement following combination is detailed under the header for the Scheme.
- 2.1.4 It should be noted that in Table 2-1, below, there is a gap in 'whole Scheme' engagement with NCC between December 2018 and January 2021. This reflects the fact that for this period engagement with NCC was done on a Part A and Part B basis. As such engagement with NCC for this period is recorded in Tables 2-2 (for Part A) and 2-3 (for Part B), respectively.

Table 2-1- Record of Engagement in Relation to the Whole Scheme

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
18/01/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting held with NCC to provide an update on the progression of separate DCOs for Part A and Part B.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>NCC was made aware of the proposal at this stage being to progress Part A and Part B as two separate DCO applications.</p>
24/05/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Typical scheme highway cross-sections on the Scheme.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>The typical cross sections were debated, and traffic management principles discussed with NCC.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
26/06/18	Highways Departures from Standards (DfS) design meeting between NCC and Highways England	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting to discuss the approach / design rationale for the side road designs, including design speed, carriageway widths, radii and Stopping Sight Distances (SSD). NCC set out materials required for their approval.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>Agreed design speeds, using Highways England's TD9 from Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).</p> <p>NCC agreed formal DfS could be generic for items associated with all side roads.</p> <p>HE to investigate design options for free-flow link at Fenrother.</p> <p>NCC stated same approach for all side road layouts. Materials for NCC to be consulted on at detailed design are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway Side Road Layout Drawings; • Schedule of Side Road Departures; • Comprehensive side road drainage information, including calculations; • Detailed structural designs on side roads; • Side Road Traffic Sign Details.
31/07/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting held to discuss the maintenance boundaries for the Scheme based on records held by Highways England.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>Traffic Management Principles raised by NCC at previous meeting of 24/05/18 now agreed. Maintenance at bridges still being investigated.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
22/08/18	Meeting in Northumberland County Hall, Historic England, Karen Derham (NCC County Archaeologist) and Glenn Shaw (NCC Buildings Conservation Team)	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Part A</p> <p>For Part A, the meeting included a review of the Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (Part A), which included the results of the geophysical survey LiDAR assessment.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>NCC confirmed they were satisfied with the content and agreed that no further assessments would be undertaken prior to DCO submission.</p> <p>Part B</p> <p>Key topics</p> <p>In relation to Part B the meeting outlined the route and the purpose was to identify and discuss any immediate concerns about heritage assets within and adjacent to Part B. Issues associated with the Scheduled Monuments within and adjacent to the Scheme were discussed.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>It was agreed to review the potential impacts following completion of the geophysical survey.</p>
29/11/18	Core Responder Engagement meeting including NCC's Northumberland Fire and Rescue.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Introductory meeting to both Parts A and B, existing emergency access procedures, existing operational, enforcement/compliance and heightened situations challenges.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>Confirmed enforcement cameras not live and agreed not required. Hardstanding platforms not required and agreed will use proposed</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<p>laybys. Construction sequence for Parkwood subway to have bespoke emergency access plans shared through HE liaison officer. Diversion routes to be issued through same process.</p> <p>It was agreed that, at detailed design, HE would explore opportunities for funding (through the rural crime prevention fund) for the provision of automatic number plate recognition (ANPR).</p>
06/12/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting to further discuss the maintenance boundaries for the Scheme</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>NCC agreed to consider the maintenance boundary technical note that was previously shared with NCC on 29/11/18. (Maintenance boundaries TNs included as TT.3 in response to First Written Questions). Agreement on details to be reached at future meetings.</p> <p>The meeting also discussed planning related matters with respect to proposals for development by Millhouse (within Part A) and Northumberland Estates (within Part B) and latest NCC activities on these matters. NCC undertook to seek legal advice on the Certificate of Lawfulness for the Millhouse planning permission, and to review the Parish Council review of the Denwick Bypass proposals from Northumberland Estates.</p>
5/1/21	Telephone conversation with Mary Fisher (NCC) and Andy Williams (on behalf of Highways England)	NCC responded on a without prejudice basis

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
09/12/20 & 07/01/21	Call between NCC and drainage specialist.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Call to discuss surface water drainage strategy for the Scheme</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>The Applicant has not produced plans showing drainage catchments in detail. This was discussed with NCC, and the Applicant has provided plans at Appendix B of Appendix 10.5 Drainage Strategy Report Part A [APP-258] and Appendix B of Appendix 10.4 Drainage Strategy Report Part B [APP-314] which show the different surface water catchments by identifying the highway drainage networks that connect to each of the detention features and subsequent outfalls to watercourses. This was confirmed in an email to NCC which was issued on 22nd December 2020.</p> <p>The existing ground conditions and their unsuitability for infiltration means that it is not reasonably practicable to comply with S4 with this Scheme. As a result, the Applicant has considered S6 which gives guidance when S4 cannot be complied with. (S6 Where it is not reasonably practicable to constrain the volume of runoff to any drain, sewer or surface water body in accordance with S4 or S5 above, the runoff volume must be discharged at a rate that does not adversely affect flood risk.) NCC confirmed that this approach is satisfactory.</p>

Table 2-2- Record of Engagement in Relation to Part A

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
20/10/17	Highways Technical Meeting for Part A between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting held with NCC.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>Issues discussed were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed that West Moor is to be widened as part of scheme for agricultural vehicles. NCC's Graham Fairs is Point of Contact to attend detailed design meetings with Wimpey. • Historical flooding problem at West View from surface runoff and Cotting Burn. It was agreed that the catchment area would be included in scheme drainage design; • It was agreed that Priest Bridge would be retained for walking, cycling and horse riding access, with an action for Highways England to include it in the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding (WCH) assessment. NCC identified that access will also be required for maintenance, and Highways England agreed to include the turning head in the preliminary design; • Request from NCC for parking provision outside Tritlington primary school to be considered by the design team; • Request from NCC that the red hatching on de-trunked section of the A1 is removed this would require new road surface. For HE to consider; • It was agreed that the proposed new bridge over River Coquet will impact on existing holding pond located to the east of the A1 for the Scheme to account for in the drainage design; • It was highlighted by NCC that Felton Bridge requires strengthening to 40T, if traffic is to be

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<p>diverted temporarily through Felton. NCC will require funding for this work. It was agreed that the Construction Traffic Management Plan would seek to avoid this route (which it subsequently did);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, if traffic is to be temporarily diverted on to the A697, remedial measures will need to be implemented in advance. Historical speed problem on the A697 and longstanding issues at Longhorsley are for the scheme to consider within the Construction Traffic Management Plan; • De-trunking of A1 – NCC requested that the existing highway drainage be made good before handed over to NCC; and • NCC requested that a commuted sum be made available to cover the cost of the handover of the de-trunked section of carriageway. <p>HE to speak to their internal departments on the existing condition and commuted sum aspects to report back to NCC at future meeting.</p>
08/11/17 & 21/11/17	Email Exchange between Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer) NCC and Highways England	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Introducing proposed assessment methodology (including approach to defining operational Study Area) for Part A.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>The proposed baseline noise survey methodology and the specific monitoring locations were described by Highways England.</p> <p>Highways England proposed to undertake a detailed level of assessment in line with the DMRB HD 213/11. The methodology to derive the Study Area for Part A in accordance with DMRB HD 213/11 was also proposed.</p> <p>Gary Park confirmed that there were no issues raised by the proposed assessment methodologies.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
08/11/17	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting held to update NCC following recent stakeholder meetings where the following issues were raised.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alternative bus route and stop proposals for Part A, which had previously been shown to Arriva, were shared with NCC. It was agreed that a mini park & ride is not expected to be required on the M2E scheme. • Highways England also informed NCC of the recent blight claims received and advised on the next steps for Highways England to respond within two months.
08/11/17	Signage Meeting with NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting held with NCC to discuss the road signage strategy for Part A including the proposed de-trunked section.</p> <p>Key outcomes</p> <p>Proposed extents of the signage north and south of the Scheme were set out. Proposed destination names were challenged, and suggested amendments agreed. Destinations with less than five dwellings should not be signed. Agreed that tourist destinations to conform to TD 57/17. NCC asked that Lane Head Junction be included, and destination amendments made to current signs, but this was stated by Highways England to be outside the Scheme scope. NCC recommended that care should be taken for signs at compact grade separated junction, following driver confusion earlier that year. It was agreed this would be incorporated at detailed design and reviewed at Road Safety Audit. Updated local area destination map to be available for next meeting.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
09/01/18	Meeting between the EA, NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Initial meeting held to discuss the approach to the water environment and flooding, including the approach to hydraulic assessment of watercourses, climate change, surface water, permitting, embankments, flood risk at Felton, Water Framework Directive Assessment and culvert design.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>The EA and NCC agreed the approach to the hydraulic assessment, i.e. smaller watercourses and overland flow routes could be assessed using simple analysis whereas more complex analysis would use 1D modelling.</p> <p>The EA also confirmed that hydraulic modelling of the River Coquet would not be required.</p>
18/01/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key topics</p> <p>Meeting held with NCC to update on the options for River Coquet Public Rights of Way (PRoW). NCC requested betterment to the northern PRoW and suggested that permanent stopping up of southern PRoW would be resisted by the NCC PRoW officer.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Highways England agreed that the Part B PROW options would be developed further and presented at a later date (see entries dated /05/19 & 04/07/19 in table 2-3, below).</p> <p>The turning head proposals for Arriva bus stops at Highlaws were discussed. NCC queried how misuse would be managed. It was agreed that Highways England would consider in the Scheme design to reduce the risk of misuse once requirements had been confirmed with Arriva.</p>
22/02/18	Meeting between NCC and	<p>Key topics</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Highways England.	<p>Meeting with NCC to feedback on liaison with Tritlington Primary school over the proposed Part A construction compound.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC suggested that there were opportunities for STEM educational activities with the school once construction starts.</p> <p>NCC identified an issue on A697 and an implication on the proposed removal of the Low Espley left-in/left-out to and from the A1. NCC to confirm status of track between Low Espley and A697 in order to allow further discussion.</p> <p>In addition, the outcome from stakeholder meetings held with Eshott Airfield and Millhouse Developments were discussed with the NCC Planning team.</p>
07/03/18	Email to Specialist Planning Services – Northumberland County Council.	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Consultation on the appropriateness of proposed viewpoint locations.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC requested a site walkover to discuss viewpoint locations on site. Site visit arranged for and took place on 18th April 2018. During the site visit approximately 50% of viewpoints were visited.</p> <p>It was also requested that photomontages be prepared as part of the DCO submission. HE agreed to do this. The location of these viewpoints were subsequently agreed with NCC and submitted with the DCO application (see entry dated 01/05/18, below).</p>
08/03/18	Email exchange between Fearn Sims (On behalf of Highways England) and David Feige, NCC Principal	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Exchange of emails to confirm that from an NCC perspective, Part A will not impact on the Northumberland Coast AONB.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Ecologist and AONB Officer.	
11/04/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Meeting to discuss de-trunking and associated surveys on Part A. NCC confirmed they use Highways England's DMRB for VRS design standards. Highways England confirmed they will retain ownership of Priest Bridge and the redundant carriageway over the bridge.</p> <p>Key Outcomes</p> <p>It was agreed with NCC that the width of side roads was to be based on traffic counts. Confirmation was given by Highways England that the PMA option had been selected for Low Esplay and the option to adjoin the A697 was not viable, based on NCC feedback.</p> <p>Highways England agreed to investigate changing the priority of Fenrother Lane junction on the de-trunked section.</p> <p>NCC confirmed that a single carrier pipe could be adopted for drainage design.</p> <p>Highways England confirmed that closed board fencing was the proposed option for segregating carriageways which are all at the same level. NCC queried if a hedgerow could be used. HE confirmed that this would be dependent on the available width and being able to secure access for maintenance.</p>
24/04/18 & 30/04/18	Email exchange between Fearn Sims (on behalf of Highways England) and Katherine Robbie (NCC Planning Services).	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Email exchange to confirm that NCC agreed that no nighttime assessments would be required for a number of viewpoints for Part A.</p>
24/04/18	Email from Highways England to	<p>Key Topics</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Specialist Planning Services – Northumberland County Council.	Consultation via email on the scope of the assessment relating to night time assessment. The omission of night time photography was proposed, with the assessment to be based on a written assessment only. The proposed method was accepted by NCC by email on the 30th April 2018.
01/05/18	Email from Fearn Sims (on behalf of Highways England) to Katherine Robbie (NCC)	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Follow up to the meeting 07/03/18 in respect of viewpoints. Revised viewpoint location plans were submitted to NCC for agreement</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>No objections to the viewpoints were received from Katherine Robbie (NCC Planning Services, email dated 10/05/18) and the viewpoints were used for the DCO submission (subject to the revision agreed with NCC on 16/08/18, see entry below).</p>
10/05/18	Teleconference between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Meeting with NCC to discuss the potential traffic management proposals in Part A and diversion routes for temporary closures of the A1 in relation to the Scheme.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Discussed the potential for diverted traffic to use the A697 and cut across Moor Road and travel through Alnwick on the B3641. NCC noted that the timing and potential diversion on the A1068 coastal road will need to be confirmed if operational during tourist season.</p> <p>HE confirmed that these issues could be addressed through the CTMP.</p>
10/05/18	Email exchange between Katherine Robbie (NCC Planning Services) and	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Confirmation of joint site visit between Highways England NCC to review proposed viewpoints for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Fearn Sims (on behalf of Highways England).	
10/05/18	Email from Glenn Shaw (Buildings Conservation Team), NCC to Highways England	Key Outcome Confirmation from NCC of Grade II listed buildings and other non-designated heritage assets that Part A might have an impact upon. Of the 65 listed buildings identified within the 1km Outer Study Area, 13 were identified as being potentially sensitive to changes in setting from the Scheme. It was agreed that while all of the assets would be reviewed, where possible, in the site walkover, particular attention would be paid to these 13. In addition, two non-designated built heritage assets were identified as requiring scoping in.
24/05/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic Highways England provided an update in relation to the de-trunking proposals on Part A and issued further information on highway maintenance boundaries following previous meeting discussions. Typical scheme highway cross-sections on the Scheme were debated. PMA width for Bywell Road on Part A was confirmed as 6.0m. In addition, Highways England provided feedback from stakeholder meetings held with Hoggs, Kelchers, Milner and Taylor Wimpey.
26/06/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic Meeting with NCC to discuss highway maintenance boundaries on Part A. As-builts for Parkwood subway on Part A confirmed as previously handed over. Key Outcome

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<p>NCC believe Highways England should retain the link roads to the junction bridges and West Moor proposed roundabout. Queries still outstanding for Causey Park and Burgham Park bridges. HE to prepare layouts in a technical note (final versions agreed show these to remain with NCC in TT.3 submitted at Deadline 1 in response to First Written Questions).</p> <p>NCC endorsed approaches for pavement survey residual life assessment and drainage assessment.</p>
31/07/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Discussed de-trunking pavement survey dates options and Private Means of Access (PMA) on Hogg land and Barn Owl mitigation with NCC's Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) officer on Part A.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>HE confirmed that they would consider these possibilities in developing the Scheme design for Part A.</p>
30/07/18 & 03/08/18	Email exchange between Highways England and from David Feige (NCC Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer).	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Confirming the approach to mitigating the impacts of Part A on the Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>David Feige of NCC confirmed that whilst the Coquet River Felton Park LWS is not designated as Ancient Woodland, NCC would nevertheless still expect to see replacement replanting, and that a ratio of 1:1 for this replanting would be too low. HE accepted this approach.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
16/08/18	Email – Specialist Planning Services – Northumberland County Council.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Correspondence relating to the revision of a number of photomontage locations on the ground of Health and Safety – due to the method of capturing verified views it was not deemed practical to take verified views from previously identified viewpoint location located along the side of roads due to the narrow widths of existing grass verges.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Revised locations accepted by NCC by email 16th August 2018.</p>
24/08/18	Meeting between Nick Best, NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting held to discuss the scope and content for the Cultural Heritage assessment for the ES (Part A).</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>The following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ES will be informed by a historic environment desk-based assessment, walkover survey and geophysical survey. • That HE would take a “pragmatic” approach to the requirement to carry out additional geophysical surveys. This means that the requirement for additional surveys should be proportionate to the size of affected area and the quality of the results in the immediate area; • Due to the limitation of land access for intrusive works, trial trench evaluations would not be included within the scope of the ES chapter (Part A). • Agreement to explore further non-intrusive survey techniques to support the assessment. • Agreement that further discussions would be held.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
31/08/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting held to review the free flow design proposal of the new Fenrother junction within Part A. NCC queried proposals for the speed limit here and at Tritlington primary school.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Further development from previous meeting on 31/07/18 on discussion of Part A and B's maintenance liabilities. Highways England confirmed that mitigation hedgerows will require a 3m maintenance strip and hedges are primarily the responsibility of the landowners on the trunk road.</p> <p>The PRoW southern tie-in principles at the River Coquet within Part A previously discussed on 18 January 2018 were agreed.</p>
05/08/18 & 09/09/18	Email exchange between Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer), NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Email exchange confirming the location of sensitive receptors in relation to Part A (Northgate Hospital Site and Tritlington School).</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC confirmed the presence of two designated sites; the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Coquet River – Felton Park (Local Wildlife and Geological Sites) at the northern end of Part A. NCC also suggested a discussion with NCC's Ecology team to confirm that the approach to the assessment of LWSs. These were subsequently confirmed via an exchange of emails with NCC Ecology team 23/10/18 (see below).</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
05/09/18	Meeting between the EA, NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting held to discuss the general design approach to the water environment and flood risk elements of Part A of the Scheme, including all watercourses and surface water flow paths with the exception of the River Coquet which was the topic of a separate meeting. This included designing all culverts for free flow conditions during the 1% AEP plus 25% climate change rainfall event, mammal passage, fish passage and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Culverts design principles were discussed and agreed including the use of trash screens and scour protection.</p>
28/09/18	Skype meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting to present the proposed Part A National Grid advanced diversion and related construction traffic. Highways England also provided an update on Part A's de-trunking and draft consultation report and confirmed that targeted consultation would be required for emerging mitigation measures.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Further to previous de-trunking meeting 11/04/18, Part A's de-trunked design speeds to be confirmed by NCC based on proposed classification. Subsequently NCC requested national speed limit be adopted. Highways England agreed, subject to the results from the road safety audits undertaken at stages throughout the detailed design.</p>
17/10/18	Exchange of emails between Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer,	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Alternative noise measurement locations suggested by Highways England due to</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	NCC) and Nicola Bolton (on behalf of Highways England)	<p>previous consultation feedback and proposed additional construction compound.</p> <p>NCC stated that the proposed changes / additions to the noise measurement locations were acceptable.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Noise measurement locations were subsequently implemented in the surveys.</p>
23/10/18	Email from David Feige, Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer, NCC to Highways England	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Email confirming that Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) should be included within the environmental assessment of the impacts of Part A.</p>
01/11/18	Meeting between the EA, NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting to discuss the flood risk and water environment elements of the proposed River Coquet Bridge with a view to understanding the requirement for and minimum criteria for hydraulic modelling, geomorphological assessment and Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>The work required for the DCO application was agreed.</p>
07/11/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting to present to NCC the proposed environmental mitigation measures for Part A.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC happy with details provided but queried the appearance of anti-reflective fencing at locations with insufficient width to accommodate hedgerows between carriageways. HE confirmed that the width and access for maintenance will determine the type of anti-reflective barrier to be used.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		NCC also requested an update on the proposed utility diversion at Causey Park within Part A as they are likely to field public queries. Details provided to NCC.
02/04/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting held to update NCC on Part A's lane configuration south of West Moor and its anti-reflective fencing and National Grid works.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC requested confirmation of the height of the proposed close board fencing. HE stated that this would be confirmed at detailed design.</p> <p>Part A's National Grid diversion at Causey Park previously discussed confirmed as moved back 12 months. NCC to be informed of updated dates for the revised diversion construction.</p>
22/05/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting held with NCC to discuss Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). This document is to accompany the SoCG and sets out the details of the de-trunking aspects of Part A that are in the process of being agreed.</p>
06/06/19	Email exchange between Alex Grassam (on behalf of Highways England) and Karen Derham (County Archaeologist), NCC.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Email exchange to clarifying the scope of the proposed Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>It was agreed to produce outline WSI for post-determination trial trenching across Part A and a separate WSI for an Archaeological Strip, Map and Sample Excavation (National Grid Diversion Works).</p> <p>The draft WSIs were submitted to NCC for comments.</p> <p>Minor comments made by Karen Derham (NCC Archaeology) via email dated 06/06/19 proposed some small revisions to the suggested WSI for the trial trenching. These revisions were</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		accepted by HE and were incorporated into the subsequent WSI.
05/09/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic Meeting held to discuss advanced construction activities within Part A, comprising the demolition of Northgate House and National Grid Diversions.</p> <p>Key Outcome Highways England presented recent agreement of blight for Northgate House and that the demolition would be early in the construction programme.</p> <p>It was confirmed that approval would be required from the local planning authority for this advanced construction activity. The National Grid diversion is due to start on site in March 2020. Advanced notifications to be shared with NCC's Streetworks team. Temporary compound required for Ground Investigation surveys at the River Coquet, with NCC approval.</p>
07/11/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topic Meeting held to discuss proposed advance utility diversions. NCC made aware that National Grid and HE would be undertaking stakeholder meeting the following week for these works.</p>
22/01/20	Email exchange between Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer, NCC) and Highways England	<p>Key Topics and Outcome Highways England confirmed the final layout for Part A and NCC confirmed that the human and ecological receptors for Part A remain as previously agreed.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
13/02/20	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting held to discuss the progress of archaeological works at Causey Park (within Part A).</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>HE tabled a programme for ground investigation surveys at the River Coquet and a high-level construction sequence for the Scheme to allow NCC to compare against their planned works.</p>
6/1/21	Email exchange with Mary Fisher, and Andy Williams (on behalf of the Applicant)	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Email exchange regarding the design of the Coronation Avenue (number, spacings and frequency). Ref to further discussion with NCC tree officer to also get feedback.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Email received from NCC confirming that they are in agreement with the proposed replacement strategy for the Coronation Avenue, as per Appendix LV.2 to Written Question LV.1.8 at Deadline 1.</p>

Table 2-3- Record of Engagement in Relation to Part B

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
11/04/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting between NCC and HE to discuss design standards and final design details for Part B.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC confirmed that they use Highway England's DMRB for VRS design standards. It was agreed that the width of side roads was to be based on traffic counts.</p> <p>NCC confirmed a single carrier pipe could be adopted for drainage design.</p> <p>Highways England confirmed that close boarded fencing was the proposed option for segregating carriageways which are all at the same level. NCC queried if a hedgerow could be used. HE confirmed that this would be dependent on the available width and being able to secure access for maintenance.</p> <p>Highways England to develop an assessment for the requirements for the location selection of the accommodation bridge on Part B. Agreed to be assessed as part of the WCH Assessment Report (WCHAR) for Part B.</p>
07/06/18	<p>Email from Stephen Wigham (on behalf of Highways England) to Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer) at NCC.</p> <p>Email from Gary Park (Environmental</p>	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Stephen Wigham on behalf of HE emailed Gary Park of NCC to set out the proposed noise and vibration assessment methodology (including approach to defining operational Study Area) for Part B proposing baseline noise measurement locations and requesting information on specific planning policies, known local sensitive receptors (other than dwellings) and sources of known noise and vibration complaint.</p> <p>Highways England proposed to undertake a detailed level of assessment in line with the DMRB HD 213/11. The methodology to derive the Study Area for Part B</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Protection Officer) NCC to Stephen Wigham (on behalf of Highways England).	<p>in accordance with DMRB HD 213/11 was also proposed.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Response from Gary Park of NCC suggested slight changes to proposed measurement locations and confirmed that there are no known sources of noise and vibration complaint and stating that there are no known particularly sensitive receptors other than dwellings within the vicinity of Part B. He also confirmed that there were no issues were raised regarding the proposed assessment methodologies and that measurement locations were subsequently updated to reflect NCC's response.</p>
31/07/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Highways England provided an overview of the design development and drainage strategy on Part B, and confirmed this to be similar in approach to Part A.</p>
22/08/18	Email from NCC to Highways England.	<p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC PRoW Officer confirmed their support for the Broxfield overbridge option for Part B, subject to mitigation for the loss of the public right of way crossings to avoid transferring WCH road user risk to the B6341 and raising the possibility of downgrading the BOAT 13 to bridleway status. The Broxfield overbridge option was accepted by HE and the suggested mitigation accepted.</p>
26/07/19	Exchange of emails between Alex Grassam (on behalf of Highways England) and Karen Derham	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Submission of the results of the geophysical survey for Part B by Alex Grassam (on behalf of HE) to Karen Derham (NCC).</p> <p>Key Outcome</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	(County Archaeologist), NCC to Highways England.	<p>Following discussion, and based on the results of the geophysical surveys, it was agreed that archaeological evaluation in the form of trial trenching was required in two locations to inform the Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land adjacent to Scheduled Monument Camp at West Linkhall (NHL 1006500) • Land adjacent to North Charlton Medieval Village and Open Field System (NHL 1018348) <p>Confirmation from NCC that the proposed locations for trial trenching around South Charlton (which had been slightly amended from those originally suggested by NCC to account for the topography of the land) were acceptable to NCC.</p> <p>The scope of the archaeological evaluations was set out in WSIs which were revised by Alex Grassam following the conclusion of the Geophysical Walkover Survey. and submitted to NCC for approval. The final WSIs are submitted as Appendix 8.5: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation Part A [APP038] and Appendix 8.5 Draft Written Scheme for Investigation for Post DCO-Consent Trial Trenching Part B [APP295]</p>
28/09/18	Skype meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Meetings held with NCC's PRoW officer to discuss the principles of provision on Part B, with further developments to be presented at a later meeting. The Arriva X15 bus route which would be impacted by Part B was discussed. Highways England confirmed that the bus stop proposals were to be finalised.</p>
01/11/18	Meeting between EA, NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Initial meeting to introduce Part B of the scheme, in relation to flooding and water issues. This included a discussion around the modelling approach, Water</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		Framework Directive and generic design considerations. All agreed approach to be taken.
06/12/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Meeting to discuss the options for the proposed accommodation bridge at either Broxfield or Heckley Fence within Part B, to be shown at consultation.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>The meeting also discussed planning related matters with respect to proposals for development by Northumberland Estates (within Part B) and latest NCC activities on these matters. NCC undertook to review Parish Council report on Denwick bypass and provide update at next meeting on 23/1/19.</p>
23/01/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Discussions to review the options for the proposed accommodation bridge at either Broxfield or Heckley Fence within Part B. NCC confirmed that they were happy with the details provided, but queried what residents at Heckley Fence will think. A follow up meeting with NCC's PROW Officer was suggested.</p> <p>NCC to provide timescales for development of the Local Plan application.</p>
22/05/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Meeting held with NCC where PROW officer confirmed that, if the Heckley Fence accommodation bridge location were selected, the byway would need to be diverted.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>In addition, the proposed archaeology surveys within Part B were discussed. It was agreed that NCC would be advised of the dates of excavations, to keep the County Archaeologist involved.</p>
07/11/19	Meeting between NCC and	Key Topic

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Highways England	Meeting held to discuss proposed advance utility diversions. NCC made aware that National Grid and HE would be undertaking stakeholder meeting the following week for these works.
16/05/19	Telecon between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Telecon to discuss the flooding issues and modelling results of the Kittycarter Burn.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>All agreed modelling approach and refinements required – see entry for 29/05/19, below.</p>
29/05/19	Telecon between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Follow up to the meeting 16/05/19: a telecon to discuss the flooding issues and modelling results of the Kittycarter Burn.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>All agreed modelling approach was acceptable.</p>
29/01/19	Email exchange between David Feige (Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer), NCC and Sophie Lewis (on behalf of Highways England).	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>Confirmation from NCC that Part B will have '<i>will not have a significant effect on the special qualities of the Northumberland Coast AONB.</i>'</p>
17/06/19	Email exchange between Katherine Robbie (Senior Planning Officer, NCC) and Fearn Sims (on behalf of	<p>Key Issue</p> <p>HE sought confirmation of viewpoints for Part B.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Email exchange with NCC, resulting in NCC's confirmation that the suggested viewpoints for Part B were representative.</p>

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
	Highways England).	
18/12/19	Email to David Laux (Head of Technical Services) from Highways England.	Key Issue Further to meeting on 07/11/19, email setting out the design change relating to the maintenance access route for one of the proposed detention basins (DB22) at the southern end of Part B. NCC feedback on use of redundant PRow would aid design. This was changed with access now proposed from the main carriageway.
06/02/20 & 11/02/20	Email exchange between Karen Derham (County Archaeologist), NCC and Highways England.	Key Issue During consultation, it was agreed that outline WSI would be produced for off route sections of Part B for post-determination trial trenching to inform the requirement for archaeological mitigation. It was agreed that a second WSI was also required for a building recording on a non-designated farmstead (Charlton Mires) which will be demolished. Key Outcome The draft WSIs for Part B were submitted to NCC for consultation. Detailed discussion between Alexandra Grassam (on behalf of Highways England) and Karen Derham (NCC) were held over the exact locations and orientation of the proposed trial trenches identified in the draft WSI. This resulted in some amendments to the proposed locations of the trial trenches.
12/10/20	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	Key Issue Discussion of detailed review of the findings of the LVIA for Part B, comments provided by NCC
1/12/20	Email correspondence with NCC and the Applicant	Key Issue Detailed response provided to the comments raised by NCC on the LVIA for Part B. Issues currently under discussion.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes

- 2.1.5 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) the Applicant and (2) NCC in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

3 ISSUES

Table 3-1 - Issues related to the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)

Item	Draft DCO Item	Northumberland County Council Comment	Highways England Response	Status
1.	The Draft Development Consent Order			
2.	Articles			
3.	Requirements			

Table 3-2 – Issues related to the Whole Scheme

Item	Document	Paragraph Reference	Sub-section	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
1.	Chapter 1 – 4 of the ES [APP-036, APP-037, APP038, and APP039]	Whole Chapters	N/A			
2.	Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES for Part A [APP040]					

3.	Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES for Part B [APP041]					
4.	Chapter 6 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES for Part A [APP042] and for Part B [APP043]					

5.	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]			<p>12/10/20 – A lack of certainty as to the length of time footpaths would be closed, such that the assessment of associated viewpoints is unclear.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We are content that we now understand the basis of the assessment of effects on footpath users.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The assessment of effects on footpaths has been set out in Appendix 7.4 Public Rights of Way Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-219] and Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule Part B [APP-287]. This has included an assessment of the footpaths during the construction period where, as a result of the construction activities having been completed, sections of the footpaths may be re-opened either on their original alignment or as part of a diversion. Temporary diversions of PRow have not been identified on the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] therefore the effects on temporary diversions during the construction phase have not been assessed.</p>	Partially agreed - under discussion
			Assessment	<p>12/10/20 - Effects on the residential amenity should have been considered in line with current guidance. However, given the private amenity focus of the methodology used, this is</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The Applicant notes NCC comments on the inclusion of residential receptors within the assessment, this was identified during the scoping exercise to add additional detail to the assessment, the Applicant notes that a</p>	Partially agreed - under discussion

				<p>unlikely to change outcomes.</p> <p>5/1/21 - As indicated in our original comment, we are content that residential amenity is adequately considered in the assessment.</p>	<p>Residential Visual Amenity Assessment was not requested within the Scoping Report Part A [APP-338], Scoping Report Part B [APP-339] or identified within the Scoping Opinion received by PINS, Scoping Opinion Part A [APP-340] and Scoping Opinion Part B [APP-341]. Scoping Opinion Part A [APP-340] did however request that the Applicant agree the residential and non-residential receptors to assess, which was undertaken at the outset of the assessment, as agreed viewpoints, and is evidenced in Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Part B [APP-045].</p>	
			Methodology	<p>12/10/20 - An assessment of effects on communities should be provided, in line with LA107.</p> <p>The 'sensitivity assessment' which</p>	<p>1/12/20 - Viewpoints as agreed with NCC, as described in Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter</p>	Under discussion

				<p>considers this question is fine as far as it goes, but it does not grapple with an important issue. A key difference between LA.107 (and GLVIA3) and the old DMRB approach used here is the recognition that public visual amenity is the main focus – rather than private. This assessment still retains a focus on private amenity, which runs through from route selection into assessment.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We note that the Applicant declines to provide an assessment of effects on communities. Given that this is important to us, we will review the separate elements of the LVIA which are pointed to as covering this topic and will set out our judgement of these local impacts in the LIR.</p>	<p>7 Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045], include viewpoints representative of public visual amenity, available from publicly available locations, the purpose of which was to assess the effects in accordance with best practice.</p> <p>In addition, and to ensure that the effects on the residents of the scattered nature of the dwellings within the study area were appropriately assessed, the LVIA has included an assessment of those properties with a view of the Proposed Scheme. The Applicant therefore considers that the effects on public visual amenity has formed an integral part of the assessments as set out in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part A [APP-044], and Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045].</p> <p>8/1/21 – The Applicant will await NCC's position within the LIR and respond</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>12/10/20 - Part A effects on Fenrother, Causey Park, Causey Park Bridge and West Moor as places and communities are not considered and this has implications for the mitigation design.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The Applicant does not agree with NCC's conclusion that the LVIA impacts on the communities of Fenrother, Causey Park, Causey Park Bridge and West Moor as a result of the Scheme have not been assessed. The viewpoints agreed with NCC as described in Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045] are associated with publicly available locations, and are representative of local residents, rights of way and local roads, all of which make up a community. NCC identifies those communities which it considers have not been adequately assessed from a community aspects, however, the Applicant would refer NCC to Figure 7.6 Visual Effects Drawings Residential Properties Part A [APP-093], and Appendix 7.2 Viewpoints Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-217] which set out receptors associated with these communities.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

					<p>Those specifically identified by NCC include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fenrother – Viewpoint 36 • Causey Park - Viewpoint 29, 31, 32 • Westmoor – Viewpoint 27 <p>With respect to Causey Park Bridge, the Applicant acknowledges that as part of the viewpoints previously agreed with NCC there is no viewpoint associated with the Causey Park Bridge locality. However, the assessment does, within Appendix 7.3 Residential Visual Effects [APP-218] identify the effects on individual receptors (ref 56 – 64 and the Oak Inn – as identified on Figure 7.6 Visual Effects Drawings Residential Properties Part A [APP-093] that make up the community of Causey Park Bridge, which it feels is sufficient to determine the significance of effect.</p>	
			Methodology	12/10/20 - Landscape susceptibility judgements	1/12/20 - NCC has suggested that the landscape susceptibility judgements are not explained, in	Under discussion

				<p>should be reconsidered – following current guidance.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We note that the Applicant declines to review their assessment of landscape susceptibility in light of our comments and the guidance referenced. We will therefore undertake a detailed review of the landscape sensitivity judgements for the host landscape character areas and highlight any important differences in the LIR as this may have a bearing on the significance of landscape character effects.</p>	<p>relation to the determination of sensitivity. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with IAN 135/10, and sensitivity has been determined using descriptions set out in Annex 2 Table 1 Visual Sensitivity and Typical Descriptors, which at the time of writing was appropriate. Nevertheless, susceptibility for the landscape character areas is identified, alongside quality and value, in Table 7-15 - Local Landscape Character Area, in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-1 – Appendix 7.3 Landscape Effects Schedule Part B [APP-288].</p> <p>8/1/21 – The Applicant will await NCC's position within the LIR and respond</p>	
			Methodology	<p>12/10/20 - ZTVs including the screening effects of existing above ground features (e.g. woodlands,</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The preparation of the ZTV (referred to as the ZVI in IAN 135/10) has been used as a tool to determine the outer limits of the study area. In the absence of</p>	<p>Partially agreed - under discussion</p>

				<p>buildings/settlement) should be provided.</p> <p>5/1/20 - Achieving a more realistic (it is understood that complete accuracy is not feasible) ZTV study is not as difficult as this response suggests.</p> <p>We are content that the nature of the ZTV has not detrimentally affected the assessment outcomes – it is just less useful and informative than it could be.</p>	<p>available roadside information to build into the model, the ZTV has been supported with site based surveys, in line with the guidance in paragraph 3.35.1 LA107, which sets out:</p> <p>“Mapping existing screening features identified (i.e. tree lines, woodland, industrial/large buildings, etc.) in the ZTV to assist the visibility analysis is difficult to achieve accurately, therefore field surveys should be used to judge their effects.”</p> <p>This identifies that mapping the existing screening features is difficult to achieve accurately. In line with the guidance, the methodology for the LVIA, the ZTV, and establishment of the study area, and location of viewpoints has been supported by field surveys, in combination with discussions with NCC as set out Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Part A [APP-044], and Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation, Chapter 7:</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

					Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Part B [APP-045], has informed the assessment of views of the Scheme.	
			Design	<p>12/10/20 - The application needs to be clear in terms of what forms part of the scheme and what does not. Without this clarity, the assessments lack a solid foundation and there is uncertainty regarding which of the landscape proposals will be delivered.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We would prefer to see the landscape design (and e.g. details such as footpath treatments) set out clearly within the works plans and supported by a LEMP - as they are for the M25 Junction 10/A3 DCO application.</p> <p>The landscape mitigation plans and brief text in the CEMP appear too flexible and lacking in detail to be enforceable.</p>	<p>1/1/2/20 - Landscape proposals for the Scheme are illustrated in Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.11 Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145]) which form part of the DCO application, and are referred to in the relevant ES chapters, and mitigation proposals area set out within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [APP-346], refer to Table 3-1, S-L1 – S-L4. The Landscape design as set out in Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144]), including any additional vegetation clearance and replacement will be approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with NCC as per Requirement 5, Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [APP-014]. The Applicant therefore considers that</p>	Under discussion

					the landscape mitigation plans do form part of the DCO application, and is committed to their delivery.	
			Design	<p>12/10/20 - There is an ecological bias to the landscape design – both in the narrative to describe it and in the resultant design – for instance the replacement avenue design feature is disrupted by shrub planting around one of the crossings, but there was no need for that approach. No information is provided regarding species selection or management or consideration given to this in terms of mitigation of landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We note the clarification regarding the approach to further development of the landscape design.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The Applicant has, within Section 7.9 of Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part A [APP-044], and Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045] described measures that seek to avoid or reduce the effects of the Proposed Scheme on the aspect of landscape and visual amenity. Item g) in the list of bullets in paragraph 7.9.4 requires “Replace existing woodland blocks, hedgerows and individual trees lost during construction with native tree and shrub planting appropriate to character.” Issues of species selection would be addressed at the detailed design stage based on this requirement.</p> <p>Depending upon the species selected and the final design of the measures to deliver mitigation, the management of the mitigation features would be included within an updated CEMP, prepared and</p>	Under discussion

					<p>updated through the design phase and subsequently converted to a Handover Environmental Management Plan to secure the long term establishment of the mitigation measures required by the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>Within the development of the landscape design it is integral to ensure that other measures are also captured, and this includes the requirement to offset and/or replace habitats impacted by the Scheme.</p>	
				<p>12/10/20 - The consultation summary is relatively brief and some issues are raised to appear to have been given little consideration:</p> <p>Northumberland Coast AONB – consideration of the designated area is requested by NCC landscape planner (and the PINS Scoping Opinion) although it is identified that the NCC AONB officer was content that significant</p>	<p>5/1/21 – It has been agreed, via email communication, that the effects on the AONB can be scoped out of the LVIA.</p>	<p>Partially agreed - under discussion</p>

				<p>effects on the special qualities would not occur. The AONB is scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We are content for the AONB to be scoped out – we would not expect significant effects to arise.</p>		
				<p>12/10/20 - The consultation summary is relatively brief and some issues are raised to appear to have been given little consideration:</p> <p>Rock Conservation Area – Historic England requested a viewpoint from here. The applicant notes the area was visited and no viewpoint identified but the description is brief and it is not clear if the area shown by the ZTV to have potential views was included. The village and Conservation Area were</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The Applicant has described in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B [APP-045] in Table 7.4 – Summary of consultation, the actions taken to determine if a suitable viewpoint could be identified for the Rock Conservation Area, which included walking through the area. As no suitable viewpoint could be identified, the village and the associated Conservation Area were scoped out of the assessment.</p>	Under discussion

				scoped out of the assessment as no viewpoint could be found.		
				<p>12/10/20 - Point K at 7.5.1 notes no off-site or advance planting would occur but at 7.9.3 notes that advance planting would occur to the south west of the proposed Charlton Mires junction.</p> <p>5/1/21 - Applicant remains unclear as to whether advanced planting referenced is on or off site, whether it is required mitigation or whether it has been considered within the assessment of effects.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - Point K identifies that no off-site or advance planting would occur. However, ongoing discussions with local land owners and residents has identified the potential requirement for advanced planting to the south west of the Charlton Mires junction to provide screening to a residential receptor to the south west.</p>	
				12/10/20 - The application needs to be what vegetation removal forms part of the scheme and what does not. Without this clarity, the assessments	1/12/20 - Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045], has been based on the clearance of vegetation as set out in Figure 7.11 Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145], and this represents a	Under discussion

			<p>lack a solid foundation and there is insufficient certainty regarding effects of vegetation clearance.</p> <p>5/1/21 - The Applicant's response clarifies that the designs are not sufficiently advanced to identify a worst case scenario. Potential for further vegetation clearance at a later date is acknowledged and would be materially worse than considered within the current assessment.</p> <p>At this stage, areas where this may be required should be identified and effects assessed on that basis.</p>	<p>worst-case scenario. Should any additional vegetation be identified as requiring removal at the detailed design stage this will be subject to an appropriate evaluation of change, along with any mitigation measures to replace these landscape features, to determine if its removal would lead to a potentially significant effect.</p>	
			<p>12/10/20 - No detailed information is provided regarding landscape mitigation design. Species selection and management</p>	<p>1/12/20 - As outlined in Table 7-3 – Local Planning Policy Relevant to Landscape and Visual, and 7.9.13, point b, planting proposals will be designed in keeping with those</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

				<p>regimes will have a notable bearing on the degree of screening afforded by proposed hedgerows and consequently their effectiveness in mitigating effects on landscapes character and visual receptors.</p> <p>5/1/21 - The Applicant's response is vague and does little to address our observations. At this stage, from indicative species mixes and outline management plans are important to assist the evaluation of how effective proposed mitigation may or may not be and over what timescales.</p>	<p>found locally. Until the detailed design has been established, the management techniques cannot be fully set out. The replacement of hedgerows is in keeping with the existing vegetation framework and replacements have been set out on Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144].</p> <p>Depending upon the species selected and the final design of the measures to deliver mitigation, the management of the mitigation features would be included within a landscape scheme to be approved by the SoS following consultation with NCC, as part of Schedule 2, Requirement 5. In addition, the full CEMP, prepared and updated through the design and delivery phases would be and subsequently converted to a Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP) to secure the long-term establishment of the mitigation measures required by the Scheme.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>12/10/20 - The applicant has not adequately assessed effects on the landscape character.</p> <p>A full assessment of effects on landscapes should be provided and should, in turn, inform landscape mitigation designs e.g. single hedgerows are unlikely to be as effective at screening the widened road corridor as they are the present road.</p> <p>5/1/21 - In our view, landscape impacts have not been adequately considered in the LVIA or this response. We will set out our view of the potential impacts in the LIR.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - In line with the agreed methodology and guidance (135/10 and GLVIA 3), the assessment of the Scheme has been undertaken to determine the effects of the Scheme on the whole of the character area, identifying as appropriate, where specific impacts and effects have arisen. The assessment has subsequently informed the development of the mitigation proposals, for example to tie proposed woodland into existing woodland features e.g. to replace landscape features such as hedgerows where they tie into the wider landscape framework of similar features.</p> <p>The landscape assessment set out within Appendix 7.3 Landscape Effects Schedule Part B [APP-288] therefore considers the effects on the landscape character areas in their entirety. The comparatively low level of effect found is a consequence more than anything of the scale of the Scheme in comparison to the size of the LCAs.</p>	Under discussion
--	--	--	--	---	--	------------------

					<p>This provides a robust assessment of the likely landscape character effects.</p> <p>8/1/21 – The Applicant will await NCC's position within the LIR and respond</p>	
				<p>12/10/20 - Visual effects – Effects on local roads:</p> <p>In the main chapter text, users of local roads are assigned a Low sensitivity and scoped out of the assessment on the basis that they would be travelling at speed and focussed on the road rather than the wider landscape. This fails to consider passengers within vehicles or other road users such as cyclists or horse riders who may place greater value on the wider views.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The Applicant has, within Table 7.19 of Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] described the reasoning for scoping out local road users from the assessment.</p> <p>8/1/21 – The Applicant will await NCC's position within the LIR and respond</p>	Under discussion

				<p>This approach is inconsistent with the Part A assessment in which local road users are identified as being of Moderate sensitivity and inconsistent with the sensitivity assessment included within Appendix 7.4 which identifies some of the local road users as being of Moderate sensitivity.</p> <p>5/1/21 - The Applicant's response does not address our observations regarding inconsistency in the approach to the assessment of sensitivity for local road users nor the potential for significant effects. We will set out our view of the potential impacts in the LIR.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>12/10/20 - RoW plans indicate closure, but the LVIA treats the following routes as remaining open:</p> <p>129/009 and 110/003 – scoped out of assessment due to limited potential views from existing route</p> <p>5/1/21 - We are content that PRow 129/009 and 110/003 are being stopped up and therefore not assessed.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The reason for scoping 129/009 and 110/003 out of the assessment is incorrect in Table 7-19 – List of Visual Receptors Scoped Out of the Assessment in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] – the correct reason for these not being included is that these PRow are identified as being stopped up – as identified on Drawing 2.5 Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009].</p>	Partially agreed - under discussion
				<p>12/10/20 - No consideration is given to redirected PRow within the assessment. Routes are either treated as though unchanged or entirely scoped out. This affects the following routes:</p>	<p>1/12/20 - 110/004 – is identified as being subject to a diversion in the assessment of effects outlined in Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule - Part B [APP-287]</p> <p>110/010 is scoped out of the assessment as explained in Table 7-19 – List of Visual Receptors</p>	Under discussion

				<p>110/004</p> <p>110/010 – scoped out of assessment due to limited views from existing route</p> <p>110/013</p> <p>110/019</p> <p>129/004</p> <p>129/024</p> <p>129/013</p> <p>5/1/21 - The Applicant's comments are helpful but only partially clarify our observations. In some instances it appears diversions have been considered but in other places not.</p> <p>e.g. 110/010 is scoped out based on limited views from the existing route, however, it would join a new PRow extending south, parallel to</p>	<p>Scoped Out of the Assessment in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Part B [APP-045]</p> <p>110/013 – This route is partially stopped up with the diversion taking recreational users north towards Heckley Fence Overbridge and parallel to the A1 rather than immediately across. The assessment considers that users will experience close proximity views of the Scheme for a slightly longer duration of the route. The Applicant considers that the findings of the assessment are appropriate.</p> <p>110/019 – There is an omission in the assessment of the effects on this PRow.</p> <p>129/004 – The assessment describes the anticipated close proximity views of Charlton Mires junction at year 1 (via the diverted route). The effect reduces by Year 15 as it is anticipated that the vegetation between the footpath</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>the A1, as far as the Heckley Fence overbridge but this diversion is not given any consideration. 110/019 also joins this new PRow, but although the response acknowledges this omission, no further comment or assessment is provided.</p>	<p>and the Scheme would be more matured.</p> <p>129/024 – is to be stopped up as part of the Scheme and not assessed.</p> <p>129/013 – This route was scoped out of the assessment as it runs through a dense woodland and there are no views towards the Scheme. This route is also to be stopped up as part of the Scheme.</p>	
				<p>12/10/20 - Designated Landscapes – no assessment of effects on Areas of High Landscape Value or Areas of Intermediate Value is provided although their presence is noted in respect of their contribution to the value of the LCAs they fall within.</p> <p>The assessment notes that there is an Area of High Landscape Value within “northern extent of the</p>	<p>1/12/20 - Areas of High Landscape Value that are potentially impacted, are aligned with LCA 8c Charlton Ridge and 3c Rock, the landscape sensitivity of these LCAs recognise the quality and value placed on these landscapes within the identified sensitivity, and this reflects the criteria for landscape sensitivity in Table 7-6 - Landscape Sensitivity of Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045]. Locally designated landscapes being of a minimum moderate sensitivity. It should be noted that 3c Rock LCA is</p>	<p>Partially agreed - under discussion</p>

			<p>Study Area" (table 7-3) and that there would be direct effects. In reality most of the western half of study area is within the AHLV and it also falls within the site boundary at the northern end where direct effects may occur.</p> <p>5/1/21 - Further discussion with the policy officer in relation to how AHLV should be treated indicates that within Alnwick the AHLV and AILV designations were superseded by the Core Strategy, so the approach taken is by the applicant is acceptable.</p>	<p>considered to have a high sensitivity as is also located within the Northumberland AONB.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the assessment of landscape effects as outlined in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-045] is sufficiently detailed and robust.</p> <p>12/1/21 – The Applicant acknowledges NCC confirmation that no further assessment of the AHLV or AILV are required.</p>	
			<p>12/10/20 - Night-time – the assessment of night-time impacts is scoped out on the basis it would be little different from the existing road. Only limited consideration is given to</p>	<p>1/12/20 - In relation to Part B, consideration of the potential night-time effects are set out in paragraph 7.4.43 in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045]. The conclusion was that during construction the majority of works</p>	Under discussion

				<p>construction lighting and the introduction of the elevated Charlton Mires junction – both introduced into very dark areas – nor the medium-term effects of vegetation removal notably opening up views of the route compared to the baseline. This would result in an increased prevalence of lighting throughout the study area in the medium-term and has the potential to be significant.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We note that Applicant declines to provide an assessment of potential night-time impacts. We will review the elements of the LVIA which are referenced in this response and will set out our judgement of these local impacts in the LIR.</p>	<p>would be undertaken in daylight hours, but that some temporary lighting may be required at specific locations to facilitate some night-time working, but this would be unlikely to result in a significant effect.</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 7.4.31 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] a night-time assessment was scoped out during the operational phase as the Scheme is not anticipated to give rise to significant landscape and visual night-time effects. This is due to the fact that the route would remain unlit during operation (including Charlton Mires junction), and receptors would only experience fleeting views of headlights at night-time</p> <p>8/1/21 – The Applicant will await NCC's position within the LIR and respond</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>12/10/20 - Assessment Parameter 3 – limited consideration is given to this scenario. It is acknowledged that changes to landscape mitigation design would be limited however it is noted that changes include a notable reduction in width of hedgerow planting, particularly sections between the proposed Heckley Fence Accommodation overbridge and Charlton Mires junction. This is likely to result in the reduced effectiveness of proposed planting to provide screening in these areas.</p> <p>5/1/21 - The Applicant's response is vague and does little to address our observations. At this stage, from indicative species mixes and outline management plans are</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The Applicant has, within Table 7.28 of Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part B [APP-045] described measures that seek to avoid or reduce the effects of the Proposed Scheme in regard to Parameter 3.</p> <p>Depending upon the species selected and the final design of the measures to deliver mitigation, the management of the mitigation features would be included within an updated CEMP, prepared and updated through the design phase and subsequently converted to a Handover Environmental Management Plan to secure the long term establishment of the mitigation measures required by the Proposed Scheme.</p> <p>11/1/21 – The Applicant anticipates further discussion on this aspect</p>	Under discussion
--	--	--	---	--	------------------

				important to assist the evaluation of how effective proposed mitigation may or may not be and over what timescales.		
				<p>12/10/20 - The information provided with reference to the replacement of Coronation Avenue is not adequate, and spacings proposed are too distant, as most of the trees in Coronation Avenue which are to be removed are Category B. The LVIA is quite clear about the local importance of the Avenue as a landscape feature and the sparse nature of the replacement compared to what is removed is not explained in the application. The consultation report indicates local representations regarding the importance of replacing the avenue, and a stated</p>	<p>1/12/20 - In paragraph 7.8.10 of Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] it is acknowledged that 187 no. of the 300no. trees that form the Coronation Avenue would be removed by the Proposed Scheme. Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] identifies the indicative location of the replacement number, at regular intervals along the extent of the A1 where the presence of trees planted as part of the Coronation Avenue currently exist, totalling 38no. The Applicant expects further discussion as to the replacement of the Coronation Avenue .</p> <p>6/1/21 – A plan indicating both the trees removed and those to be replaced as part of the Coronation Avenue proposals has been</p>	Partially agreed - under discussion

				<p>intent to do so in materials published for consultation by the applicant.</p> <p>6/1/21 - A like-for-like is the right principle, subject to any other design considerations that are relevant. In terms of species we agree with your suggestion of a mix; uneven spacing, and suitability both for the roadside conditions and climate/pest resilience as key considerations to achieving a successful long-term result. Given the scale of the dual carriageway width then it will be more challenging to create an avenue character with smaller species – so I think size probably matters. The Applicant should also be guided by Barry (tree officer) who may have some views on species selection (or related matters).</p>	<p>prepared and is presented in Appendix LV.2 submitted at Deadline 1 having been discussed and agreed with NCC via email January 2021 and evidenced in the SoCG at Deadline 1.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				A quick sketch/draft on that basis and then we can discuss to resolve any issues before it is finalised		
				<p>12/10/20 - There is a lack of certainty and commitment in the landscape proposals, some of the bunds are described as 'desirable mitigation' and it is unclear whether this means they will be delivered or not. Quite a few proposed hedges are marked as being 'by agreement', and the replacement avenue is described as 'currently proposed' in the LVIA, and 'as appropriate and if required' in the scheme description – suggesting that it does not form a committed aspect of the proposals.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We note the helpful clarification that desirable measures have</p>	<p>1/12/20 - Landscape proposals as illustrated in Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.11 Vegetation Clearance Plan Part B [APP-145]) do form part of the DCO application documents, and are referred to in the relevant ES chapters, and mitigation proposals area set out within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-346], refer to Table 3-1, S-L1 – S-L4. The Application therefore considers that the landscape mitigation plans do form part of the DCO application, and as such, and is committed to their delivery.</p> <p>The applicant has set out in paragraph 7.5.1 points q and r of Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] that only those measures that are within the DCO Limits and that form the mitigation strategy are committed to and have</p>	Under discussion

				<p>not been included in the LVIA findings.</p> <p>The identification of 'desirable' measures is welcomed as an intent, but we feel it is important that all parties, including the ExA, understand that these do not form part of the scheme to be consented and can clearly understand the proposals without those measures.</p> <p>As discussed in our meeting, we feel it would be helpful if landscape plans which include only what is committed to should be produced. These should include any amendments (e.g. to Coronation Avenue) to be agreed as part of further discussions.</p>	<p>been incorporated into the assessment. Desirable measures or those that would require agreement with the adjacent landowner, as indicated on the Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095], have not been incorporated into the findings of the landscape and visual assessment.</p> <p>By including the locations of hedgerows and tree planting on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] and Figure 7.10 Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] it is providing sufficient assurances within the DCO that these measures are committed to. The Applicant is committed to delivering the measures required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p>11/1/21 – The Applicant is expecting further discussions on this aspect.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>12/10/20 - Mitigation for visual effects on the community at Causey Park Bridge appears to be inadequate given the proposals include no vegetative screening for a 4.2m high embankment with a noise fence on top openly seen at a distance of 100-150m from the street and homes. The red line boundary includes an area where planting could have been included to provide some screening.</p> <p>5/1/21 - A noise fence on top of an embankment is also an atypical feature and woodland would mitigate this. Also, given the land within the redline in this area there is no need for planting to be a linear strip.</p> <p>Not clear what Applicant response means in terms of practicalities, in particular in light of the response</p>	<p>1/12/20 - In establishing the landscape proposals as set out on Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095] the Applicant considered that provision of long linear belts of woodland type woodland would not be appropriate, as these are typically absent within the immediate area. The embankment and noise barrier would be within the line of sight from receptors within Causey Park Bridge and is anticipated to screen traffic movements. The planting comprises groups of trees that would replicate the existing nature of the vegetation to the west of Causey Park Bridge, reflecting the existing characteristics and interrupting views towards the Scheme.</p> <p>11/1/21 – The Applicant is expecting further discussions on this aspect.</p>	Under discussion
--	--	--	--	--	---	------------------

				regarding the landscape mitigation plans.		
				<p>12/10/20 - Mitigation for visual effects on the community at West Moor appears to be inadequate given the proposals include little vegetative screening for views from the street towards the proposed West Moor junction. The red line boundary includes an area where planting could have been included to provide some screening.</p> <p>5/1/21 - The photomontage referred to is positioned in a field to the north of the road and is further west than the majority of the homes. As a result it will benefit more from the proposed woodland planting. Closer homes and the road would see the overbridge from a more southwesterly angle and would receive little to no benefit from the proposed woodland. We</p>	<p>1/12/20 - Views to the south from properties at West Moor would be comparable to the existing outlook, with the A1, albeit widened, screened by hedgerows and hedgerow trees, that would stretch out into the distance. The West Moor Junction does have a robust planting strategy associated with it, the existing block off woodland screening views immediately to the east, and hedgerow and woodland planting establishing to the outer edge of the West Moor junction as identified on Sheet 15 of 19, Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095]. This view is supported by the preparation of a photomontage, refer to Viewpoint 27, Figure 7.11 Photomontages Part A 2 of 2 [APP-099], which demonstrates that, whilst the junction, overbridge and traffic would be visible immediately following construction, planting associated with the junction, would in Year 15, largely screen the</p>	Under discussion

				<p>would like to see improvements to the planting proposals either in the vicinity of the 'topsoil' storage indicted on the landscape masterplan and/or along the field boundary to the north of the road through Westmoor.</p> <p>Not clear what Applicant response means in terms of practicalities, in particular in light of the response regarding the landscape mitigation plans.</p>	<p>junction, with only a short section of the overbridge itself being visible crossing the A1, in views to the north east.</p> <p>11/1/21 - The location of photomontages was agreed with NCC, based on the viewpoints agreed with NCC following a site walkover. With reference to additional mitigation measures, north of the realigned local road, it would be possible to extend the planting associated with the western facing embankment slope to form a broader belt of shrubs that would reduce views to the north and the western edge of the West Moor Junction, however this would have the negative effect of reducing the open views to the north of the open countryside. The provision of a broader belt of shrubs would potentially reduce the impact of the main components of the West Moor Junction, although it would not screen the realigned local road, and the open aspect to the north would be lost, which would represent a</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>negative effect. Whilst the impacts would be reduced by the creation of the wider belt of planting, the negative impact of the loss of open aspects would, on balance, not change the findings of moderate adverse (significant) effects.</p> <p>The Applicant anticipates further discussion on this aspect.</p>	
				<p>12/10/20 - it appears that landscape and public visual amenity has not been a primary consideration in the route selection and design, with other matters such as cost, ecology and private amenity being given greater weight.</p> <p>5/1/21 - The Applicant response does not address our observation regarding the route selection and design.</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The Applicant has, within the assessment, and in the development of the landscape proposals, as set out in Figure 7.8 Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A, [APP-095], considered landscape and visual amenity, the visual receptors assessed having been done so from publicly accessible locations.</p> <p>Landscape and visual amenity forms an integral part of the route selection process undertaken by Highways England at previous stages of the Scheme, further information relating to the route selection process are set out in</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

					Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives	
				<p>12/10/20 - Landscape character – Some of the judgements for susceptibility appear counter-intuitive – for example character areas which are already influenced by roads tend to be identified in the assessment as being more susceptible than those which are not.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We note the helpful clarification that desirable measures have not been included in the LVIA findings.</p> <p>The identification of 'desirable' measures is welcomed as an intent, but we feel it is important that all parties, including the ExA, understand that these do not form part of the scheme to be consented</p>	<p>1/12/20 - As has been outlined above, the assessment as outlined in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] and supporting documents, has been undertaken in accordance with the guidance at the time, the primary guidance being IAN 135/10. This provides a robust assessment of the likely landscape character effects.</p> <p>11/1/21 – The Applicant considers that the information provided within the landscape mitigation plans provide sufficient and clear information relating to what is proposed within the Scheme, however anticipates further discussions on this aspect, including agreeing what, if any, additional information is required by NCC.</p>	Under discussion

				<p>and can clearly understand the proposals without those measures.</p> <p>As discussed in our meeting, we feel it would be helpful if landscape plans which include only what is committed to should be produced. These should include any amendments (e.g. to Coronation Avenue) to be agreed as part of further discussions.</p>		
				<p>12/10/20 - Landscape character – Assessments appear as expected in terms of the magnitude of effects. An exception is for area 38b(i) where the West Moor junction, widening of the road corridor, noise fences and embankments, cuttings, drainage structures would have a notably more dominant presence than the current road which is also set amongst mature vegetation, and would be</p>	<p>1/12/20 - The assessment of the magnitude of effect for LCA 38b(i) identifies that the landscape character area is of relatively low sensitivity, and the Applicant assumes that NCC are happy with this conclusion. The construction of the West Moor Junction would, during construction result in a minor adverse significance of effect, occurring on the edge of the character area with the proposed roundabouts at grade and the overbridge representing the only</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

				<p>expected to have more than a Negligible and Neutral effect character post-construction.</p> <p>5/1/21 - In our view, the localised impacts have not been adequately considered in the LVIA or this response, and we will set out our view of the localised impacts in the LIR.</p> <p>In the context of the whole character area we can agree the assessment of magnitude provided in the LVIA with significance subject to the outcome of our consideration of sensitivity.</p>	<p>elevated structure associated with the character area.</p> <p>Whilst the A1 would be a wider element within the landscape, and the overbridge would in the short term, and prior to the establishment of roadside vegetation, form a new perceptible feature within what is an otherwise flat landscape and one that is currently impacted by the existing A1. The overall impact on the perception of landscape character as a whole would not be greater than negligible, the bridge associated with the West Moor Junction forming a relatively discreet feature on the fringes of the character area, and in the context of the existing A1 which is a significant visual detractor within the landscape. On a landscape of low sensitivity, a negligible magnitude of impact would be neutral or slight adverse. The assessment has therefore concluded that the significance of effect on LCA 38b(i) would be neutral.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

					8/1/21 – The Applicant will await NCC's position within the LIR and respond	
				<p>12/10/20 - Designated landscapes – no assessment is provided for effects on Areas of High Landscape Value though the likelihood of direct adverse effects is recognised when describing potential effects.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We note that the Applicant declines to provide an assessment of effects on local landscape designations - which remain in place at present. However, given that the draft Local Plan is now at examination and these designations are not proposed to be retained or replaced we are content that impacts on the AHLV themselves are not</p>	<p>1/12/20 - In line with the agreed methodology and guidance (135/10 and GLVIA 3), the assessment of the Scheme has been undertaken to determine the effects of the Scheme on the whole of the character area, identifying as appropriate, where specific impacts and effects have arisen e.g. the removal of trees forming the Coronation Avenue. The assessment has subsequently informed the development of the mitigation proposals, for example to tie proposed woodland into existing woodland features e.g. River Coquet Valley, or to replace landscape features such as hedgerows where they tie into the wider landscape framework of similar features.</p> <p>Areas of High Landscape Value that are potentially impacted, are</p>	Partially agreed - under discussion

				considered and that they are considered in the assessment of value for character areas.	aligned with LCA 35a Coquet Valley and 38b Longhorsley, the landscape sensitivity of these LCAs recognise the quality and value placed on these landscapes within the identified sensitivity, and this reflects the criteria for landscape sensitivity in Table 7-6 - Landscape Sensitivity of Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044]. Locally designated landscapes being of a minimum moderate sensitivity. The Applicant considers that the assessment of landscape effects as outlined in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044] is sufficiently detailed and robust.	
				5/1/21 – With the exception of Viewpoints 6, 31, and 36 NCC are content to agree the assessment of effects on viewpoints Specific comments on the viewpoints which are not agreed are outlined below.	11/1/21 – It is agreed that with the exception of viewpoint 6, 31 and 36 the assessment of the effects on viewpoints are appropriate.	Under discussion

				<p>Site check at Fenrother that the assessment of effects, and the view shown, do not appear to take account of the proximity of the new road, or the proposed junction, which would be visible from here (near the woodland seen on the horizon to the left of the view shown at VP36). It would be helpful to have a visualisation from VP36 – including the junction -as without this effects on the settlement of Fenrother are hard to judge.</p> <p>5/1/21 - The response also usefully highlights a difference between the VP36 assessment in Appendix 7.2 and the assessment of effects on residents R78 and R79 in Appendix 7.3. It was the assessment of effects on nearby residents in year 1</p>	<p>1/12/20 - Fenrother – The Applicant has from the edge of the settlement of Fenrother undertaken an assessment of visual effects, against Viewpoint 36, the viewpoints having been agreed previously with NCC (refer to Table 7-4 – Summary of Consultation in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual, Part A [APP-044]). The assessment at Viewpoint 36, as outlined in Appendix 7.2 Viewpoints Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-217] recognises that the off-line section of the A1, and the junction at Fenrother would be perceptible within the landscape, and that as a result a significant effect (moderate adverse) would occur during the construction period. A significant effect (moderate adverse) would remain for users of the PRoW immediately following construction.</p> <p>A small number of individual receptors within Fenrother (R78 – R79) have been identified within Appendix 7.3 Residential Visual</p>	Under discussion

				and year 15 for VP36 which we felt underestimated the impact, and the assessment of effects for receptors R78 and R79 are more in line with what we would expect.	Effects Schedule - Part A [APP-218] as being subject to a significant effect (moderate adverse) where buildings and outdoor spaces are particularly orientated east, with views towards the Proposed Scheme. However, the proposed mitigation measures which include new blocks of woodland, establishment of hedgerows and hedgerow trees would in the Design Year (Year 15) reduce this to a slight adverse effect (non-significant).	
				5/1/21 - A similar issue arises with VP31 and R50 at Causey Park where the 'nearby residents' assessment for the viewpoint is much lower than the assessment for the nearest resident at R50.	11/1/21 – There would appear to be some discrepancy between the assessment of effects identified for R50, and 'residential receptors' associated with VP31. The specific assessment of the receptors at R50 should however take precedent, as this is specific to the closest residential receptors in the locality. The Applicant will review with the aim of confirming what the findings of the assessment should be and agree these with NCC.	Under discussion

				<p>12/10/20 - The assessment of effects on 6 appears to take inadequate account of the loss of vegetation and the way in which the road will appear closer and traffic more eye-catching without the mature hedges and trees. Given this and the proximity and width of view occupied by the proposals it is considered that Year 1 effects would be Large and Year 15 would be Moderate magnitude throughout – as illustrated by the photomontages provided.</p>	<p>5/1/21 - Viewpoint 6 – The Applicant has within Appendix 7.2 Viewpoints Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-217] set out the anticipated visual effects on this viewpoint. It has recognised that during construction and immediately following construction there would be a significant effect (large adverse for construction and moderate adverse for Year 1). The assessment recognises that the loss of vegetation would arise during construction and would endure into Year 1 within the context of the existing views of the A1, but that in Year 15 this is anticipated to reduce as a result of the re-establishment of roadside hedgerows and maturing of the trees to replace the Coronation Avenue. In relation to the replacement of these trees and in response to A.1 above, the Applicant is willing to discuss the final number and spacings of the replacement trees that would be</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

					<p>planted to restore the landscape feature.</p> <p>6/1/21 - A plan indicating both the trees removed and those to be replaced as part of the Coronation Avenue proposals has been prepared and is presented in Appendix LV.2 submitted at Deadline 1 having been discussed and agreed with NCC via email January 2021. The additional detail provided in the above updated plan, would substantially replace the trees that form the Coronation Avenue, reducing the potential effects identified as arising on Viewpoint 6, in line with the findings of the assessment outlined in Appendix 7.2 Viewpoints Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-217].</p>	
				<p>12/10/20 - Assessment judgements for diverted routes do not appear to fully take account of the differences between views from the current (baseline)</p>	<p>1/12/20 - As has previously been stated above, the assessment of effects on footpaths has been clearly set out in Appendix 7.4 Public Rights of Way Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-219] and</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

			<p>and views from the proposed route in reaching judgements. The changes are well described, but the judgements appear to reflect the degree to which the new road would be visible more than it reflects the degree of change to the visual experience as a result of the development (i.e. including the changes arising from the diversion).</p> <p>This affects the following routes:</p> <p>407/001 407/002 423/001 423/013 422/011</p> <p>It is noted that no commitment is given to minimising footpath closures or diverting any routes during construction. Given that this means</p>	<p>Appendix 7.2 Visual Effects Schedule Part B [APP-287]. This has included an assessment of the footpaths during the construction period, where, as a result of the construction activities having been completed, sections of the footpaths may be re-opened either on their original alignment or as part of a diversion. Temporary diversions of PRow have not been identified on the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-009] therefore the effects on temporary diversions during the construction phase have not been assessed.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided this additional information to reflect opportunities that may arise to re-open footpaths when the opportunity arises during the construction phase, and is provided for completeness.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that PRow 423/006 will be permanently closed.</p> <p>407/001 and 407/002 – would both be subject to a minor diversion and the tie-ins to the existing A1 would</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>severance of all routes crossing the A1 corridor for up to 2.5 years this may be a matter to be explored between HE and access officers in terms of phasing to keep closures to the shortest possible timescale. Given that St Oswalds Way is near the northern end of the works there are may be potential for a diversion.</p> <p>5/1/21 - We are content that the visual effects of the diversions have been taken into account for re-routed PROW; the assessment descriptions are a little ambiguous in places hence the misunderstanding.</p>	<p>be closed. The assessment in Appendix 7.4 Public Rights of Way Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-219] identifies that there would be awareness of construction however upon completion the existing features within the views associated with the footpaths would be unchanged and significant effects are not anticipated to arise.</p> <p>423/001 – The assessment in Appendix 7.4 Public Rights of Way Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-219] identifies that there would be significant changes to the outlook and experience for the users of the PROW, which includes the views of the Fenrother Junction, associated road elements and proposed mitigation planting.</p> <p>423/013 - The assessment in Appendix 7.4 Public Rights of Way Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-219] identifies that there would be a diversion and describes the changes to the outlook, carrying this through to the assessment of effects which are significant.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					422/011 – The assessment in Appendix 7.4 Public Rights of Way Visual Effects Schedule Part A [APP-219] identifies that there would be a diversion. This would be a short diversion to tie into Bywell Road at a similar location, such that the effects are not anticipated to be materially changed as a result of the diversion.	
5.	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES [APP046 and APP047]	Whole Chapter	N/A			
6.	Chapter 9 (Biodiversity) of the ES [APP048 and APP049]					
7.	Chapter 10 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES [APP050 and APP051]					

8.	Chapter 11 – 17 of the ES [APP051 to APP-063]					
9.	Appendices of the ES					
10	Construction Traffic Management Plan					
11.	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan					
12.	New local roads to be adopted			The trunk road and associated junctions, slip roads and their soft estate to remain with the Applicant. Private Means of Access will stay with the appropriate landowner.	Agreed to trunk road and associated junctions, slip roads and their soft estate will remain with the Applicant. Private Means of Access will stay with the appropriate landowner. The Applicant proposes for the following list of roads to be adopted by the local authority: <u>Part A</u> West View; De-trunked A1, from Priests Bridge, including Fenrother freeflow, to the	Under discussion.

					<p>new link road connecting to the new West Moor roundabout; Bywell Road.</p> <p><u>Part B</u></p> <p>Rock South Farm Access Road West Linkhall Access Road East Linkhall Access Road Local Authority roads to be handed back to landowner: Rock South Farm Road</p>	
13.	Design speed / speed limit			<p>New side roads leading from the Charlton Mires Junction are designed in line with NCC's Residential Roads and Footpaths in Northumberland design guidance but instead of a 20mph speed limit the national speed limit is appropriate</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that rather than imposing lower speed limits on the long straight or large radii bends, agreed traffic calming features could be incorporated as part of detailed design.</p> <p>Further discussions on 17/12/20 with NCC agreed that the national speed limit is appropriate and any traffic calming features will be agreed at detailed design.</p>	Under discussion.
14	Maintenance boundaries – at junctions, soft estate			<p>All infrastructure relating to the new trunk road and its supporting earthworks and</p>	<p>Critical infrastructure relating to the new trunk road and its supporting earthworks and soft estate will remain under the maintenance of</p>	Under discussion.

				soft estate to remain under the maintenance of the HE.	<p>the Applicant. Other earthworks supporting local access roads and management of its soft estate will form part of the handover to the local highway authority.</p> <p>Further principles defining the embankments and cuttings have been agreed and are set out in the DCO appendix TT.3</p> <p>Detention basins associated with servicing the trunk road will be the responsibility of the Applicant. There are two basins DB17a and DB17b which service Bywell Road and the new de-trunked link road respectively. These roads are to be adopted by the Local Highway Authority, while the basins would be maintained by the Local Authority.</p>	
15.	Abnormal loads and winter maintenance					
16.	Bus stops					
17.	Local road tie-ins					
18.	WCHAR and PRoW diversion routes					

19.	Anti-glare barrier type of parallel roads					
20.	TMM diversion routes					

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

WITHOUT PREJUDICE