

A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham

Scheme Number: TR010059

7.6A Statement of Common Ground with Northumberland County Council

Rule 8 (1)(e)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

April 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

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

Development Consent Order 20[xx]

**Statement of Common Ground with
Northumberland County Council**

Rule Reference:	8(1)(e)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010059
Doc Reference:	7.6A
Author:	A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	March 2021	Deadline 4
Rev 2	April 2021	Deadline 5

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT	1
1.2	PARTIES TO THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND	2
1.3	TERMINOLOGY	2
2	RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT	3
3	ISSUES	30

TABLES

Table 2-1 - Record of Engagement in Relation to the Whole Scheme	4
Table 2-2 - Record of Engagement in Relation to Part A	12
Table 2-3 – Record of Engagement in Relation to Part B	24
Table 3-1 – Issues related to the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	30
Table 3-2 – Issues related to the Scheme	32

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.
- 1.1.5. This SoCG seeks to address the issues identified by the ExA in the Rule 6 Letter dated 19 November 2020, namely:
- a.** Development Consent Order;
 - b.** Economic and Social effects (to the extent that it is relevant to the application, planning policy is also addressed in this section);
 - c.** Environmental Impact Assessment, including issues related to:
 - d.** cumulative effects;
 - e.** noise and disturbance (including construction and operational);
 - f.** Landscape and visual impact;
 - g.** Historic environment;
 - h.** Design;
 - i.** Air quality;
 - j.** Ecology, habitats and nature conservation effects;
 - k.** Traffic and transport;
 - l.** Effects on motorised road traffic;
 - m.** Effects on the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network and on cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders;
 - n.** Construction Environmental Management Plan.

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.

2 RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT

- 2.1.1. This Chapter provides a summary of the engagement to date between the Applicant and NCC in relation to the Scheme.
- 2.1.2. Any engagement with NCC in relation to the Scheme as a whole is recorded in Table 2-1, below. It should be noted that it was originally envisaged that Part A and Part B would be pursued as separate DCO applications. Any engagement with NCC that solely relates to either Part A or Part B is therefore recorded Tables 2-2 and 2-3, 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 Meeting held with NCC to provide an update on the progression of separate DCOs for Part A and Part B.</p> <p>Key Outcomes 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 The Applicant tabled typical scheme highway cross-sections on the Scheme.</p> <p>Key Outcomes The typical cross sections were debated, and high-level traffic management principles discussed with NCC.</p>
26/06/18	Highways Departures from Standards (DfS) design meeting between NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topics 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 Agreed design speeds, using Highways England's TD9 from Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). NCC agreed formal DfS could be generic for items associated with all side roads. HE to investigate design options for free-flow link at Fenrother. 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 Meeting held to discuss the maintenance boundaries for the Scheme based on records held by Highways England.</p> <p>Key Outcomes Traffic Management Principles raised by NCC at previous meeting of 24/05/18 now agreed. Maintenance at bridges still being reviewed.</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>
23/10/18	Email exchange between Highways England and NCC Ecologist	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Email exchange regarding the scope of the air quality assessment with regards to designated sites. Highways England stated that the relevant Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance (HA 207/07) does not include local wildlife sites in the assessment criteria. A comment from the Planning Inspectorate states that “The need to consider ... sensitive nature conservation sites should be established through consultation with the relevant statutory consultees” and therefore comment was requested from NCC.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC confirmed that they firmly believe that Local Wildlife Sites should be included as part of the air quality assessment.</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 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>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		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).
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 Technical Notes included as TT.3 in response to First Written Questions [REP1-032]). 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. NCC has subsequently confirmed their view that the Millhouse planning permission is not extant and therefore not capable of implementation [REP3-029].</p>
09/12/20	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>NCC stated that the Applicant had not produced plans showing drainage catchments in detail. This was discussed with NCC, and the Applicant highlighted that it has provided plans at Appendix B of Appendix 10.5 Drainage</p> <p>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. NCC agreed with this approach and 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>
05/01/21	Telephone conversation with Mary Fisher (NCC) and Andy Williams (on behalf of Highways England)	<p>Key Topics and Outcome</p> <p>Discussion over landscape and visual impacts. WSP set out the position of the Applicant and NCC responded on a without prejudice basis.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
6/1/21	Email exchange with Mary Fisher, and Andy Williams (on behalf of the Applicant)	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Email exchange regarding the design of the Coronation Avenue (number, spacings and frequency). Reference 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 [REP1-032].</p>
07/01/21	Call between NCC and drainage specialist.	<p>Key Topic and Outcome</p> <p>Follow up call to discuss surface water drainage strategy for the Scheme.</p>
14/01/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Detailed discussion around issues identified with the Rights of Way and Access Plans and DCO Schedules.</p> <p>Key Topic</p> <p>NCC stated that it was unclear from the DCO plans which roads are to be adopted and which are not. NCC also requested clarification as to the extents of stopping up of the existing A1 at the southern end of the detrunking section, at Priest's Bridge. NCC believe stopping up of highway should continue further south than is shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans.</p> <p>NCC stated that the extent of soft estate to be adopted is unclear, with respect to earthworks, verge, landscaping and detention basins.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>A scheme overview plan showing the extent of roads to be adopted was produced and issued to NCC on 08/02/21. Extents of stopping up of the existing A1 at the southern end of the detrunking section, at Priest's Bridge, amended as per NCC's suggestion. Updated Rights of Way and Access Plans issued at Deadline 02. [REP2-003].</p> <p>The Applicant is unable to confirm exact limits of soft estate to be adopted at present. Such details are subject to detailed design, with the exception of the detention basins for adoption which can and will be confirmed.</p>
15/01/21	Skype Meeting between Katherine Robbie (NCC), David Green, Nic Macmillan, and Amy Hallam (all WSP on behalf of Highways England).	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Call to review the NCC SoCG and agree next steps for how to progress it.</p> <p>Key Outcomes</p> <p>NCC Agreed to identify the relevant team members to progress the SoCG in the areas identified by the ExA in the Rule 6 Letter [PD-006].</p>
21/01/21 – 01/02/21	Virtual Meeting and Email	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Meeting to discuss agreement to transport modelling elements.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		Key Outcomes At the meeting the Applicant clarified the detail of flows presented in the ES, signposted NCC to the sections of the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] which detail the operational junction modelling and provided further information on the forecast model flows to enable NCC to undertake a full review.
23/01/21 – 25/01/21	Emails between Andy Williams (WSP on behalf of Highways England) and Mary Fisher and (on behalf of NCC)	Key Topics Correspondence relating to agreement on the SoCG text, and potential amendments to the mitigation strategy at Fenrother, West Moor, Causey Park Bridge. Key Outcomes The Applicant provided NCC with a copy of DMRB Vol 10 Part 0 for information relating to the Landscape and Environmental Elements within the Landscape Mitigation Masterplans/Plans
27/01/2021	Meeting via Teams. In attendance were Alex Grassam (WSP), David Green (WSP), Karen Derham (NCC) and Katherine Robbie (NCC)	Key Topic Review of the Table of Issues (Tables 3-1 and Table 3-2) within the SoCG [REP1-027], to establish the status of the issues. Key Outcomes All issues, and the status of those issues, as presented within the SoCG submitted at Deadline 3 are agreed, although still in draft.
01/02/21	Meeting via Teams. In attendance were Mike Collins (Historic England), Alex Grassam (WSP), Kevin Stubbs (WSP), Natasha Powers (WSP), Lowri McCann (WSP), Mark Stoneman (Highways England), Karen Derham (NCC), Shiona MacDonald (CJP), Mike Hutchinson (CJP). Email from Alex Grassam (WSP) to Mike Collins (Historic England) and Karen Derham (NCC).	Key Topic Presentation of the following proposed amendments to the Scheme and assessment of the impacts on the Historic Environment: 1. Earthwork Amendments 2. River Coquet Stabilisation Works 3. River Coquet Southern Access works. Key Outcome A general discussion was held on potential changes to the Scheme and the potential impacts on heritage assets. The changes are the subject of an ongoing consultation exercise. This will be the subject of further discussion before Deadline 4.
05/02/21	Meeting between Highways England and NCC Ecologist	Key Topic Highways England provided a summary of the findings of the Updated Biodiversity Air Quality DMRB Sensitivity Assessment to be issued to the ExA at Deadline 3 [REP3-010]. The updated assessment was in response to: – The change in the opening year from 2023 to 2024 (with associated changes to traffic flows and speeds);

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
	Natural England were also in attendance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– The release of updated air quality datasets (with associated changes in speed-banded vehicle emission rates and background concentrations); and– Reflection by the Applicant of how the updated DMRB guidance (namely LA 108 Biodiversity) has been applied to the assessment. <p>Highways England confirmed that the previous DMRB sensitivity assessment (Appendix 16.7 Biodiversity DMRB Sensitivity Test: The Scheme [APP-333]) concluded that there would be no significant effects (adverse or beneficial) to ecological receptors as a result of changes in operational nitrogen deposition.</p> <p>Highways England explained that the updated DMRB sensitivity assessment concluded that increases in nitrogen deposition may lead to significant adverse effects at the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Borough Woods Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and ancient woodland (impacted area of LNR contains the impacted area for the ancient woodland)– Well Wood ancient woodland– Veteran tree T682– Veteran tree T701 <p>Highways England confirmed that no significant effects to the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI were predicted as the Maintain air quality attribute threshold (1.7 kg N/ha/yr) is not predicted to be exceeded (maximum increase predicted to be 1.3 kg N/ha/yr).</p> <p>Highways England presented mitigation options where significant effects may occur as a result of operational nitrogen deposition. Highways England explained that LA 105 Air Quality (the updated DMRB guidance) states the following mitigation measures should be assessed for suitability, alongside any other proposed viable mitigation measures for the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. vertical barrier of at least 9m in height2. speed limits adjusted for air quality <p>Highways England explained that preliminary discussions within the project team concluded both options to be unviable for the ecological receptors under consideration.</p> <p>Following the discussion of mitigation options, opportunity for compensation was discussed. Highways England confirmed that the following compensation opportunities had been identified and were to be explored further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Both veteran trees are located within grazed grassland fields (believed to be sheep). Highways England suggested the installation of stock fencing around the tree to reduce the pressures of grazing.- Highways England enquired regarding other known pressures on the Borough Woods LNR/ancient woodland and Well Wood ancient woodland, where it may be possible to develop intervention measures to “offset” the impacts of increased operational nitrogen deposition predicted as a result of the Scheme. <p>Key Outcomes</p> <p>NCC did not provide comment on the findings of the air quality assessment. With regards to the assessment for the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI, NCC confirmed that they would defer to Natural England for this matter.</p> <p>NCC stated that their Country Parks Team may be able to assist with the identification of potential mitigation and compensation opportunities with regards to the predicted impacts to Borough Woods and Well Wood. Highways England and NCC agreed to engage further to identify potential mitigation and compensation opportunities.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		<p>Key Topic</p> <p>NCC raised a query about the impact to the white-clawed crayfish population within the River Wansbeck as a result of predicted increases in nitrogen deposition from vehicular emissions as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>Highways England confirmed that LA 105 Air Quality (the DMRB guidance) screens out impacts to watercourses (rivers and streams) as there is no critical load for nitrogen for this habitat and insufficient scientific information to inform an assessment. In addition, LA 105 does not require an assessment at the species level. However, Highways England confirmed it would not be expected that the Scheme would result in levels of increased nitrogen deposition that would acidify the watercourse to a level that would adversely impact the crayfish population. Highways England reviewed this matter further following the meeting and provided a response via email on 10/02/21 (see below).</p>
10/02/21	Email from Highways England to NCC Ecologist	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Follow up email to the meeting held on 05/02/21 (see above) and the query from NCC regarding the impacts to white-clawed crayfish as a result of predicted increases in in nitrogen deposition from vehicular emissions as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Highways England confirmed that this matter was discussed with internal aquatic ecologists, who confirmed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - White-clawed crayfish occur in areas with relatively hard, mineral-rich waters on calcareous and rapidly weathering rocks. The white-clawed crayfish is principally found in clean, alkaline waters. Most populations in the British Isles are associated with waterbodies in areas with chalk, limestone or sandstone deposits where calcium (5 mg l⁻¹ minimum) and pH (6.5–9.0) levels are suitable. - A study by Durham University of the white-clawed crayfish distribution with the River Wansbeck indicates that the water Ca²⁺ levels range between approx. 40-60 mg/l and Mg²⁺ between 8-15 mg/l. This would give an approximate General Hardness (GH) of 174 mg/l, which would indicate hard water and therefore a high buffering capacity. The pH of the river ranges between 7.1 and 8.1. The hardness of the drinking water of the area (Morpeth) is also classed as hard (>200mg/l). The underlying geology of the area is understood to predominantly be sandstone with some limestone, which tallies with the water hardness. - This gives confidence in stating that the buffering capacity of such water, together with dilution/flushing rate, will mean that an increase in atmospheric nitrogen deposition resulting from the Scheme will not result in a pH increase of the water within the River Wansbeck. <p>Overall, Highways England confirmed the literature review provides confidence in scoping out significant adverse effects to the population of white-clawed crayfish within the River Wansbeck as a result of the predicted increase in nitrogen deposition from vehicle emissions during the operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Key Outcomes</p> <p>NCC provided agreement with the conclusions drawn in relation to the impacts to white-clawed crayfish within an email dated 16/02/21.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
15/02/21	Meeting via Teams between Katherine Robbie (NCC Planning), Kevin Mavin (NCC Streetworks) and Matthew Payne (NCC Highways) with HE, CJP and WSP team.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Discussion on the content of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [REP3-015 and 016].</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>It was agreed that the OCTMP submitted at Deadline 3 had been updated in line with previous feedback from the NCC Streetworks team. Some concerns raised on the diversion route onto the A697 and volume of HGVs impacting on Longhorsley and other villages along the route. WSP confirmed that traffic flows modelled during construction do not identify a significant increase. NCC and traffic team to liaise on model. CJP Traffic Management liaison officer swapped contact details with NCC Streetworks representative.</p>
16/02/21	Meeting via Teams between David Green (WSP, on behalf of HE) and Katherine Robbie and Matthew Payne (NCC)	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Discussion of progress of the NCC SoCG.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>It was agreed that the SoCG submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-017] would be updated and re-circulated to progress the document. Good progress over Heritage and Landscape was noted, albeit with some issues still outstanding.</p>
17/02/21	Meeting via Teams between Katherine Robbie (NCC Planning) and David Brooks (NCC PRoW) with HE and WSP team.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Discussion on the Public Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-003] and dDCO [REP1-005 and 006].</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>It was agreed that the PRoW plans submitted at Deadline 1 had been updated in line with previous feedback from the NCC PROW team. NCC wanted to review the latest submission of the plans at Deadline 2 [REP2-003] and if there were any minor corrections then these would be put in writing at Deadline 4 by NCC.</p>
02/03/21	Meeting via Teams with David Laux and Matthew Payne (NCC Highways) with HE, CJP and WSP team.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Concerns from NCC on the detail and extent of the highway boundary, drainage and soft estate across the scheme. Also a discussion about the nature of the Stopping Up Orders and highway ownership.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC generally content with the extent of the highways to be adopted across both Parts A and B.</p> <p>The elements previously annotated in the Proposed Highway Adoption & Maintenance Responsibilities Plans [REP3-003] and the Maintenance Boundary Technical Note [REP1-049] were agreed with NCC. The Applicant undertook to provide further clarification to NCC on elements of soft estate in Part A to be adopted, following which the plans and Technical Note for Part A will be updated and submitted at Deadline 6.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		<p>The strategic road network currently includes the layby at West Lodge. The Applicant confirms that it is proposing a similar solution to that at Priests Bridge and will discuss this further with the NCC Officers. If an update to the Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-003] is required, this will be re-submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>A date for a follow up meeting with NCC Officers is planned for 09/04/2021.</p> <p>Part B East Linkhall Road – WSP confirmed change to 2-lane but note potential pinch-point.</p> <p>Part B West Linkhall Road – NCC request for pinch-point to be shortened and narrowed. WSP to prepare new General Arrangement (GA).</p> <p>Part B Rock South Access Road – NCC request to narrow track width. WSP to prepare new GA.</p> <p>Drainage – NCC request for all of the above to have positive drainage system and for all detention basins to be combined and under HE maintenance. WSP to work up amendments for Highways England to consider with Operations team and report back to NCC at next meeting w/c 15/03/21.</p>
09/03/21	Skype call between David Green (WSP, on behalf of the applicant) and Katherine Robbie (NCC Case Officer).	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Discussion on the progress of the SoCG.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>A number of areas of common ground were agreed as set out in Table 3-2, below.</p>

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

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
26/09/16	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic and Outcome</p> <p>De-trunking of A1 from Priests Bridge to Bockenfield, including need to consider condition of asset for handover and potential changes to cross section. HE to provide information from previous de-trunking schemes.</p>
31/10/16	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic and Outcome</p> <p>Traffic Modelling reviewed. De-trunking principles discussed.</p>
10/03/17	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic and Outcome</p> <p>De-trunking principles discussed. Asset condition surveys and information required by NCC relating to existing carriageway, drainage and structures confirmed</p>
18/05/17	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic and Outcome</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		Further discussion on de-trunking principles and data required. Discussion on DCO process and roads which may be for adoption by NCC
28/07/17	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic and Outcome Further discussion on de-trunking principles. HE to provide cut off date of when in programme de-trunking principles need to be agreed.
20/09/17	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic and Outcome Preferred route announcement discussed. Detrunking of A1 discussed. NCC agreed to work with WSP regarding design for de-trunked section. Condition surveys of de-trunked section also discussed as well as NMU / cycling. Examples of previous de-trunking schemes to be provided by HE. NCC indicated southern extent of de-trunking only to extend to Jacksons Garage. NCC confirmed design of side roads to be to DMRB.
20/10/17	Highways Technical Meeting for Part A between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topics Meeting held with NCC. Key Outcomes Issues discussed were as follows: <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 Coting 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 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); – 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

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>
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 and ride is not expected to be required on the (then) M2F 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 22/05/19 & 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 their removal in the Scheme design to reduce the risk of misuse once requirements had been confirmed with Arriva (email 14/08/2018).</p>
22/02/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>General Meeting with NCC including 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>HE provided NCC with A556 Knutsford to Bowden de-trunking example; four lane single carriageway reduced to two lane single carriageway.</p> <p>In addition, the outcome from stakeholder meetings held with Eshott Airfield and Millhouse Developments were discussed with the NCC Planning team.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
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 was 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 Ecologist and AONB Officer.	<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>
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 Highway 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>HE to provide information on scope of pavement surveys on de-trunked section.</p> <p>It was agreed that the existing highway design suppresses use by cyclist and pedestrians. There is opportunity to improve/increase cycle and pedestrian provision on the de-trunked section. Highways England indicated they were looking to progress this through designated funding.</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 Topic and Outcome</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>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
24/04/18	Email from Highways England to Specialist Planning Services – Northumberland County Council.	Key Topic and Outcome Consultation via email on the scope of the assessment relating to nighttime assessment. The omission of nighttime 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)	Key Topics Follow up to the meeting 07/03/18 in respect of viewpoints. Revised viewpoint location plans were submitted to NCC for agreement Key Outcome 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).
10/05/18	Teleconference between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topics 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. Key Outcome 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. HE confirmed that these issues could be addressed through the CTMP.
10/05/18	Email exchange between Katherine Robbie (NCC Planning Services) and Fearn Sims (on behalf of Highways England).	Key Topic and Outcome Confirmation of joint site visit between Highways England NCC to review proposed viewpoints for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
10/05/18	Email from Glenn Shaw (Buildings Conservation Team), NCC to Highways England	Key Topic and 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 and Outcome 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.

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
26/06/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topics</p> <p>Meeting with NCC to discuss highway maintenance boundaries on Part A. As-builts for Parkwood subway on Part A confirmed as previously handed over.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <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). NCC endorsed approaches for pavement survey residual life assessment and drainage assessment. HE confirmed condition survey for assets other than pavement and drainage will be undertaken at the appropriate time.</p> <p>NCC agreed to provide a proposed typical section for the de-trunked A1. Noted that carriageway may need to be resurfaced after removal of red hatched areas.</p> <p>HE confirmed cycleway will be included in the new link road on east side linking to the de-trunked A1.</p>
28/06/18	Email from Dale Rumney (NCC) to Ellie Briggs (on behalf of Highways England)	Email including copy of typical cross-section to illustrate the County Council's preferred layout for the de-trunked section of A1, incorporating narrowing of the carriageway and provision of both a footway and cycleway.
30/07/18	Email from Highways England to NCC Ecologist.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Email to NCC regarding impacts to the Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS) as a result of Part A. Highways England confirmed that Part A would result in the loss of a small area of the LWS to facilitate the construction of a new bridge across the River Coquet and associated infrastructure. Highways England explained that the mitigation scheme would likely involve compensatory planting at a minimum of like-for-like (in area) to compensate for the loss. The Applicant confirmed that they would welcome comment.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>NCC provided a response via email on 03/08/2018 (see below).</p>
31/07/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topics</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>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
30/07/18 & 03/08/18	Email exchange between Highways England and from David Feige (NCC Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer).	<p>Key Topics Confirming the approach to mitigating the impacts of Part A on the Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</p> <p>Key Outcome 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>
03/08/18	Email from NCC Ecologist to Highways England	<p>Key Topic Reply to the email dated 30/07/2018 (see above) from Highways England regarding the impacts to the Coquet River Felton Park LWS as a result of Part A and the proposed compensation.</p> <p>Key Outcome NCC confirmed that whilst the area of woodland habitat within the LWS that would be impacted by Part A is not designated as ancient woodland, it supports ancient woodland indicator species and lies immediately adjacent to ancient semi-natural woodland that is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). As such, NCC stated that they would consider a 1:1 replacement to be a “<i>very long way short of what would be appropriate in this case.</i>”</p>
05/08/18 & 09/09/18	Email exchange between Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer), NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topics Email exchange confirming the location of sensitive receptors in relation to Part A (Northgate Hospital Site and Tritlington School).</p> <p>Key Outcome 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>
16/08/18	Email – Specialist Planning Services – Northumberland County Council.	<p>Key Topics 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 Revised locations accepted by NCC by email 16/08/18.</p>
24/08/18	Meeting between Nick Best, NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topics Meeting held to discuss the scope and content for the Cultural Heritage assessment for the ES (Part A).</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		<p>Key Outcome 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 proportionate 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.
31/08/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topics 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 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. The PRoW southern tie-in principles at the River Coquet within Part A previously discussed on 18 January 2018 were agreed. HE indicated investigating the option of including cycleway provision for the whole length of de-trunk and new link to Felton</p>
05/09/18	Meeting between the EA, NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topics 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 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 Topics 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>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		Key Outcome 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 on 18/12/2020 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.
17/10/18	Exchange of emails between Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer, NCC) and Nicola Bolton (on behalf of Highways England)	Key Topics Alternative noise measurement locations suggested by Highways England due to previous consultation feedback and proposed additional construction compound. NCC stated that the proposed changes / additions to the noise measurement locations were acceptable. Key Outcome Noise measurement locations were subsequently implemented in the surveys.
23/10/18	Email from David Feige, Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer, NCC to Highways England	Key Topic and Outcome Email confirming that Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) should be included within the environmental assessment of the impacts of Part A.
01/11/18	Meeting between the EA, NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic 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. Key Outcome The work required for the DCO application was agreed.
07/11/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic Meeting to present to NCC the proposed environmental mitigation measures for Part A. Key Outcome 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. 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. HE noted that cyclist and environmental options for designated funds are being developed for review at the end of the year

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
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>Ownership and maintenance of hedges in this section to be confirmed. NCC re-iterated importance of cycleway on de-trunked section. HE confirmed inclusion of cycleway in DCO application.</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 and Outcome</p> <p>Meeting held with NCC to discuss Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). This document is intended to accompany the SoCG and sets out the details of the de-trunking aspects of Part A that are to be agreed.</p> <p>NCC requested written confirmation that cycleway would be provided from West Moor to Tritlington junction</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 accepted by HE and were incorporated into the subsequent WSI [APP-225].</p>
05/09/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</p> <p>Meeting held to discuss advanced construction activities within Part A, comprising the demolition of Northgate House and National Grid Diversions.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		<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>
05/12/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topic and Outcome HE to provide NCC with copy of Memorandum of Understanding for de-trunking section. Discussion regarding progress with designated funds for cycleway</p>
07/11/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topic and Outcome 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>
12/02/20	Meeting between NCC and Highways England	<p>Key Topic and Outcome Copy of draft Memorandum of Understanding for de-trunking section now received by NCC. NCC to review and respond</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>
13/02/20	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic Meeting held to discuss the progress of archaeological works at Causey Park (within Part A.)</p> <p>Key Outcome 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>
15/02/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Discussion regarding the Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Key Topic Discussed the concerns previously raised by NCC and the subsequent responses provided by the Applicant ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>Key outcome Unable to close out most issues during the meeting, with both parties taking actions away. NCC to confirm whether or not their concerns have been fully addressed and items can be closed out.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
17/02/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Discussion regarding the Public Rights of Way proposals.</p> <p>Key Topic Follow up meeting to discuss the changes made to the Rights of Way and Access Plans and dDCO Schedules following comment from NCC.</p> <p>Key outcome NCC's Infrastructure Records Manager confirmed that they are satisfied with the Applicant's responses and updates to the Rights of Way and Access Plans and dDCO Schedules, and that there are only a couple of minor issues outstanding.</p>
03/03/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Key Topic Meeting to discuss the proposed maintenance boundaries</p> <p>Key outcome NCC raised issues surrounding the stopping up of highways near Detention Basin 20 and Highlaw Junction, particularly with regard to ownership following completion of the scheme and whether this should be covered off in the DCO. The Applicant took this issue away and is to respond.</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 Meeting between NCC and HE to discuss design standards and final design details for Part B.</p> <p>Key Outcome NCC confirmed that they use Highway England's DMRB for VRS design standards. It was agreed that the width of side roads were to be based on traffic counts. NCC confirmed a single carrier pipe could be adopted for drainage design. 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. 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	Email from Stephen Wigham (on behalf of Highways England) to Gary Park	<p>Key Topic 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</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
	<p>(Environmental Protection Officer) at NCC.</p> <p>Email from Gary Park (Environmental Protection Officer) NCC to Stephen Wigham (on behalf of Highways England).</p>	<p>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 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 Topic and 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 Topic</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.</p> <p>Key Outcome</p> <p>The Broxfield overbridge option was accepted by HE and the suggested mitigation accepted.</p>
28/09/18	Skype meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</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 Topic</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 Framework Directive and generic design considerations. All agreed approach to be taken.</p>
06/12/18	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	<p>Key Topic</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>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		Key Outcome 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.
23/01/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic 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. NCC to provide timescales for development of the Local Plan application.
29/01/19	Email exchange between David Feige (Principal Ecologist and AONB Officer), NCC and Sophie Lewis (on behalf of Highways England).	Key Topic 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> '
16/05/19	Telecon between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic Telecon to discuss the flooding issues and modelling results of the Kittycarter Burn. Key Outcome All agreed modelling approach and refinements required – see entry for 29/05/19, below.
22/05/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic 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. Key Outcome 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.
29/05/19	Telecon between NCC and Highways England.	Key Topic Follow up to the meeting 16/05/19: a telecon to discuss the flooding issues and modelling results of the Kittycarter Burn. Key Outcome All agreed modelling approach was acceptable.
17/06/19	Email exchange between Katherine Robbie (Senior Planning Officer, NCC)	Key Topic HE sought confirmation of viewpoints for Part B.

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
	and Fearn Sims (on behalf of Highways England).	Key Outcome Email exchange with NCC, resulting in NCC's confirmation that the suggested viewpoints for Part B were representative.
26/07/19	Exchange of emails between Alex Grassam (on behalf of Highways England) and Karen Derham (County Archaeologist), NCC to Highways England.	Key Topic Submission of the results of the geophysical survey for Part B by Alex Grassam (on behalf of HE) to Karen Derham (NCC). Key Outcome 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: <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) 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. 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]
07/11/19	Meeting between NCC and Highways England	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.
18/12/19	Email to David Laux (Head of Technical Services) from Highways England.	Key Topic 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 agreed to the proposed design change at Liaison meeting 05/12/2019. 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 Topic 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 agreed amendments to the proposed locations of the trial trenches.

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
12/10/20	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	Key Topic and Outcome Discussion of detailed review of the findings of the LVIA for Part B [APP-045], comments provided by NCC
01/12/20	Email correspondence with NCC and the Applicant	Key Topic Detailed response provided to the comments raised by NCC on the LVIA for Part B [APP-045]. Issues currently under discussion.
14/01/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Detailed discussion around issues identified with the Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-003] and DCO [REP2-004 and 005] Schedules.</p> <p>Key Topic NCC stated that the proposed local access roads serving East Linkhall, West Linkhall and Rock South Farm should not have 20mph speed limits are applied. They should be national speed limit.</p> <p>NCC took the view that it was unclear from the DCO plans which roads are to be adopted and which are not. Also agreed that the existing unclassified local access road (U3004) serving Rock South Farm is not shown as being stopped up on the Rights of Way and Access Plans, but the road is to be handed over to adjacent landowners as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Key Outcome The Applicant confirmed that the national speed limit is to be applied to the proposed local access roads serving East Linkhall, West Linkhall and Rock South Farm. Agreed to update the Traffic Regulation Plans accordingly.</p> <p>A scheme overview plan showing the extent of roads to be adopted was produced and issued to NCC on 08/02/21.</p> <p>The Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-003] and DCO Schedules [REP2-004 and 005] were updated for Deadline 02 to show existing unclassified local access road (U3004) serving Rock South Farm was updated to be stopped up.</p>
15/02/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Discussion regarding the Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Key Topic Discussed the concerns previously raised by NCC and the subsequent responses provided by the Applicant ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>Key outcome Unable to close out most issues during the meeting, with both parties taking actions away. NCC to confirm whether or not their concerns have been fully addressed and items can be closed out.</p>
17/02/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Discussion regarding the Public Rights of Way proposals.</p> <p>Key Topic Follow up meeting to discuss the changes made to the Rights of Way and Access Plans and dDCO Schedules following comment from NCC.</p>

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
		<p>Key outcome NCC's Infrastructure Records Manager confirmed that they are satisfied with the Applicant's responses and updates to the Rights of Way and Access Plans and dDCO Schedules, and that there are only a couple of minor issues outstanding.</p>
24/2/21	Email and telephone calls with NCC (Mary Fisher) and the Applicant	<p>Details discussed on the updates to the agreement for landscape and visual issues</p> <p>Key Topic Issues of sensitivity of landscape character, impacts on communities and mitigation measures to reduce the effects were discussed.</p> <p>Key outcome Agreement was reached on a number of points, including confirmation of the mitigation strategy for Parts A and B, and the absence of material differences between the assessment undertaken by the Applicant and NCC.</p>
03/03/21	Meeting with NCC and the Applicant	<p>Key Topic Meeting to discuss the proposed maintenance boundaries</p> <p>Key outcome The Applicant took the following actions away:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – East Linkhall Access Road to be widened from 4.5m wide single lane with passing bays to become 6.0m wide two lane carriageway. – Length of existing road to the north of East Linkhall Access Road tie-in (Ch.60200 to Ch.603000) is to be de-trunked – dDCO Schedules to be updated accordingly. NCC ask that Shipperton Bridge to be maintained by HE, similar to the arrangement at Priest Bridge on Part A. – West Linkhall Access Road pinch point – length and width of single lane section of road to be reduced if possible. – Turning head to be provided at northern end of West Linkhall Access Road. – Rock South Farm Access Road carriageway width to be reduced from 4.5m. – Positive drainage to be provided on access roads for East Linkhall, West Linkhall and Rock South Farm.

2.1.3. 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.	Articles	Other than the Articles discussed below, NCC is satisfied with the provisions of the draft DCO and consider that they are satisfactory and appropriate.	Agreed.	Under discussion.
2	7 – (Limits of Deviation)	NCC is content with the limits of deviation contained in Article 7, subject to NCC being consulted on any proposed amendments made under this article.	Agree. In practice, NCC would be consulted on any amendments made under this Article prior to their submission to the Secretary of State.	Under discussion.
3	12 – Street works	Art 12(1) – NCC is satisfied that this Article is appropriate provided that the Applicant/contractor complies with the requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the New Roads & Street Works Act 1991 and specifically S60 – General duty of undertakers to cooperate. Any streets outside the Order will be subject to the requirements under the Northumberland County Council Works Permit Scheme.	Agreed. This requirement will be complied with.	Under discussion.
4		Art 12(1)(b) – It is agreed that the Article should be restricted to specific streets as set out in a Schedule although the Schedule should include the Road Classification (including C and U road classification) for clarity and ease of reference.	It is not considered that it is appropriate to include a Schedule in relation to the powers under Article 12. The definition of “streets” is very wide, and the list would require to be very extensive. The extent of affected streets is clear from the application plans.	Under discussion.
5		It is agreed that the powers shall be exercised with the consent of the Street Authority subject to consultation to ensure the Street Authority is fully aware of the powers being exercised to ensure no conflict between other authorisations from the Street Authority under their existing powers.	These are standard powers required for construction of the road which would be authorised by the DCO. It is not appropriate for such works to be subject to the consent of the street authority. The protection of NCC is protected by other provisions in the Order.	Under discussion.
6		Subject to the points raised above, it is our view that the Article is acceptable combined with the requirements for the Applicant/Contractor to adhere to the requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.	The Applicant agrees that the requirements of the 2004 Act and the 1991 Act will be complied with.	Under discussion.
7	Article 16 – Permanent stopping up and restriction of use of streets, public	Art 16(3)- NCC’s preference is that the term “stopping up” to be used consistently through the document. This should be preceded by the word temporary or permanent depending on what is being proposed.	It is understood that NCC now accept that it is appropriate that there is reference to extinguishment of public rights of way.	Under discussion.

Item	Draft DCO Item	Northumberland County Council Comment	Highways England Response	Status
8	rights of way and private means of access	NCC has found a number of drafting errors in Article 16 and on the accompanying plans and also considers that the Article is confusing in the way that the proposals for the rights of way network are set out. Details of these drafting errors are set out at NCC05 attached to this document.	These have been reviewed with NCC and revisions made to the draft DCO at DL3 to address [REP3-004]. It is considered that the significant majority of these have now been addressed and the Applicant will continue to discuss corrections with NCC.	Under discussion.
9		The principles set out within Article 16 are generally agreed with however, clarification is required from the Applicant in relation to the precise nature of the Stopping Up and the resultant status/ownership of the stopped up highway. Meeting required to formally establish exact boundaries between the Local and Strategic Road Networks.	Noted. This is under review.	Under discussion.
10	Article 17 – Access to works	The proposed wording was previously used by NCC for the Morpeth Northern Bypass DCO granted in 2015. NCC is satisfied with the proposed article but require that “with the consent of the Street Authority subject to consultation” is added to the provision.	The additional wording is not considered necessary and the position of NCC is protected by other provisions in the DCO.	Under discussion.
11	Article 22 – Powers in relation to relevant watercourses	NCC is satisfied with the wording of this Article and has does not request any amendments to the wording.	Agreed.	Under discussion.
12	Article 23 – Discharge of water	NCC is satisfied with the wording of this Article and has does not request any amendments to the wording.	Agreed.	Under discussion.
13	Article 28 – Time limit for exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily	NCC is satisfied with the wording of this Article and has does not request any amendments to the wording.	Agreed.	Under discussion.
14	Article 40 – Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows	NCC is satisfied with this Article but is keen to ensure that words are carried out to British Standards and at a time of year that avoids seasonal constraints.	Agreed. The works will be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5837 (<i>‘Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction’</i>) to ensure that trees and their root systems will be protected. This is captured in in Commitment SL5 of the outline CEMP [REP3-013]	Under discussion.
15	Requirements	NCC is satisfied that the impacts of the Scheme are capable of being appropriately controlled by requirements contained within any DCO granted.	Agreed.	Under discussion.

Item	Draft DCO Item	Northumberland County Council Comment	Highways England Response	Status
16		NCC will continue to liaise with Highways England over the scope and wording of the requirements throughout the DCO process. In general, NCC is satisfied that the wording of the proposed requirements will appropriately and satisfactorily control and mitigate the environmental impacts of the Scheme. NCC will comment on the wording of individual requirements as and when issues arise throughout the DCO process.	Agreed.	Under discussion.
17		NCC welcomes requirements 9 (Archaeological Remains) and 10 (Safeguarding of Listed Milestones) of the draft DCO. NCC further considers that these requirements are sufficient to safeguard features of Archaeological and Historic interest.	Agreed.	Agreed.
18	Definitions	NCC does not object to the definition of “commencement” that has been used in the draft DCO [REP3-005]		Under discussion

Table 3-2 – Issues related to the Scheme

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
1.	Economic and Social effects			
1.1	Case for the Scheme [APP-344]	<p>Northumberland County Council recognises the benefits of this project. The Dualling of the A1 is a long ambition and NCC is supportive of the proposal, in principle.</p> <p>The principle of the Scheme is supported in both adopted and emerging planning policy as well as a of economic and transport strategies and documents that are material to the determination of planning applications. Individual environmental impacts are considered below.</p> <p>There is a identified “need” for the Scheme confirmed in both planning and transport policy. This is an ongoing need that remains unaltered by the ongoing Covid crisis.</p> <p>There dualling of the A1 will have a range of benefits. The Scheme will help improve journey times, and journey reliability.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		<p>The current single carriageway stretches of the A1 currently suffers from major problems with slow moving vehicles causing disruption. The single carriageway stretches are more vulnerable to accidents and are harder to maintain without causing significant disruption.</p> <p>The Scheme will also improve journey time and will remove a barrier to economic investment in the region. For this reason, the Scheme will be important for economic growth and tourism.</p> <p>The A1 a currently barrier to east west traffic flows (including non-motorised uses). The at grade crossings will help to address this issue and will also be a significant benefit providing a safer means of crossing the A1.</p>		
1.2		NCC supports the proposed Scheme, subject to appropriate mitigation of any unacceptable environmental impacts.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.3		<p>For Part A the southern (approximately) half of the length falls within the general extent of the Green Belt, as set out at 1.4, below.</p> <p>Much of the remaining length of the route is not covered by any designation, with the main exception being the natural and landscape value clearly attributed to the areas on either side of the Coquet crossing. The Proposals Map from Local Plan shows that the southern section, immediately north of the Coquet crossing, was designated an AHLV under saved Policy RE17.A designated Wildlife Corridor that follows the River Lyne.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.4		A substantial portion of Part A of the Scheme lies within the Green Belt defined by Policy S5 of the Northumberland County and National Park Joint Structure Plan. Whilst this policy does not specifically define Green Belt boundaries, the Green Belt Boundaries defined in the emerging Northumberland Local Plan form a reasonable and logical illustration of the Green Belt boundaries to the north of Morpeth defined in Policy S5.	The Applicant accepts this. The Applicant is happy to accept that the Proposal Map that forms part of the emerging Northumberland Local Plan provides a reasonable illustration the Green Belt around Morpeth contained in Structure Plan Policy S5.	Agreed.
1.5		The Scheme comprises 'inappropriate development' within the Green Belt, as defined in the NPPF. However, it is considered that the harm to the Green Belt is significantly outweighed by the relevant other considerations and very special circumstances can be demonstrated in line with the requirements of Paragraph 144 of the NPPF.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.6		There is no inherent conflict between the principle of dualling the A1 and the designation of Green Belt to the north of Morpeth. Both policies were promoted equally and in parallel in the Structure Plan, albeit that only Policy S5 was "saved" and remains part of the current development plan.	Agreed.	Agreed.

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
1.7		The only area specific designation, shown on the Alnwick Local Plan proposals map is another of the Area of High Landscape Value that abuts the west side of the A1, towards the northern end of Part B	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.8		In summary, for Part B, the roadline for part B has no allocations or designations that would be 'showstoppers'.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.9		The Scheme compound area will impact on Lionheart Enterprise Park. This impact is however considered to be acceptable in principle.	Agreed. The applicant confirms that, as set out in the Applicant's Response to ExA's First Written Questions [REP1-032], the amount of land required for the compound has been reduced. In practice land take required will be less than identified in Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-037].	Agreed.
1.10		Community benefits will accrue from the Scheme and it is accepted that these will contribute positively to the planning balance.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.11		The Scheme will help to support the building of a strong, responsive and competitive economy through the reduction in travel time and by helping to bring businesses, residents and employees closer together across the County. To the north of Morpeth, the single carriageway nature of the A1 trunk road has contributed to Alnwick and places further north having a much more remote character with reduced opportunity to access work and metropolitan services offered by the Tyneside conurbation and, to the north, Edinburgh.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.12		The inclusion of features to protect human health such as new junctions and linkages between severed rural areas will contribute to community, as well as economic, wellbeing	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.13		In terms of infrastructure, a detailed options exercise was undertaken before the current Scheme was arrived at and it is considered that the solution is probably the optimal one in terms of the use of existing infrastructure – reuse of existing carriageway areas, drainage solutions etc.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.14		A number of studies have been undertaken across a range of different transport modes and from a variety of perspectives which demonstrate the need and the benefits of dualling the A1.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.15		The Council considers that the proposed scheme will contribute to economic growth both during the construction period and thereafter. It is anticipated that the improved accessibility throughout the A1 corridor will make towns and sites in	Agreed.	Agreed.

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		Northumberland more attractive to new businesses and attract further investment for improvements at existing sites.		
1.16		The full dualling of the A1 to Ellingham is a ' <i>committed Scheme</i> ' within the Road Investment Strategy.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.17		The NPS NN was published by the DfT in December 2014 and sets out the need for, and Government's policies for delivering NSIP developments on the national road network.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.18		Paragraph 2.2 of the NPS NN recognises that there is a ' <i>critical need</i> ' to improve the national road and rail networks to address road congestion and crowding on railways.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.19		The Government has concluded that at a strategic level there is a ' <i>compelling need</i> ' for development on the national networks, as confirmed in paragraph 2.10 of the NPS NN. The same paragraph confirms that ' <i>The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State should therefore start their assessment of applications for infrastructure covered by this NPS on that basis</i> '.	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.20		Paragraph 2.22 of the NPS NN confirms the importance of improving the road network as without doing so ' <i>it will be difficult to support further economic development, employment and housing and this will impede economic growth and reduce people's quality of life. The Government has therefore concluded that at a strategic level there is a compelling need for development of all national road networks.</i> '	Agreed.	Agreed.
1.21		The NPS NN sets out that, subject to the detailed policies and protections contained in the NPS and the legal constraints set out in the 2008 Act, there is a ' <i>presumption in favour</i> ' of granting development consent for national network NSIPs that fall within the need for infrastructure established in the NPS NN.	Agreed.	Agreed.
Environmental Impact Assessment				
2.	Cumulative Effects			
2.1		The dualling of the A1 presents a major opportunity in the county and the Scheme should not miss opportunities to improve the environment and accessibility in this part of the county.	Agreed. The Applicant does not consider that there are any unacceptable environmental impacts of the Scheme, either individually or cumulatively.	Agreed.

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		The local impacts and their cumulative impacts caused by the scheme have been appropriately considered and adequately addressed by the Applicant in Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects of the ES [APP-062].		
3.	Air Quality			
3.1	Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041] and Appendix 16.4 Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330].	<p>NCC agrees with the use of HA207/07 and the supporting Interim Advice Notes (IANs) to inform the air quality assessment in Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041] as well as in the assessment of cumulative air quality impacts [APP-330].</p> <p>NCC supports the use of the emission rates issued by Highways England in line with IAN185/15 (derived from version 8 of Defra's Emission Factor Toolkit) and supporting tools including background mapping with a reference monitoring year of 2015 (the Scheme baseline year) and version 6.1 of the Nox-to-NO2 calculator issued by Defra in line with version 8 of the Emission Factor Toolkit.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed
3.2	Appendix 5.8 – Air Quality DMRB Sensitivity Test Part A and B [APP-205] and [APP-275]	<p>NCC supports the need for the DMRB Sensitivity [APP-] Test to resolve any changes arising from the difference in approach as a result of the issue of DMRB document LA105, which supersedes the HA207/07 guidance and supporting IANs.</p> <p>NCC also supports the need for the Air Quality Updated Assessment (Scheme Opening Year 2024) [REP3-010] to capture any changes in the impact of the Scheme with the revised Scheme opening year (from 2023 to 2024). Furthermore, NCC accepts that this Updated Assessment should follow the guidance set out in DMRB document LA105 as this provides the most appropriate up-to-date available guidance.</p> <p>NCC supports the use of the latest emission rates (issued by Highways England in line with LA105 and derived from version 10 of Defra's Emission Factor Toolkit) and supporting tools (including background mapping from 2015 and version 8.1 of the Nox-to-NO2 calculator issued by Defra in line with version 10 of the Emission Factor Toolkit) within the Updated Assessment.</p> <p>NCC agrees that the approach undertaken in the Updated Sensitivity Test is appropriate, and that the difference in the Scheme's impact on human health between 2023 and 2024 have been captured within the Updated Sensitivity Test.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
3.3	Air Quality Updated Assessment (Scheme Opening Year 2024) [REP3-010]	NCC agrees that appropriate and adequate baseline data have been used within the baseline assessment of the Scheme set out in Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041]. NCC confirms that the diffusion tube monitoring undertaken for the Scheme offers appropriate coverage of the areas of concern highlighted by NCC, and furthermore offers sufficient coverage of the air quality study area for the Scheme.	Agreed.	Agreed
3.4	Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041] and Appendix 16.4 Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330].	NCC's Public Health Protection Unit are satisfied that the selection of receptors includes those identified by NCC, and that the assessment considers those nearest receptors which are representative of the worst-case impacts of the Scheme and areas of existing poor air quality. Furthermore, the receptors offer sufficient coverage of the air quality study area for the Scheme.	Agreed.	Agreed
3.5	Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041]	NCC agrees with the findings and conclusions of the assessment set out in Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041], the Cumulative Assessment [APP-330] and the Updated Air Quality Assessment (Scheme Opening Year 2024) [REP3-010]. In all cases there were no significant air quality effects relating to human health, compliance with air quality limit values, or statutory nuisance identified.	Agreed.	Agreed
3.6	Appendix 16.4 Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330].	NCC agrees that no mitigations measures to deduce the impacts of the Scheme on Air Quality are required during the operational phase of the Scheme.	Agreed.	Agreed
3.7	Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041]	NCC's Public Health Protection Unit considers that the proposed dualling will improve the overall flow of traffic on the entire section of dual-carriageway from Fairmoor to Ellingham and specifically along the two existing single-carriageways that form Part A and Part B. This will improve emissions from the majority of smaller vehicles whose speed limit is often constrained by slower moving HGV traffic.	Agreed.	Agreed
3.8	Appendix 16.4 Air Quality Likely Significant Effects of the Scheme [APP-330]	NCC agrees that dust from demolition / construction works can be managed and mitigated and compliance with a dust management plan would be the controlling mechanism during development. NCC agrees that the outline measures proposed in Chapter 5 of the ES Part A and Part B [APP-040 and APP-041] and the Outline Construction Environmental	Agreed.	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		Management Plan (CEMP) [REP3-014] are appropriate to control the impacts of the Scheme on air quality during the construction phase. Agreement on the measures to be included within the finalised CEMP will be required prior to construction commencing.		
4.	Noise and Vibration (including construction and operational)			
4.1	Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.3, Paragraphs 6.3.1 to 6.3.22 Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.3, Paragraphs 6.3.1 to 6.3.22	It is agreed that, for the construction stage of the Scheme, the relevant legislative and policy framework for noise and vibration is set out within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.3, Paragraphs 6.3.1 to 6.3.22, and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.3, Paragraphs 6.3.1 to 6.3.22 along with an appropriate appraisal of compliance of the Scheme against each relevant policy objective. It is agreed that the assessments presented within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042] and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043] appropriately consider and apply the relevant legislation and policy to the construction stage of the Scheme in relation to noise and vibration.	Agreed	Agreed
4.2	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.6, Paragraphs 1.6.1 to 1.6.16	For the operational stage of the Scheme, the relevant legislative and policy framework or noise and vibration is set out within Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.6, Paragraphs 1.6.1 to 1.6.16 along with an appropriate appraisal of compliance of the Scheme against each relevant policy objective. It is agreed that the assessment presented within Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019] appropriately considers and applies the relevant legislation and policy to the operational stage of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration.	Agreed	Agreed
4.3	Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.4 Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.4	The detailed methodology applicable to the construction stage noise and vibration assessments is presented within Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.4 and Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.4. It is agreed that the scope and methodology adopted and applied for the assessment of potential construction stage noise and vibration impacts is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
4.4	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.7, Paragraphs 1.7.1 to 1.7.36	<p>The detailed methodology applicable to the operational stage noise and vibration assessments is presented within Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.7, Paragraphs 1.7.1 to 1.7.36.</p> <p>It is agreed that the scope and methodology adopted and applied for the assessment of potential operational stage noise and vibration impacts is appropriate.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
4.5	<p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.5, paragraphs 6.5.1 to 6.5.11</p> <p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.5, paragraphs 6.5.1 to 6.5.11.</p>	<p>Assessment assumptions and limitations applicable to the construction stage noise and vibration stage assessments are set out within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.5, paragraphs 6.5.1 to 6.5.11 and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.5, paragraphs 6.5.1 to 6.5.11.</p> <p>It is agreed that the presented assumptions and limitations are appropriate for the stage of noise and vibration assessment and have been suitably considered.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
		<p>NCC additional comment – It is appreciated that the exact composition of plant and equipment will be unknown until the main contractor is appointed. Whilst it is appreciated that a “worst case scenario” is presented, any such assessment should be reviewed once the exact composition of plant and equipment is known and compared to the one presented at this stage, to address any impacts above the current predictions.</p>	<p>Applicants response – It is expected that such an assessment will be undertaken at detailed design stage as part of the application under Section 61 of Part III of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (See Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP3-013 (Ref S-G9 and S-N2 point j)]).</p>	Agreed
4.6	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.8, Paragraphs 1.8.1 to 1.8.8	<p>Assessment assumptions and limitations applicable to the operational stage noise and vibration assessments are set out within Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.8, Paragraphs 1.8.1 to 1.8.8.</p> <p>It is agreed that the presented assumptions and limitations are appropriate for the stage of noise and vibration assessment and have been suitably considered.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
4.7	<p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.6, paragraphs 6.6.1 to 6.6.4.</p> <p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section</p>	<p>The Study Areas relevant to the construction stage noise and vibration assessment are set out within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.6, Paragraph 6.6.1 to 6.6.4 and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.6, Paragraph 6.6.1 to 6.6.3.</p> <p>It is agreed that the Study Areas have been appropriately defined based on available guidance and professional judgement and are sufficient to enable the potential impacts of the construction stage of the Scheme to be identified.</p>	Agreed	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
	6.6, paragraphs 6.6.1 to 6.6.3.	NCC additional comment – Additionally, construction noise can be “managed” through CMP/CEMPs, use of BPM, agreed restriction of noisy works during periods of night, community engagement, CoPA Section 60/61 and/or enforcement action.	The applicant considers that the submission of a CEMP, included in Requirement 4 of the draft DCO [REP1-005], is an appropriate means of managing noise during the construction phase of the Scheme.	Under discussion
4.8	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.9, Paragraphs 1.9.1 to 1.9.8	<p>The operational road traffic noise Study Area is set out within Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.9, Paragraphs 1.9.1 to 1.9.8.</p> <p>It is agreed that the Study Area has been appropriately defined based on available guidance and is sufficient to enable the potential impacts of the operational phase of the Scheme to be identified</p>	Agreed	Agreed
4.9	<p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.7*</p> <p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.7*</p>	<p>Baseline conditions applicable to the construction stage noise and vibration assessments are presented within Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.7, and Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.7. *</p> <p>It is agreed that the description of baseline conditions, details of sensitive receptors, and noise survey results are an accurate reflection of the existing baseline environment and are appropriate for the purpose of the construction phase assessments.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
4.10	<p>Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.10, Paragraphs 1.10.1 to 1.10.29</p> <p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.7*</p> <p>Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.7*</p>	<p>Baseline conditions applicable to the operational phase noise and vibration assessment are presented within deadline 1 submission – 6.22 Noise Addendum [REP1-019] paragraphs 1.10.1 to 1.10.29, Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.7, and Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.7. *</p> <p>It is agreed that the description of baseline conditions, details of sensitive receptors, and noise survey results are an accurate reflection of the existing baseline environment and are appropriate for the purpose of the operational phase assessment.</p> <p>It is agreed that the appraisal of future baseline conditions presented within the deadline 1 submission – 6.22 Noise Addendum [REP1-019], paragraph 1.10.15 to 1.10.29, is appropriate and accurate based on provided traffic data.</p>	Agreed	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		NCC additional comment – However, as the future operational noise limits are primarily dependent upon predicted traffic flows then please note that confirming future traffic flows is outside of the scope of the Public Health Protection Unit and this should be confirmed by our colleagues in NCC Highways.	Noted	Under discussion.
4.11	Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.8, paragraphs 6.8.1 to 6.8.32 Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.8, paragraphs 6.8.1 to 6.8.38	Potential impacts applicable to the construction stage noise and vibration assessment are predicted and assessed within Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.8, paragraphs 6.8.1 to 6.8.32 and Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.8, paragraphs 6.8.1 to 6.8.38.	Agreed	Agreed
		It is agreed that the potential noise and vibration impacts have been appropriately assessed implementing suitable methodologies with consideration given to compliance against relevant planning policies. It is agreed that potential noise and vibration impacts of the Scheme in relation to noise and vibration sensitive receptors have been accurately documented.		
		NCC additional comment – However, the Public Health Protection Unit cannot confirm compliance with planning policies – this would be within the scope of the Local Planning Authority.	Noted. The Scheme is assessed against planning policy is contained in Part 1 of this Table. No conflicts with planning policy in relation to noise have been raised by NCC.	Agreed
4.12	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.11, Paragraphs 1.11.1 to 1.11.50	Potential impacts applicable to the operational stage noise and vibration assessment are predicted and assessed within Noise Addendum [REP1-019], Section 1.11, Paragraphs 1.11.1 to 1.11.50. It is agreed that the potential noise and vibration impacts have been appropriately assessed implementing suitable methodologies with consideration given to compliance against relevant planning policies. It is agreed that potential noise and vibration impacts of the Scheme in relation to all noise sensitive receptors have been accurately documented.	Agreed	Agreed
		NCC additional comment – However, the Public Health Protection Unit cannot confirm compliance with planning policies – this would be within the scope of the Local Planning Authority.	Noted. The Scheme is assessed against planning policy is contained in Part 1 of this Table. No conflicts with planning policy in relation to noise have been raised by NCC.	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
4.13	Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.9* Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.9*	Proposed construction noise and vibration mitigation is presented within Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.9 and Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.9 * It is agreed that the construction noise and vibration mitigation measures detailed are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
4.14	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.12, Paragraphs 1.12.1 to 1.12.35	It is agreed that noise and vibration design, mitigation and enhancement measures have been appropriately considered for the operational stage of the scheme within Noise Addendum [REP1-019], Section 1.12, Paragraphs 1.12.1 to 1.12.35. It is agreed that the operational noise design, mitigation and enhancement measures detailed are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
4.15	Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.10, paragraphs 6.10.1 to 6.10.6. Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.10, Paragraph 6.10.1 to 6.10.4.	Assessment of likely significant construction stage noise and vibration effects is presented within Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.10, paragraphs 6.10.1 to 6.10.6 and Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.10, Paragraph 6.10.1 to 6.10.4. It is agreed that the assessment of likely significant construction stage effects is proportionate to the impacts of the Scheme following implementation of the proposed mitigation.	Agreed	Agreed
4.16	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.13, Paragraphs 1.13.1 to 1.13.24	Assessment of likely significant operational stage noise and vibration effects is presented within Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.13, Paragraphs 1.13.1 to 1.13.24. It is agreed that the assessment of likely significant operational stage noise and vibration effects considers the predicted impacts of the Scheme following implementation of the proposed mitigation.	Agreed	Agreed
4.17	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.14, Paragraph 1.14.1	It is agreed that the assessment parameters applicable to the operational stage of the Scheme in relation to noise and vibration are appropriately considered within Noise Addendum [REP1-019], Section 1.14, Paragraph 1.14.1 and Tables 1.41 and 1.42.	Agreed	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
	and Tables 1.41 and 1.42.			
4.18	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.15, Paragraph 1.15.1 to 1.15.9.	It is agreed that the Scheme carriageway alignment limits of deviation have been appropriately considered within Noise Addendum [REP1-019], Section 1.15, Paragraph 1.15.1 to 1.15.9.	Agreed	Agreed
		NCC additional comment – Although it might be expected that updates of the noise impacts are redone once final vertical LODs have been determined to reclassify the noise impact class that any receptor falls within.	Applicants response – Should it be considered necessary for design to deviate from the proposed Scheme 3D General Arrangement within the Limits of Deviation, the earthworks and proposed noise barriers associated with the Scheme would be re-considered by the main contractor to ensure that no greater or different significant adverse effects would arise. (See Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP3-013 (Ref S-N6)]).	Under Discussion
4.19	Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part A [APP-042], Section 6.11, paragraph 6.11.1. Chapter 6 Noise and Vibration Part B [APP-043], Section 6.11, Paragraph 6.11.1.	It is agreed that the requirement for noise or vibration monitoring during the construction phase will be determined once a detailed programme of works and schedule of plant has been produced by the contractor.	Agreed	Agreed
4.20	Noise Addendum – Rev 0 [REP1-019], Section 1.16, Paragraph 1.16.1.	It is agreed that no noise or vibration monitoring has been proposed for the operation of the Scheme once it is completed.	Agreed	Agreed
* Chapter 6 Part A and B section and paragraph references exclude paragraphs and tables listed within Deadline 1 submission 6.22 Noise Addendum [REP1-019] Table 1-1 which have been replaced by the Noise Addendum.				
Landscape and visual impact				

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
5.	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	25/01/2021 – It is agreed that the study area is appropriate for the Proposed Scheme (Parts A and B).		Agreed
5.1	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	22/01/2021 – It is not agreed that the methodology used (based on Highways England's IAN 135/10) was fully up to date and appropriate.	25/01/2021 – The assessment of landscape effects has been undertaken in accordance with then-current best practice as set out in IAN 135/10. Following the issue of updated guidance, a sensitivity test has been undertaken, which demonstrates that the original assessments appropriately predict landscape impacts.	Not agreed
5.2	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – However, it is agreed that the findings of the LVIAs are robust despite this methodology disagreement, NCC's concerns focussing on the visual effects on communities, users of the B6341 and character areas (which arose in part from the methodology used) are now addressed as set out below:</p> <p>24/2/21 – NCC's concerns focussing on the visual effects on communities, users of the B6341 and character areas (which arose in part from the methodology used) are now addressed as set out below under items 5.5, 5.7 and 5.8,</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant acknowledges agreement on the findings of the LVIA. The Applicant has addressed more specific comments on the local impacts that NCC feel have not been adequately identified below.</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges NCC's remaining concerns which it is agreed have been addressed below under items 5.5, 5.7 and 5.8.</p>	Agreed
5.3	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	25/01/2021 – It is agreed that the scope of landscape character assessment for both LVIAs is adequate to address all significant effects.		Agreed
5.4	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	25/01/2021 – It is agreed that the variation on judgements regarding the landscape sensitivity, set out within the LIR are minor and do not contribute markedly to the disagreement regarding the significance of effect		Agreed
5.5	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – Effects on character areas are as identified within the LVIAs with the exception of character areas 38b (Part A), 3c and 8c (Part B), where NCC set out within the LIR their judgment that some local impacts would be greater in magnitude and significance than the effects identified within the LVIAs, which contextualise those effects within the wider character areas.</p> <p>24/2/21 – The provision of updated Landscape Mitigation Plans for Part A means that NCC are able to revise their assessment for effects on character area 38b at Year 15 and now consider effects to be of Slight magnitude and Moderate\Minor significance. This remains greater than the Negligible magnitude and Slight</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant acknowledges the agreement with the effects on landscape character, with the exception of character areas 38b (Part A), 3c and 8c (Part B).</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the LIR [REP1-071] and concluded that the effects on character areas are agreed, with the exception of LCA 38b Longhorsley, which is considered by NCC to have significant effects extending beyond the summer of year 15, and LCA 8c Charlton Ridge that NCC considers would be subject to slightly greater effects following construction, but</p>	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		<p>Adverse effects identified in the LVIA, but it is agreed that effects would not be significant.</p> <p>All other effects on landscape character are agreed with the exception of Year 1 (early completion) effects on character areas 3c and 8c (both affected by part B) where NCC and the Applicant differ on the degree to which the loss of vegetation and (as yet unmitigated) presence of a wider road and new overbridge would affect the character.</p> <p>NCC judge that effects during this stage would be of a similar magnitude and significance to those during construction, whilst the applicant judges that these effects would be of a similar magnitude and significance to those of the design year.</p>	<p>would, in the summer of year 15 be subject to a neutral effects, as reported by the Applicant. A full response to this position is provided in the Applicant's response to LIR at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.16).</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges the findings of the assessment of effects on landscape character as set out in the LIR [REP1-071] and agrees that whilst there remains a difference of opinion on the findings, these are minor and do not materially change the overall findings of the LVIA, as set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044].</p>	
5.6	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	22/01/2021 – It is agreed that the scope of the visual impact assessment for both LVIAs is adequate to address all significant effects, with the exception of the potential effects on communities.	25/01/2021 – The Applicant acknowledges agreement on the scope of the visual effect's assessment for Parts A and B, with the exception of the potential effects on communities.	
		24/2/21 – It is agreed that the scope of the visual impact assessment for both LVIAs is adequate to address all significant effects.		Agreed
5.7	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – The visual effects on communities at Fenrother, Causey Park Bridge, Causey Park and West Moor are not agreed, NCC have identified in more detail within the LIR what they consider the visual effects to be, and these are subject to further discussion.</p> <p>24/2/21 – Submissions at deadlines 1-3, improvements to mitigation proposals included in (ref mitigation plans), and further discussion have resolved NCC concerns about the assessment of visual effects on the communities at Fenrother, Causey Park, Causey Park Bridge and West Moor.</p> <p>As a result, effects on these communities are agreed to be as set out within the Part A LVIA, modified only by the clarifications agreed regarding viewpoints 31 and 36 below in item 5.9.</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant acknowledges that the visual effects on communities at Fenrother, Causey Park Bridge, Causey Park and West Moor are not agreed.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that sufficient information has been provided for the ExA to understand the visual effects of the Scheme, which includes those receptors that make up the communities of Fenrother, Causey Park Bridge, Causey Park and West Moor. A full response to this position is provided in the Applicant's response to LIR at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.16).</p> <p>11/2/21 – In discussion with NCC, the Applicant has updated Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] and this is agreed with NCC and submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges resolution on the concerns raised by NCC in reference to the effects on communities, and agreement on the findings of the effects as set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044]. Specific concerns relating to viewpoints 31 and 36 have been agreed below in item 5.9.</p>	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
5.8	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – The visual effects on users of B6341 (both day and night) (Part B) are not agreed, NCC have identified in more detail within the LIR what they consider the visual effects to be, and these are subject to further discussion.</p> <p>24/2/21 – Submissions at Deadlines 2 and 3, which clarified the nature of hedgerow planting proposed, and provided an assessment of effects on the B6341 have resolved NCC concerns regarding effects on the users of the B6341.</p> <p>The precise details of effects on different stretches of the route are not entirely agreed. However, these differences are minor and both parties identify some significant effects during construction and Year 1. With the nature of the planting now clarified, there is also agreement that that effects would not be significant at Year 15.</p> <p>There are also minor differences of opinion regarding effects on users of the B6341 at night, arising from views of car headlights moving along the A1 during early competition (Year 1). However, it is agreed that effects would not be significant.</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant acknowledges NCC's concern that the night-time effects for Part B have not been assessed. However, in line with the scoping opinion received by NCC in relation to Part B that 'The impact from illumination of the carriageway during the operational phase will not be required', the Applicant has therefore not undertaken an assessment of night-time effects. Additionally, the B6341 was scoped out of the assessment of visual effects.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that as a result of roadside vegetation removal, there would be impacts on users of the B6341 during construction and in winter year 1. However, by the summer of year 15, and following the establishment of roadside vegetation the effects of headlights on users of the B6341 would not be significant. A full response to this position is provided in the Applicant's response to LIR at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.16).</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges NCC's confirmation that the effects on the B6341 have been provided, and whilst there remains some disagreement on the effects on some specific stretches during construction and Year 1, the additional information relating to the long term management of the hedgerows means that there is agreement on the non-significant effects on users of the B6341 in Year 15.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the effects on users of the B6341 at night and prior to the establishment of the roadside planting are not entirely agreed upon, however, it is agreed that the effects would not be significant.</p>	Agreed
5.9	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – The visual effects on the viewpoints (Part A) provide sufficient information and in the most part are agreed, with the exception of viewpoints 6, 31 and 36 which are not agreed.</p> <p>24/2/21 – The visual effects on the viewpoints (Part A) provide sufficient information and in the most part are agreed to be as set out within the LVIA, with the exception of viewpoints 6, 31 and 36 as follows:</p> <p>Viewpoint 6 – NCC's concerns regarding the visual effects arising from the removal of Coronation Avenue have been addressed via the submission of revised Landscape Mitigation plans (ref). As a result, there is now agreement that visual effects at year 15 would not be significant, although NCC remain of the opinion that effects at year 1 and year 15 would be greater than indicated in the LVIA – as indicated below:</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant acknowledges agreement on the visual effects on the viewpoints (Part A), with the exception of viewpoints 6, 31 and 36 which are not agreed.</p> <p>Viewpoint 6 – The Applicant considers that in providing more information as to the number and location of the tree replacement strategy for the Coronation Avenue, the effects on the receptors associated with Viewpoint 6 in year 15 are slight adverse.</p> <p>Viewpoints 31 and 36 – These viewpoints are representative of broader clusters of receptors, within which some receptors have been assessed as being subject to a greater significance of effects that is reported for the viewpoint.</p>	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status															
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>Year 1 Mag.</td><td>Year 1 Sig.</td><td>Year 15 Mag.</td><td>Year 15 Sig.</td></tr> <tr> <td>LVIA</td><td>Minor</td><td>Moderate</td><td>Negligible</td><td>Slight</td></tr> <tr> <td>NCC</td><td>Moderate</td><td>Large</td><td>Minor</td><td>Moderate</td></tr> </table> <p>Viewpoints 31 and 36 – NCC's concerns regarding the disparity between assessed effects for the nearest houses and the effects on nearby residents identified for these two viewpoints have been addressed in Deadline 3 submissions (at 6.5.24 of [Rep3-025]). It is agreed that effects for the nearest residents, that form part of the community in the immediate vicinity of these viewpoints would be as set out within the LVIA for the nearest residential receptors and would therefore be significant. The visual receptors that form the remainder of the communities associated with these viewpoints would not be subject to a significant effect</p>		Year 1 Mag.	Year 1 Sig.	Year 15 Mag.	Year 15 Sig.	LVIA	Minor	Moderate	Negligible	Slight	NCC	Moderate	Large	Minor	Moderate	<p>A full response to this position is provided in the Applicant's response to LIR at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.16).</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant is in agreement with NCC that for viewpoint 6 the effects would not be significant, nevertheless the Applicant acknowledges NCC's opinion that there is a minor discrepancy between the findings.</p> <p>In relation to viewpoints 31 and 36, the Applicant acknowledges NCC's agreement on the findings of the assessment, which for the closest receptors would be significant, but that for the remainder of the receptors associated with these receptors the effect would not be significant.</p>	
	Year 1 Mag.	Year 1 Sig.	Year 15 Mag.	Year 15 Sig.															
LVIA	Minor	Moderate	Negligible	Slight															
NCC	Moderate	Large	Minor	Moderate															
5.10	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	25/01/2021 – The night-time effects of Part A are agreed.		Agreed															
5.11	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – It is not agreed that the night-time effects of Part B should have been scoped out, in undertaking further assessment of the potential night-time effects NCC have identified that B6341 would potentially be subject to not-significant effects.</p> <p>24/2/21 – There are minor differences of opinion remaining regarding effects on users of the B6341 at night, arising from views of car headlights moving along the A1 during early competition (Year 1). However, it is agreed that effects would not be significant.</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – In line with the scoping opinion received by NCC in relation to Part B that 'The impact from illumination of the carriageway during the operational phase will not be required', the Applicant has therefore not undertaken an assessment of night-time effects. Additionally, the B6341 was scoped out of the assessment of visual effects.</p> <p>12/2/21 – The Applicant considers that had an assessment of the effects on night-time users of the B6341 been undertaken, the conclusion of the assessment would be that significant effects would not arise, which reflects the findings of NCC's assessment as set out within the LIR [REP1-071]</p> <p>A full response to this position is provided in the Applicant's response to LIR at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.16).</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges that the effects on users of the B6341 at night and prior to the establishment of the roadside planting are not entirely agreed upon, however, it is agreed that the effects would not be significant.</p>	Agreed															

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
5.12	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – It is not agreed that the mitigation strategy provides sufficient information relating to species and future management in order that in the long term, mitigation measures are fully understood and to ensure that significant effects are adequately mitigated.</p> <p>24/2/21 – Subject to the inclusion of the requirement for a LEMP, NCC are satisfied that the mitigation strategy provides sufficient information relating to species and future management, in order that significant effects are adequately mitigated.</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant considers that the landscape mitigation strategy provides sufficient information for the ExA to consider the effectiveness of the strategy to ensure that significant effects are adequately mitigated. A full response to this issue has been provided by the Applicant in their Response to the LIR, at Deadline 3, refer to 6.5.5 and 6.5.6 (document reference 7.16).</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges NCC's agreement, and has included a specific item in the Outline CEMP (item S-L100 in Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and commitments: The Scheme) in the Outline CEMP [REP3-013]</p>	Agreed
5.13	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – It is not agreed that the assessment of the effects on the communities at Fenrother, Causey Park Bridge, Causey Park and West Moor are appropriately described therefore further review of mitigation measures is required.</p> <p>24/2/21 – Submissions at deadlines 1-3, improvements to mitigation proposals included in (ref mitigation plans), and further discussion have resolved NCC concerns about the assessment of visual effects on the communities at Fenrother, Causey Park, Causey Park Bridge and West Moor.</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant considers that sufficient information has been provided for the ExA to understand the visual effects of the Scheme, which includes those receptors that make up the communities of Fenrother, Causey Park Bridge, Causey Park and West Moor. A full response to this position is provided in the Applicant's response to LIR at Deadline 3 (document reference 7.16).</p> <p>11/2/21 – In discussion with NCC, the Applicant has updated Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [APP-095] and this is agreed with NCC and submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges resolution on the concerns raised by NCC in reference to the effects on communities, and agreement on the findings of the effects as set out in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A [APP-044].</p>	Agreed
5.14	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	25/01/2021 – It is agreed that following submission of the Coronation Avenue Replacement Strategy (DRAFT) at Deadline 1, that the number and location of replacement trees are appropriate.		Agreed
5.15	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – However, NCC considers that further information is required relating to the species and future management, in order that the impacts on this distinctive landscape feature are adequately mitigated in the long term.</p> <p>24/2/21 – 24/2/21 – Subject to the inclusion of the requirement for a LEMP, NCC are satisfied that the mitigation strategy provides sufficient information relating to species and future management, in order that significant effects are adequately</p>	25/01/2021 – The Applicant considers that the landscape mitigation strategy provides sufficient information for the ExA to consider the effectiveness of the strategy to ensure that significant effects arising from the removal of part of the Coronation Avenue are adequately mitigated. The Applicant has, at Deadline 3, updated the Outline CEMP to include provision for a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be prepared for Part A and Part B, prior to the commencement	Under discussion

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		mitigated, however NCC wish to retain their position until further advice is provided by NCC tree officer.	of construction, secured through Requirement 5 of the draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005], which requires approval by the SoS in consultation with NCC. 24/2/21 – 24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges NCC's agreement and has included a specific item in the Outline CEMP (item S-L100 in Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and commitments: The Scheme) in the Outline CEMP [REP3-013].	
5.16	Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP044 and APP045]	<p>22/01/2021 – It is not agreed that the current roadside hedgerow mitigation for Part B would adequately mitigate the impact of the removal of existing roadside vegetation, and further information relating to species and future management is required in order that mitigation measures are fully understood and to ensure that potentially significant effects are adequately mitigated.</p> <p>24/2/21 – Taking account of improvements to mitigation measures for Part A and clarifications regarding mitigation measure for part B as submitted at Deadlines 1-3, it is now agreed that all proposed landscape and visual mitigation measures are appropriate and adequate.</p>	<p>25/01/2021 – The Applicant considers that the landscape mitigation strategy does provide sufficient information for the ExA to consider the effectiveness of the strategy to ensure that significant effects arising from the removal of existing roadside vegetation. The Applicant has, at Deadline 2 provided further information relating to the design objectives, form and nature of the landscape proposals, refer to Applicant's Comments on Responses to Written Questions – Appendix B – DMRB Guidance [REP2-022]. Furthermore, at Deadline 3, the Applicant has updated the Outline CEMP to include provision for a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be prepared, prior to the commencement of construction, secured through Requirement 5(1) of the updated Draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] and would be subject to approval by the Secretary of State (SoS), in consultation with the Local Planning Authority (LPA).</p> <p>DG to chase MF and AW on a further meeting. Update KR and DG when meeting held.</p> <p>24/2/21 – The Applicant acknowledges agreement that all proposed landscape and visual mitigation measures are appropriate and adequate</p>	Agreed
6	Historic environment			
6.1	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) of the ES [APP046 and APP047]	This refers to the Scheme as originally submitted (and Deadline 3). No comments yet provided in relation to the proposed scheme amendments that will be presented in ES Addendums.		Agreed.
6.2	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.3.1 to 8.3.8 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B	It is agreed that the assessments presented within Chapter 8 appropriately considers relevant legislation and policy in relation to the historic environment		Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
	Paragraph 8.3.1 to 8.3.8 [APP047]			
6.3	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.4.1 to 8.4.41 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.4.1 to 8.4.34 [APP047]	<p>It is agreed that the scope and methodology adopted for the baseline cultural heritage assessment of the potential impacts is appropriate and follows standards and guidance.</p> <p>It is agreed that as the permanent easement along an existing track which passes Felton Park and through Parkwood subway in Part A would not be in used in the construction and during operation would only be utilised occasionally to monitor and provide maintenance to the subway and a buried geocellular drainage tank, there would be no change on the setting of the designated assets situated alongside it (one Grade II* Listed Building (NHL 1154561), and four Grade II Listed (NHL 1371126, 1303774, 1041874 and 1303719)) and therefore this would not be considered in the assessment.</p>		Agreed
6.4	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.5.1 to 8.5.10 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.5.1 to 8.5.6 [APP047]	It is agreed that the assumptions and limitations to the historic environment assessment have been acknowledged and appropriately considered within the assessment.		Agreed
6.5	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.6.1 to 8.6.3 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.6.1 to 8.6.3 [APP047]	<p>It is agreed that the inner Study Area of 500 m is appropriate for the identification of all types of heritage assets (designated, non-designated, potential archaeological remains and historic landscapes) to establish the known historic environment context and potential for hitherto unknown below-ground archaeological remains.</p> <p>It is agreed that the outer Study Area of 1km for the assessment of setting heritage assets and Conservation Areas is appropriate.</p> <p>It is agreed that the extension of the outer Study Area for Part B to include Grade I Registered Park and Garden Alnwick Castle (NHL 10014041) and all designated heritage assets located within it.</p>		Agreed
6.6	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.7.1 to 8.7.61 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.7.1 to 8.7.87 [APP047]	It is agreed that the heritage assets identified and described in the baseline are appropriate for the assessment. The baseline was based on desk-based assessment and supported by geophysical surveys, an assessment of LiDAR data and targeted trial trenching in areas where high value heritage assets were predicted to be present. The value of the heritage assets and the contribution of the setting to the value of the heritage asset (where appropriate) is correctly assessed.		Agreed
6.7	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.8.1 to 8.8.4 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.8.1 to 8.8.4 [APP047]	<p>It is agreed that the receptors/heritage assets scoped out for assessment is appropriate for the assessment.</p> <p>It is agreed that the construction phase of Part A would not result in direct physical impacts on five Grade II Listed Buildings (NHL 1371039, 1371021, 1370646, 1303996 and 1042132) and the non-designated site of the Building at Tile Kiln Rush (HER 17065) and Priest Bridge (HER17397). It is agreed that operation phase Part A would not impact on the setting of six Grade II Listed mileposts (NHL 1153544, 1371039, 1371021, 1370646, 1303996, and 1042132).</p>		Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		<p>It is agreed that the construction and operation of Part B would not impact on the Grade I Registered Park and Garden Alnwick Castle (NHL 1001041) and all designated heritage assets located within it, and Rock Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is agreed that the potential impacts on heritage assets (including their setting) during construction and operation identified are adequately assessed. The assessment work has included targeted trial trenching by the Scheduled Monuments and has established that there is a low potential for high value assets associated with the Scheduled Monuments to be present within the Order limits.</p>		
6.8	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.8.5 to 8.8.34 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.8.5 to 8.8.78 [APP047]	<p>It is agreed that the potential impacts on heritage assets (including their setting) during construction and operation identified are adequately assessed.</p> <p>The assessment work has included targeted trial trenching in Part B adjacent to Scheduled Monuments and has established that there is a low potential for high value assets associated with the Scheduled Monuments to be present within the Order Limits</p>		Agreed
6.9	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.9.1 to 8.9.11 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.9.1 to 8.9.41 [APP047]	<p>It is agreed that the design and mitigation measures presented for heritage assets during construction and operation are appropriate.</p> <p>Design measures proposed as part of the surface water drainage system on Parts A and Parts B would remove impacts on below ground remains resulting from a change in hydrology. These are detailed in the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024].</p> <p>The WSIs outline the approach to post development consent excavation assessment, reporting, dissemination of the results of the work and archiving. The WSIs have been produced in consultation with the NCC County Archaeologist. The WSIs include a requirement for the production of detailed method statements, which would supersede the draft WSIs, as the scheme progresses. The aim of the evaluation would be to determine the value, extent, date, level of survival of the assets, and to inform a mitigation strategy which would be implemented either prior to or during the construction stage. Any mitigation required would require the production of additional Written Schemes of Investigation in consultation with the NCC County Archaeologist. Where any below-ground archaeological remains are identified which require preservation in-situ, a detailed method statement would be required to set out how the remains would be protected during the construction stage. The method statement would be produced in consultation with NCC and potentially Historic England (depending on the nature of the assets) and could include measures such as avoidance through redesign, diversion (within the Order limits), or reburial and protection. The mitigation measures adopted would be dependent on the nature and material of heritage assets identified. This would be secured through the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and 024]</p> <p>A programme of historic building recording would be undertaken post development consent and prior to the demolition of non-designated Charlton Mires Farm to ensure it is preserved by record. This is presented in the Draft WSI for Historic Building Recording (Appendix 8.6 [APP-296]) which has been approved by NCC.</p> <p>It is agreed that the no enhancement measures are required for the cultural heritage assessment.</p>		Agreed
6.10	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.10.1 to 8.10.30 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.10.1 to 8.9.43 [APP047]	<p>It is agreed that the assessment of likely significant effects is appropriate for the cultural heritage assessment.</p> <p>It is agreed that the assessment of assessment parameters is appropriate for the cultural heritage assessment.</p> <p>It is agreed that the DMRB sensitivity test is appropriate for the cultural heritage assessment.</p>		Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
6.11	Chapter 8 (Cultural Heritage) Part A – Paragraph 8.11.1 of the ES [APP 046] and Part B Paragraph 8.11.1 [APP047]	It is agreed that the monitoring is appropriate and adequate in relation to cultural heritage.		Agreed
7.	Ecology, Habitats and Nature Conservation Effects			
7.1	Chapter 9 (Biodiversity) of the ES [APP048 and APP049]	NCC is satisfied that appropriate surveys have been carried out to assess the value of the habitat and the presence of any protected species. NCC is also content with the search / study areas used to assess the impacts of the Scheme.	Agreed	Agreed
7.2		Survey and mitigation for the protected species found along the route is also robust, and the provision of a number of animal crossing points for a range of species is welcome.	Agreed	Agreed
7.3		A number of UK and European Protected Species are present within the road corridor and may be impacted by the development but the approach to mitigation and licensing is sound.	Agreed	Agreed
7.4		The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP1-023 and 024] includes all of the ecological mitigation requirements proposed and is comprehensive and robust, for this stage of the project. Further fine detail is required for works affecting watercourses including bridges, culverts and pollution prevention, although the detail provided so far is a good basis.	Agreed	Agreed
7.5		It is considered that the indicated proposed ecological mitigation identified in the CEMP reasonably considers construction and operational impacts of the project. However, some of the proposed mitigation will require time to establish and reach its full potential and this is why the Council considers the impacts on biodiversity overall to be a negative impact.	The Applicant agrees that the Scheme would result in adverse (negative impacts) but considers that the mitigation and compensation measures summarised within the Outline CEMP [REP1-023 and REP1-024] are sufficient to avoid significant residual impacts, with the exception of those identified in section 9.10 of Chapter 9: Biodiversity for Part A [APP-048] and Part B [APP-049].	Under discussion
7.6		The main document prepared by the Applicant to address impacts on ancient woodland is at Appendix 9.21: Ancient Woodland Strategy [APP-247]. The overall design approach and the compensation package set out is in accordance with previous informal discussion with the County Ecologist who	Agreed	Agreed

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		<p>sought a 1:4 multiplier which is considered to be enhancement due to the significant increase in area of woodland created versus that which is lost.</p> <p>In this a suitable compensation strategy is in place. Whilst fine detail of that woodland creation is required (soil analysis of receptor site, translocation details of soils and young trees) the overall plan is welcomed. It includes the translocation of soils, saplings, ground flora seed, ancient woodland indicator species and felled timber (for deadwood habitat) from the ancient woodland site which will safeguard the seedbank present in that soil and improve the chances of success of replicating that habitat over time.</p> <p>The County Ecologist considers both the location and increased area of the new woodland (adjacent to the River Coquet) to be optimal.</p> <p>The need for this dualling of the A1 would be an exceptional circumstance, and the widening of an existing route would be the preferable option to a new route being created.</p>		
7.7		Two years is a general requirement for the validity of survey reports, but it is often the case with large infrastructure projects that surveys may be out of date and require updating. In this case the habitats affected are not likely to have undergone significant change and a series of checking surveys are included within the mitigation and pre-start operations, which will be controlled by Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).	Agreed	Agreed
7.8		Further discussions will be required in relation in relation to Ecology, habitats and nature conservation effects.	Agreed.	Under discussion
8	Road Drainage and the Water Environment			
8.1	Chapter 10 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES [APP050 and APP051]	NCC accepts that the submitted documents and assessments have undertaken modelling of all the relevant watercourses for which the new highway will cross and will impact upon. All modelling has been in accordance with national policy and best practice guidance. This modelling shows that with appropriate design and mitigation flood risk will not increase on or offsite as a result of the development.	Agreed.	Agreed.
8.2		NCC has reviewed the submitted information in relation to surface water and is satisfied with the proposed flood risk mitigation measures.	Agreed.	Agreed.
8.3		The submitted documents and assessments have looked at the disposal of surface water from the new highway. With this aspect it needs to be ensured that	Agreed.	Agreed.

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
		the rate and volume of water leaving the development / appropriate catchment is no greater than previous.		
8.4		In relation to the River Coquet, NCC is satisfied with the proposals and mitigation in relation to flood risk and drainage.	Agreed.	Agreed.
9	Traffic and transport			
9.1	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.	The final extent of adoptions is still the subject of discussion between NCC and the Applicant.	Under discussion.
9.2		The Council is content that the pathways and junctions which were used for the survey were appropriate to assess the way in which the network was being used by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Based on the results of the survey undertaken over the six days at the various locations the Council is satisfied that the level of use is commensurate with our own anecdotal knowledge of use of these types of rights of way in particular locations	Agreed.	Agreed
10	Design			
10.1	Design speed / speed limit	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	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. 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.	Under discussion.
10.2	Maintenance boundaries – at junctions, soft estate	All infrastructure relating to the new trunk road and its supporting earthworks and soft estate to remain under the maintenance of the Highways England.	Critical infrastructure relating to the new trunk road and its supporting earthworks and soft estate will remain under the maintenance of 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. Further principles defining the embankments and cuttings have been agreed and are set out in Appendix TT.3 of the Applicant's Response to the ExA's First Written Questions [REP1-049]. 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	Under discussion.

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
			Local Highway Authority, while the basins would be maintained by the Local Authority.	
10.3		NCC has no concerns over the access to and from the A1 from the current Causey Park junction with vehicles to and from the Widdrington Road approach being able to use the de-trunked and new local road connections to the dualled A1 without any significant diversion over the current access as both the West Moor and Fenrother junctions are all-direction grade separated junctions	Agreed	Agreed.
10.4	Maintenance boundaries	NCC raised issues surrounding the stopping up of highways near Detention Basin 20 and Highlaw Junction, particularly with regard to ownership following completion of the scheme and whether this should be covered off in the DCO.	The Applicant is looking into this issue and is to confirm position in due course.	Under discussion.
10.5	Maintenance boundaries – adoption	East Linkhall Access Road to be widened from 4.5m wide single-lane with passing bays to become 6.0m wide two-lane carriageway.	The Applicant agrees – this change was allowed for within the Order limits set. Update to the General Arrangement Plans be made for Deadline 5.	Agreed.
10.6	Maintenance boundaries – adoption	Length of existing road to the north of East Linkhall Access Road tie-in (Ch.60200 to Ch.603000) is to be de-trunked – dDCO Schedules to be updated accordingly. NCC ask that Shipperton Bridge to be maintained by HE, similar to the arrangement at Priest Bridge on Part A.	The Applicant agrees that the dDCO Schedules to reflect the de-trunking at this location. The maintenance arrangements for Shipperton Bridge are to be confirmed.	Under discussion.
10.7	Maintenance boundaries – adoption	West Linkhall Access Road pinch point – length and width of single lane section of road to be reduced if possible.	The Applicant agrees that the carriageway width should be reduced to 3.9m, with updates to be made to DCO Plans for Deadline 6. The length of the single carriageway section is to be investigated further and details to be provided to NCC.	Under discussion.
10.8	Maintenance boundaries – adoption	Turning head to be provided at northern extent of West Linkhall Access Road.	The Applicant agrees – amendment to be made for Deadline 6.	Agreed.
10.9	Maintenance boundaries – adoption	Rock South Farm Access Road carriageway width to be reduced from 4.5m.	The Applicant agrees. Carriageway width to be reduced to 3.9m and update to be made to DCO Plans for Deadline 6.	Under discussion.
10.10	Maintenance boundaries – adoption	Positive drainage to be provided on access roads for East Linkhall, West Linkhall and Rock South Farm.	The Applicant confirms that West Linkhall Access Road will be positively drained through the reuse of existing drainage on the repurposed A1 carriageway.	Under discussion.

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
			Provision of positive drainage on the access roads for East Linkhall and Rock South Farm is currently being investigated and is subject to further discussion.	
11	Effects on Motorised Road Traffic			
11.1		In relation to the impact on road safety away from the Strategic Road Network, the proposals will make the A1 a more attractive travel option and those travellers who wish to avoid actual or perceived delays, especially in the summer months, will use the upgraded sections removing traffic from unsuitable routes on the Local Road Network.	Agreed.	Agreed
11.2		NCC considers that the single carriageway nature of the A1 has contributed to Alnwick and places further north having a much more remote character with reduced opportunity to access work and key services offered by the Tyneside conurbation.	Agreed, the Scheme will help to address this issue.	Agreed
11.3		In relation to the Alnwick to Ellingham section (Part B), there are road safety benefits from removing the local traffic from the Strategic Road Network in particular through the provision of the new Local Access Roads to East and West Linkhall as well as new road to Rock South Farm.	Agreed, the Scheme will help to address this issue.	Agreed
11.4		These positive impacts upon Road Safety can only be fully confirmed once all additional points of clarification and additional information in relation to the development as requested from Highways England and their consultant and contractor partners is received and agreed.	Agreed, but it is common ground that the Scheme will improve highway safety in the area.	Agreed
12	Effects on the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network and on cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders			
12.1	Extents and widths of new rights of way, diverted rights of way and stopping up of existing rights of way	NCC proposed numerous changes to the Public Rights of Way and Access Drawings [REP2-003] and the relevant schedules in the Draft DCO [REP2-004 and 005] following their review of the DCO Application.	<p>The proposed changes were considered by the Applicant and responded to via direct communication as well as through the Applicant's Comments on Responses to Written Questions for Deadline 2. For details refer to Applicant's Comments on Responses to Written Questions – Appendix A - Public Rights of Way Response [REP2-021]. Both the plans and dDCO [REP2-004 and 005] were updated to reflect the proposed changes and resubmitted for Deadline 2.</p> <p>NCC confirmed at a meeting held on 17/02/21 that almost all issues raised in relation to the PRoWs have now been resolved,</p>	Under discussion

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
			<p>with just a couple of minor outstanding issues still to be addressed.</p> <p>NCC is content for the proposed PRow widths to be captured in the SoCG, as long as this is agreeable with the Examiner. The standard widths employed by NCC are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The preferred width for a public footpath is 1.5 metres or 2.0 metres where the public footpath is proposed to be fenced or hedged on each side. – The preferred width for a bridleway is 3 metres. <p>It is noted that these widths refer to the legal width and represent the minimum gap between any boundary features (fence, wall trees, hedge etc) along the length of the right of way. Any made up path or bridleway which is being physically created may have a different width and NCC are open to discussion with respect to any specific proposals for individual rights of way where there is physical creation on the ground.</p>	
12.2	Statement in the Hearings	The A1 currently acts as a barrier to East / West journeys in the region, and the Scheme will improve East / West connectivity.	Agreed.	Agreed.
13	Construction Environmental Management Plan			
13.1		An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [APP-346] has been submitted with the application. This document provided is an appropriate vehicle for identifying the mitigation measures for the Scheme that will be included within the final CEMP.	Agreed. The CEMP will be kept under review.	Under discussion.
14	Construction Traffic Management Plan			
14.1	7 day working during the works	NCC suggest encouraging 7 day working (subject to other factors)	<p>The Applicant disagrees and has confirmed the following:</p> <p>Any traffic management required on the network will be left in place for the duration of the requirement – supported by 24/7 inspection and maintenance provision.</p> <p>For wider activities 7-day working is not supported unless for a specified fixed duration activity. This is not only to manage workforce safety and ensure the Applicant does not impose fatigue, but also to afford a regular period of respite and break form the works to all locally affected stakeholders.</p>	Under discussion

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
			<p>Where there is a significant benefit or need to complete 7-day operations this will be planned as a specific work item with those affected.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	
14.2	Consultation in relation to road closures during the works	The requirement to close side roads and the A1 will be subject to consultation with NCC. NCC need to ensure that consultation is timely to allow for any re-planning of their works that may be affected.	<p>The Applicant has confirmed the following:</p> <p>When the construction programme is more mature (and no later than 6 months ahead of construction start) the main contractor will arrange a meeting with key stakeholders (NCC, emergency services etc) to introduce key personnel from our team and provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – An overview of the TTM proposals and sequence of works, – Key switches in the first quarter, – Establish agreed contact points for comms between the main contractor and each stakeholder, – Gather feedback on proposals and refine and develop and necessary. <p>This will be repeated at 3 months ahead of construction and then 1 month ahead providing updates and addressing any new concerns.</p> <p>When construction starts the main contractor will operate monthly TM Forums whereby, they will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Present the proposed works for the coming quarter at high level (and the specific details of any forthcoming significant switches in that period); – Seek to identify any potential clashes with road space for works or diversion planning for that quarter to be assessed and co-ordinated out of the meeting; – Present detailed plans for any switches in the coming month; – Review any concerns from the previous month; and – Discuss any forthcoming events/embargoes/etc. to ensure they plan accordingly. <p>In the meantime, the main contractor's TM Managers will be available for any concerns from key stakeholders between the regular contact points of TM Forums.</p>	Under discussion

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
			Discussions are ongoing.	
14.3	TTROs for reduced speed limits during the works	TTROs would be required to reduce the speed limit on both the A1 and local road network (managed by NCC) as part of the Scheme. The main contractor will define the extents of the speed restrictions and progress the TTROs with the Applicant and NCC to ensure these are in place prior to any temporary speed restrictions being imposed - restrictions will be entered onto One network by the Streetworks team.	<p>The Applicant agrees and has confirmed the following:</p> <p>Proposed TTROs for the Scheme will be introduced in the main contractor's initial meeting (6 months prior to construction start) and then discussed and developed together prior to any formal submission.</p> <p>The main contractor will also arrange to populate other systems at the relevant time as agreed with NCC (i.e. at the time of formal TTRO submission, or at specified number of weeks ahead). This will be led by the main contractor's TM Manager.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	Under discussion
14.4	Extended closures / weekend closures during the works	Para. 2.6.24 of the CTMP refers to extended closures (possibly some Friday to Monday full closures). Full weekend closures may cause a lot of pressure on NCC network. There are only 4 extended closures planned – NCC want assurances that this will be the case.	<p>The Applicant has confirmed the following:</p> <p>The main contractor does not currently anticipate needing more than 4 extended closures to deliver the works.</p> <p>Should this change as their planning develops, they will engage with NCC and all affected stakeholders through specific meetings at the earliest opportunity to discuss the proposal, the need and ensure sufficient time for robust communication and stakeholder liaison with all affected parties.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	Under discussion
14.5	Communication of journey times during the works	In respect to para. 2.6.29 of the CTMP, NCC have stated a preference for the quoted journey time to be expressed as the additional time the journey will take.	<p>The Applicant has confirmed the following:</p> <p>When the main contractor displays journey times for diversion routes on their pVMS they are governed by Highways England VMS policy. Their TM Manager will look to provide the best information to the travelling public whilst ensuring they still comply with Highways England policy.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	Under discussion

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
14.6	Coordination meetings prior to and during the works	NCC concerned over the regularity, scope and attendees of coordination meetings.	<p>The Applicant has confirmed the following:</p> <p>When the construction programme is more mature (and no later than 6 months ahead of construction start) the main contractor will arrange a meeting with key stakeholders (NCC, emergency services etc) to introduce key personnel from our team and provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – An overview of the TTM proposals and sequence of works, – Key switches in the first quarter, – Establish agreed contact points for comms between the main contractor and each stakeholder, – Gather feedback on proposals and refine and develop and necessary. <p>This will be repeated at 3 months ahead of construction and then 1 month ahead providing updates and addressing any new concerns.</p> <p>When construction starts the main contractor will operate monthly TM Forums whereby, they will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Present the proposed works for the coming quarter at high level (and the specific details of any forthcoming significant switches in that period); – Seek to identify any potential clashes with road space for works or diversion planning for that quarter to be assessed and co-ordinated out of the meeting; – Present detailed plans for any switches in the coming month; – Review any concerns from the previous month; and – Discuss any forthcoming events/embargoes/etc. to ensure they plan accordingly. <p>In the meantime, the main contractor's TM Managers will be available for any concerns from key stakeholders between the regular contact points of TM Forums.</p> <p>The revised CTMP issued at Deadline 1 [REP1-025] has been updated in response to NCC's comment and will be issued at Deadline 3.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	Under discussion

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
14.7	Traffic counts	NCC expressed wish for traffic counts on informal diversion routes, prior to and during the work, to assess/quantify any increased rat running.	<p>The Applicant has confirmed the following:</p> <p>The main contractor will provide additional supportive signage to discourage rat running and encourage people following signed diversions only.</p> <p>HE will continue to engage with NCC regarding construction impacts and the monitoring of noise, air quality and traffic flows at key locations. The CTMP will continue to be developed based on these discussions.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	Under discussion
14.8	Preparation of the Detailed Local Operating Agreement	NCC expressed wish for this to start as soon as possible so that the process is not rushed.	<p>The Applicant agrees and has confirmed the following:</p> <p>The main contractor agrees and would like to start the preparation of the Detailed Local Operating Agreement at the earliest practical opportunity to avoid any rush. The proposal would be to engage from Easter time 2021 to start to draft allowing circa 1 year for completion and reviews.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	Under discussion
14.9	Impact of organised and “informal” diversion of traffic during the works	There is a concern over the impact of both the organised and “informal” diversion of traffic during the works. Particular areas of concern include the A697 through Longhorsely and Longframlington as this is the obvious diversion for traffic who may experience queues entering the Traffic Management at the Northgate junction, similar to what occurs during summer peak periods when concertina or phantom queuing can occur as vehicles slow from the dual carriageway into the single carriageway currently.	<p>The Applicant has confirmed the following:</p> <p>The main contractor has the use of mobile VMS and technology that has the capability to alert road users to journey times through the works; this should inform them that phantom queues are just that and that journey time is still better to remain on the A1. They can trial the locations of these and adjust as trials suggest, seeking to avoid unnecessary pressures being put on the potential informal diversion routes.</p> <p>As described in the Case for the Scheme [APP-344], traffic modelling of the construction scenario was undertaken using the SATURN model, in order to calculate the monetised disbenefits associated with delays during the construction works. The model forecasts that the majority of A1 traffic (around 90%) will remain on the A1 during the construction works, with a small forecast increase in traffic flows along the A697. During the morning peak hour, the model forecasts an additional 29 vehicles northbound and 84 vehicles southbound on the A697 passing through Longhorsley and Longframlington. During the</p>	Under discussion

Item	Document	NCC Position	Highways England Response	Status
			<p>evening peak hour, the model forecasts an increase of 30 vehicles northbound and 40 vehicles southbound. Given that the forecast increase is below two vehicles per minute, this is not considered likely to have a significant adverse impact at these locations.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>	
14.10	Impacts of the diversion routes on villages during the works	There are concerns over the impacts in all villages on the diversion routes, both formal and informal, especially during the full weekend closures and whether any temporary mitigation is therefore required.	<p>The Applicant continues to liaise with NCC regarding the impact of redistributed traffic on the local road network and provided the following comments to NCC's response to written question TT1.18 at Deadline 2 (see Table 1-5 of [REP2-020]):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 2.6.36 of the CTMP [REF] confirms that signage will be erected to confirm the official diversion route and deter traffic from passing through sensitive areas. – The model referred to in the Case for the Scheme [APP-344] forecasts that the majority of A1 traffic (around 90%) will remain on the A1 during the construction works, with a small forecast increase in traffic flows along the A697. During the morning peak hour, the model forecasts an additional 29 vehicles northbound and 84 vehicles southbound on the A697 passing through Longhorsley and Longframlington. During the evening peak hour, the model forecasts an increase of 30 vehicles northbound and 40 vehicles southbound. Given that the forecast increase is below two vehicles per minute, this is not considered likely to have a significant adverse impact at these locations. 	Under discussion

© Crown copyright 2021.

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

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

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

Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email

psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

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

If you have any enquiries about this document

A1inNorthumberland@highwaysengland.co.uk

or call **0300 470 4580***.

*Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls.

These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ

Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363