

Sir Antony Gormley & Antony Gormley Studio, Submission for Deadline 5 – 1st May 2020

Please find below our submission for Deadline 5, 1st May 2020, in answer to the Applicant's responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions, the Applicant's comments on Deadline 3 Submissions, and on relevant additional information submitted in line with Deadline 4.

Introductory Statement

We would like to impress upon the Applicant and the Examining Authority that we are not simply concerned by the individual and distinct interruptions that the Scheme will cause to existing views of the Angel of the North – it is of great concern to us that the cumulative effect of these disruptions will cause significant harm to experiences of the Angel of the North.

Whilst we of course understand the necessity of additional signage to ensure that A1 users are safe, we are alarmed by the 'superspan' gantry proposed at Eighton Lodge. The prospect of such a large and obtrusive structure in the very near approach to the Angel of the North is shocking. We would implore the Applicant to consider a more Southerly placement of this gantry to minimise the unquestionably negative impact on views to the Angel of the North.

We will expect to receive further information in the detailed design phase, and request that better visuals are supplied, to reassure us that the gantries are designed and placed to be as least visually distracting as possible.

Our primary concern is the way in which the negative consequences of the scheme would be mitigated through the planting and vegetation management plans. It is critical that the Applicant is fully conversive and cooperative with Gateshead Council in the development of these plans.

The Angel of the North is most effective when seen against a clean backdrop of the sky and the surrounding landscape. Gateshead Council's commissioned *NECT Report* reinforces this notion that the Angel of the North is active when visible and that it is essential that the Angel of the North remains visible in order to fulfil its potential. It is vital that the open nature of the Angel of the North and its relationship to the mound is safeguarded.

EXAD4/018 Applicant's responses to ExA's Second Written Questions:

Q2.0.5 –

North Dene Footbridge

- a) The height of the existing North Dene Footbridge is 1.9m, the height of the new proposed structure would be 2.35m rising to 4.5m at the centre of the bridge – this would significantly disrupt views of the Angel of the North from the South of the footbridge. We would welcome any attempts made by the Applicant to lower the height of the replacement footbridge.
- b) The Applicant outlines two preferred options for the North Dene footbridge replacement in *Structure Options Report Appendix 2.01, HE551462-WSP-LSI-22-DR-ZL-45010 Structures Engineering Drawings and Sections Document Reference*

TR010031/APP/2.7.5(2)(0) at (K) Sheet 10 of 16 and (L) Sheet 11 of 16. The Tied Arch Structure may create a finer structure and reduce the visual weight of the footbridge, allowing for better through views of the Angel of the North. However, the Half through Warren Truss Structure would reduce the height of the new structure, preserving more of the existing views, and is more comparable to the existing structure. We would support any design aspects that would minimise the height and weight of the replacement structure.

Q2.4.3 –

Limits of Deviation

We would like to reiterate our concern, and to second Gateshead Council's assertion, that a 1m deviation as stated in *Article 7 Limits of Deviation ISH1 (REP1-003)* is unacceptable and allows too great a flexibility on the height of structures.

A 1m deviation in height for both the gantry structures and the North Dene footbridge replacement could have significant detrimental effect on views to the Angel of the North.

EXA/D4/007 Applicant's Comments on Submissions to Deadline 3

4.5 and 6 & 2.0.7 a, b & c –

Gantries – visual impact and placement

We of course support the Applicant in their endeavours to make the A1 as safe for users as possible and agree that the placement of signage and gantries will fulfil an important role in this.

As detailed in *Appendix 2.0 B - Gantry Details (WQ 2.0.7) 4.6.5* we also appreciate that the Applicant has attempted to use more open truss designs featuring hollow sections to create less visual weight in an attempt to minimise disruption of views to the Angel of the North.

In *App/7.4 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan* the Applicant states that attempts will be made in the Detailed Design Phase to reduce the visual impact of the gantries and to consider 'sympathetic' placement of the gantries. We look forward to receiving further information to support this statement.

Highways England have stated that they do not feel that detailed video renderings are warranted to convey the impact of the gantries and footbridge on views to the Angel of the North. We accept that a number of photomontages of views across landscape towards the Angel of the North have been considered in the Applicant's submission *Appendix 7.1 – Visual Effects Schedule of the ES [APP-121]*, listed by the Applicant as Viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 14, 16, 21, 23, and 31. However, the photomontages that have been made available by the Applicant do little to aid our understanding of how the scheme will affect views of the Angel of the North whilst driving on the A1. Without an accurate and detailed video rendering from the point of view of a vehicle approaching the Angel of the North from both directions on the A1 it is extremely difficult to gauge the cumulative effect of the multiple gantries that drivers would encounter on their experience.

One of the Applicant's repeated positions, in attempts to detract from the detrimental effect on views of the Angel of the North, is that views from the A1 by car are fleeting in nature. We would like to make it clear that the transitory nature of views from the A1 in no way diminish their value.

Furthermore, the conclusion drawn in *Appendix 1.5 A - Angel of the North (WQ 1.5.11)* acknowledges that the multitude of gantries proposed in the new scheme will have detrimental effects on views of the Angel of the North. Likewise, in *Conclusion 1.2.23*, the Applicant confesses that Northbound views from junction 65 would be adversely affected by the combined impact of the gantries and replacement North Dene footbridge.

We do not believe that the Applicant is taking sufficient mitigating measures to safeguard views to the Angel of the North.

4.4.8 –

The Applicant's response to Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

We would like to reinforce the issues raised in Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*, and would like more guarantees from the Applicant that, as proposed in *Figure 7.6: Landscape Mitigation Design [APP-061]*, any reduction in views to the Angel of the North are considered and compensated for in the landscape design and mitigation planning. For example, the Applicant has suggested that woodland edge planting between chainage 12300 – 12560 could be less dense to allow greater potential for views to the Angel of the North, but we propose that there are no trees in this area at all, in line with Gateshead Council's commitment to opening up the site to its original configuration.

We understand that the Applicant is currently in conversation with Gateshead Council regarding landscape mitigation plans and vegetation management schemes and welcome a coordinated approach. We would be grateful for any updates on these discussions, and further assurances that the opening up of views to the Angel of the North to minimise the negative effect of gantry placement will be prioritised in these plans.

5.2.1 –

The Applicant's response to Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

The mitigation measures promised in the current landscaping plans are not of sufficient reassurance. Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report* determined that the scheme would cause significant harm to experiences of the Angel of the North. In response to the concerns raised in Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*, the Applicant has stated that any harm to the Angel of the North would be offset in the *Outline CEMP (APP-174)* and *Figure 7.6 Landscape Mitigation Design (APP-061)* in the *Applicant's Response to Gateshead Council's Local Impact Report – Document Reference EXA/D3/002*. We cannot accept this as discussions are still ongoing.

5.2.3 –

The Applicant's response to Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

The photomontages provided by the Applicant largely use locations far away from the Angel of the North and have little bearing on the experience of A1 users in the near or immediate approach to the Angel of the North from either the North or the South.

Whilst the Applicant consulted Gateshead Council on the locations for these photomontages, locations were selected before gantry placement had been confirmed. Thus, the potential impact of the proposed gantries was not considered in the location selection process.

We have requested but have not received accurate renders of relevant views that include the Angel of the North. We would be grateful to receive further photomontage locations based on accurate renderings of the relationship between the proposed gantries, North Dene footbridge replacement, and the Angel of the North. Furthermore, we have asked and ask again to be consulted in this process and be offered the opportunity to suggest key locations for photomontages.

5.2.4 –

The Applicant's response to Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

All visual assessments carried out by the Applicant to date do not factor in the proposed Southern Green Landscaping plan developed by Gateshead Council. This plan aims to reveal more views to the Angel of the North and to manage the now overgrown vegetation that currently surrounds the Artwork.

The conclusions drawn in the Applicant's reports fail to reflect the significant disruption that would be caused by the proposed gantries. The Applicant consistently diminishes the impact of the gantries by referring to current vegetation cover. This is not a representative assessment of the true potential impact. The Southern Green 'Revealing the Angel' scheme embodies our desire, and Gateshead Council's desire, to effectively manage the surrounding vegetation to maximise views of the Angel of the North. The current state of the vegetation is not as intended.

The Applicant simply states that they do not currently intend to undertake further assessments factoring in a background of cleared vegetation. Failure to account for the planned changes to vegetation cover in these assessments is misleading.

5.2.5 –

Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

The Gateshead Council report finds that the combination of the gantries and the North Dene Replacement footbridge would have a significantly harmful effect on views of the Angel of the North when travelling Northbound. The images set out on page 57 of the *NECT Report* also help to illustrate this potentially negative outcome.

As observed in the report, the Angel of the North is intended to be boldly exposed to the passing traffic. The effects of the proposed bridge design and gantries are worrying.

It is anticipated that the proposed design of the bridge will fully obscure views of the Angel of the North on the northbound approach. Once past the footbridge the views remain obscured by the proposed gantries.

It is undeniable that this harmful impact on the views of the Angel of the North from the A1 would have a significant negative effect on experiences of the Artwork.

5.2.7 –

Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

We are anxious to hear how the workshop with Gateshead Council to discuss Landscape Mitigation Design went, and how ongoing discussions are developing.

5.2.9 –

Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

Regarding the photomontages, and the further photomontages supplied by the Applicant, the selection of locations was made in consultation with Gateshead Council before it became apparent how detrimental the overhead structures would be.

As stated above, the Studio would have been grateful to have been consulted for advice on key locations

5.3.3 –

Gateshead Council's *Local Impact Report*

The Applicant acknowledges that visual impacts would occur on the users of the A1, with those travellers with a view northward of the Angel of the North, between junction 65 (Birtley) and 66 (Eighton Lodge) having a noticeable worsening of the view.

Therefore, we would impress upon the Applicant the need to mitigate these negative effects. The placement of the gantries, including the design of the attached signage, the design of the North Dene footbridge replacement, and the landscaping plans should all be considered in light of minimising negative effects on views to the Angel of the North.

7 –

North Dene Footbridge Replacement

As stated in our comments in response to *Q2.0.5 a) and b)* of the *EXAD4/018 Applicant's responses to ExA's Second Written Questions*, we believe that the Applicant should take all steps within their power to minimise the disruption of the replacement North Dene Footbridge. We would support a lower overall height of the bridge, as well as a more open structure to allow more through views to the Angel of the North.