

Comments from Gareth Moor/Colin Moor Deadline 4

Sir

The proposed meeting to discuss my concerns has not been held and is not scheduled to be held until after the deadline. Therefore I respectfully request that I am allowed to make further comment following the conclusion of the above meeting.

Following on from the stage 3 hearings I feel I must once again raise my objections to part of the scheme. The area I object to be the works proposed to West View and the proposed tracks servicing Northgate Farm Warreners House and Stafford House and the proposal to use these roads for agricultural traffic .

The duelling of the A1 has been proposed for several reasons well detailed in the documentation.

From my perspective the main reason is one of safety of the public who will be using this road and the roads leading to and from the A1

You may recall the long campaign the late former Chief fire officer of Northumberland Jeff Ord championed and worked tirelessly to have the road duelled. He used a substantial portion of this road to commute to work and witnessed the carnage during his travelling, likewise he had firsthand knowledge the trauma his fire fighters faced when attending accidents. I therefore welcome these proposals for the A1 its self however, as I have previously stated I have serious concerns regarding the proposals for West View and the proposal to service the properties and agricultural activities beyond to the North

The current proposals are not the safest options available the safest route and more practical route is to build is a northern route

My reasons for this are I doubt that at design stage a complete and sufficient risk assessment has been undertaken as required by the CDM Regulations in deed the applicants response is to allude to a small number of additional vehicles using the road in addition to this a small number of agricultural vehicles. There is no acknowledgment to the number of people or other traffic that these vehicles impact on. In short who could be harmed? Had this been undertaken it would clearly indicate that the level of Risk and the potential for that risk been released is significantly much higher diverting the road South as opposed to North

The applicants response is to refer to a small number of Vehicles and not the numbers of people it impacts on. I would also add that it transpired within the meetings that whilst the applicant refers to the farmer only visiting a small number of times a year clearly it now transpires that the fields are regularly use for shoots, This begs the question where will they park when these are held.and what other activities take place on the land which have not been accounted for?

I have previously alluded to my concerns that the usage is well understated and this only adds to my concerns and reinforces my view that this design is flawed.

I can only conclude that there has been no consideration to whom or what could be harmed and the applicant is relying on the number of vehicles as justification of the decision for the proposals. not a risk assessment.

The applicant verbal response at the hearing was to refer to what is “reasonably practicable” as their reasons for designing the road in a south wards direction

I would contend it is more reasonably practicable taking the road north for the following reasons.

1 It is more practicable to work in a field with no other vehicular traffic or people for the majority of the time where ingress and egress can be easily controlled and the track built from North to South in a progressive manner and very safe manner

2 If designed correctly there is the potential to remove two proposed culverts from the scheme. Whilst the Environment Agency have commented on the scheme it is their preference to remove or not to culvert wherever possible

3 The specification for the proposed track is not to adoptable standard therefore will be considerably more cost effective than the works to West View.

4 This design would eliminate all agricultural traffic from a residential street and eliminate the risk to the residents of two new housing estates, hospital complex users, and West View occupants, visitors, and delivery personnel. In Short the risks are completely designed out, a fundamental requirement of the regulations that has not been adhered to in the proposed design.

5 This route would eliminate the modifications and removal of the Gas pumping Station at the North end of West View

6 This route would eliminate from Highways England’s budget substantial cost that would be incurred upgrading West View to adoptable standards a cost which at present is with the housing developer budget. This raises the question why should the public purse pay the costs of developer’s commitments.

7 This route will eliminate the concerns I have regarding flooding due to the proposed works.

8 This route eliminates the temporary traffic that will be travelling through the housing estate, hospital grounds and West View removing spoil, delivering road materials and construction plant to construct the road North of West View. A very reasonably practicable solution

9 This route preserves the features inherent in West View which is compatible to secure by design recommendations. It also preserves the existing hedgerows and trees in the area also.

I would also contend that the applicants assertion that the proposed road/track is shorter than a northern route is not correct I have previously provide dimension regarding this, these indicates that designed correctly it can be shorter.

Gareth/Colin Moor