

**This forms part of Deadline 6 response from Northgate Farm. The Response is directed at the Deadline 5 submission made by the Applicant referenced by 7.22 Applicant's Response to Deadline 4**

As part of deadline 5 submission the Applicant has provided detailed responses (7.22 Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions) to each of the Northgate Farm responses provided in deadline 4. The deadline 4 submission having made in response to the Applicant's deadline 3 response to the written representation.

In reading the responses the majority are reiterations or embellishments on points already made by the applicant in deadline 3. None of the responses provided served to ease or resolve our concerns. More importantly the responses do not provide any material change to the current position.

On responding here, the natural inclination was to make a further submission to address each of the points made by the Applicant. Inevitably this would have led to a further iteration by the Applicant in deadline 7. We do not believe continuing with this approach is helpful and have therefore chosen to break out of the current recursive loop by not responding to every point.

The reality is that both parties have a very different perspective and will never agree on the impact upon the plans. The Applicant is looking to implement the scheme in the most costs effective manner and is duty bound to defend the submitted plans. Having lived at the property for over 25 years we are naturally protective of the lifestyle and benefits that we enjoyed to date and now believe are at risk. This should be respected by both parties.

Notwithstanding the above position there is one point made by the Applicant in deadline 5 that does warrant a response. In deadline 5 the Applicant makes the following statement as part of the Summary section:

*The Applicant does not consider that there are 50 issues which remain outstanding. While extensive written submissions have been exchanged with Mr Hawes, the underlying points at issue are capable of being condensed into a set of key issues, which number rather fewer than 50. Discussions are ongoing with Mr Hawes to condense the points raised.*

In response to this comment, we felt it was appropriate and helpful to share a high-level summary of the issues as they stand today taking into account recent feedback from the Applicant. As a living document we continue to work with the Applicant to try to address specific issues on the list.

Although the number 50 was previously referenced to provide an indication of scale and breadth of the impact upon Northgate Farm this is not a numbers game. In presenting them as a list, our primary objective was to help the targeting of individual issues with possible mitigation.

We would much rather be in a position where the list was much smaller and we were able to support the scheme. Having objectively read and listened to various representations over the last 5 years the reality is that the scheme will have a significant effect on the property and the list of issues is long. From our perspective these are genuine concerns which stem from our detailed understanding of the plans. Whilst we do not profess to be planning experts, we are experts in knowing what we enjoy about the property and how the scheme will change our personal enjoyment. The list of issues shared below provides a summary of this viewpoint. We are hopeful that the Applicant is able to respect this opinion and does not feel compelled to counter each point.

## Loss of benefits

The following provides a high-level view of some of the lost benefits.

1. The loss of views. The outlook views from all corners of the property are significantly impacted by the expansion of the road, the noise barrier and the construction of the PMA.
2. Easy commute to Newcastle has been lost.
3. Bus service on the doorstep has been lost along with car sharing.
4. Easy unfettered access to the property directly from a public road.
5. The convenience and enjoyment of friends popping in for coffee while passing.
6. Privacy available in the garden.
7. Security of the property is compromised.
8. Easy access to footpaths at the west of the property and bridleway access to the south of the property.
9. Lost kerb appeal to the property
10. Safe woodland to play and relax.

The above list focusses solely on key benefits lost by the scheme they do not include other detrimental impacts such as increase in noise or loss of trees. The following provides a high-level view of the outstanding concerns relating to the Northgate Farm.

## Acquisition of permanent rights 1-8b

1. **Tree loss in woodland.** Loss of trees and hedgerow within the wooded area as part of the PMA construction. A potential risk of losing further loss of trees in the future with the close proximity of the access road compromising the root system.
2. **Security Risk.** The woodland area of the property is an integral part of the garden which provides a secure place to enjoy day and night. The close proximity of the access road changes all of that. It can no longer be considered a secure area where tools and machinery. Furthermore, the position of the road provides a point of unprotected access to the property which does not have security cameras and lighting.
3. **Safe Play area lost.** The woodland has provided a safe haven for Children and pets to play without fear and risk. The introduction of the road means that this is no longer an option. Furthermore, we will no longer feel safe sitting in woodland at night.
4. **Wildlife.** The construction of the access road wrapping around the woodland will reduce the level of wildlife which visits the woodland which includes Owls, hedgehogs, Stoats, Badgers, Deer and bats. We have invested a lot of time in encouraging wildlife in this area. The access road will create a barrier around woods deterring its use by some wildlife. The wildlife does not need be on the protected species list for us to enjoy. For example, we particularly enjoy watching deer in the woods.
5. **Additional Noise from Vehicles in the woodland.** With the number of journeys exceeding 20 per day there will be a noticeable increase in the noise levels in the woodland area. This is further exasperated by the absence of speed limits on the road.
6. **Views from the woodland.** We particularly enjoy sitting in the woodland with uninterrupted views across the fields in all directions. The new access road will become the prominent feature blocking views to the south, east and North.
7. **Woodland Privacy.** We have been fortunate enough to have enjoyed the woodland to relax and recharge the batteries in the knowledge that we had complete privacy and would not be interrupted. The construction of the access road will mean that all parts of this garden will be exposed to the road.

### Acquisition of permanent rights 1-8a

8. **Kerb Appeal.** All kerb appeal is lost with the current proposed access. The stone wall entrance is replaced with views of tarmac and an array of metal constructions on the adjacent property which are not picturesque.
9. **Loss of trees.** To accommodate the new access further trees will need to be felled thereby further exposing the widened carriageway. No provision has been made to retain the existing banks of soil.
10. **Water supply.** The current PMA route crosses over two different water pipes. At this stage there is no provision to address this.
11. **Landscape Design** A significant amount of effort and investment has been made over the last 25 years to landscape the garden. The landscape design was purposely customised to orientate around the current access. The proposed plans will effectively negate much of this work requiring significant rework.
12. **HGV turning.** There is no provision in the plans for large HGV vehicles to turn around with the new access direction.
13. **Minimal protection offered by trees.** Great store has been placed by the Applicant in the masking properties of the trees in this area. Unfortunately, the trees are at an age where they have become "quite leggy" and will not mask the A1 when construction is completed.

### Placement of Layby close to the property

14. **View of HGV Vehicles** Laybys are commonly used by HGV vehicles to provide a stopover. As such the view of parked HGV vehicles will be a prominent view on the landscape. The view of HGV vehicles will be particularly prominent on the approach to Northgate farm via the new PMA access road.
15. **Layby Assistance.** Laybys are essential to assist broken downs vehicles. Unfortunately, it is also common that they look to the local properties for assistance.
16. **Security risk.** The layby provides a convenient legitimate place to park for anyone wishing to burgle the local properties.
17. **Mitigation Constraint** The wide expanse of the layby minimises what can be done to the landscape to mitigate the impact of removing the hedgerow and coronation trees.
18. **Antisocial behaviour** Unfortunately it is common to see antisocial behaviour at laybys
19. **Rubbish.** It is common to see layby bins overflow with rubbish despite regular emptying. In addition, there are plenty of examples where the layby has been used to fly tip.

### Placement of Soil depot close to the property.

20. **Picturesque cottage lost.** The widening of the road and the establishment of the soil depot will result in the stone cottage being demolished.
21. **Loss of additional trees due to Swale Maintenance access road.** The scale of trees and vegetation loss, to facilitate the Swale maintenance, is significant and much greater than that depicted in the plans.
22. **Additional Access Road.** The new swale maintenance road and associated works will become a prominent part of the view to the west of the property replacing the current woodland outlook.
23. **A697 road view.** The planned swale works will require trees to be removed thereby thinning the protected cover currently provided.
24. **Access of vehicles** to the depot will add to the air quality, dust and noise concerns during the construction period.

25. **Soil Deposit view.** The views of open field of countryside will be blocked by the soil deposit during construction.

### **Access to the property**

26. **Viable route concern.** The owners of the adjacent property have communicated directly they will not accept any shared use of the access road over their property.
27. **Increased Journey time.** Access to the property from the North will take much longer to complete with circa 3 extra miles of travel and an additional 15-minute journey to access the property. Similarly, journeys to the south will take much longer.
28. **Loss of Convenience.** The convenience and enjoyment of friends popping in for coffee while passing the property will be lost.
29. **Beholden to 3 additional property owners.** The new access road to the property will entail travelling through the property of 3 different owners. As such are very vulnerable to potential uses of the respective properties which would compromise the Northgate household.
30. **Different usage.** The different owners will have a different expectation on how the road should be maintained leading contention and possible conflict. For example, the farm use of the road will be very different to domestic use.
31. **Access to the rear of the property by car.** To get access to the rear of the property (to carry out maintenance and manage the water supply) by car the new plans require a journey of over 1k, travelling through 5 different properties.
32. **High level dependency on 6 different property owners acting reasonably.** The new arrangement relies upon 6 different property owners to operate corroboratively and fairly in maintaining the access roads. There is a real risk that the access will become compromised with any relationship fall-out. This has happened in the past and unfortunately is likely to happen again. This arrangement will be a constant source of contention going forward and is not sustainable. Unfortunately, even before the route has been established this issue has created a conflict with one owner not accepting access through their property.
33. **Extra Burden.** The maintenance of the new access road will place an additional obligation on the property that will deter future buyers.
34. **Vehicle speed.** The new PMA road does not have any speed limit or constraints. As such vehicles could reach speeds of 60mph. As pedestrians are expected to share the road with the vehicles this would pose a real safety risk, particularly at night.
35. **Farm shooting.** In the past the farmer has participated in bird shooting in the same field as the new PMA. If this is to continue in the future then it would not be safe to use the access road on those occasions.
36. **Snow Clearance.** There have been occasions in the past when snowfall would have would have left us blocked in the house for more than a week, (even with a 4X4 car) if our only means of access was the PMA. Three years ago, the local fulbeck road was impassable for over 2 weeks due to snow
37. **Road Cleaning.** There is no provision for cleaning.
38. **Type of use on the PMA.** At this stage there is no covenant protecting how the road will be used in the future. Without protection the road could be used to facilitate potential business use which radically increases road usage and add extra detriment to the property.
39. **Emergency services.** The time taken for emergency services to reach the property will significantly increase. This also applies to other delivery services. There is a real risk that some services will refuse to deliver, particularly as it involves travelling over a private road.
40. **Navigation.** As it will no longer be possible to navigate to the property by Google maps and other sat nav services this will create a number of problems in the future.

41. **Outlook from access road.** The planned route of the PMA is less than picturesque with the route passing by various constructions in poor repair and a large car park covered in road planning's.

### Transport.

42. **Lost Bus Service.** Having a regular bus service directly outside the property is a significant benefit to the property and has been well used over the years.
43. **Alternative Bus service not viable.** In order to catch the X15 service to Newcastle it will be necessary to walk 2k to nearest bus stop. This will add at least 1 hour to a return journey. However, the prospect of anyone from my family walking across unlit fields to catch a bus service in the winter is a nonstarter given the obvious safety concerns.
44. **Footpath.** For the last 25 years we have regularly used the council-maintained footpath through the woodlands directly west of the property. The removal of the footpath and the widening leaves the property land locked with no option to venture west of the property.
45. **Car sharing.** In living alongside the A1 we are ideally positioned to take advantage of car sharing with friends who live further north. This will no longer be an option in the future.
46. **Bridleway Access.** The plans currently do not include provision to preserve the existing bridleway access from the woodland to the stream.

### Landscape and Visual

The proposed plans negatively impact the visual effect from all parts of the property, which include:

47. **View of the new PMA.** The new access road approaches from the south of the property replacing the rolling fields outlook. It then wraps around the eastern hedgerow boundary of the property, before heading west across the north eastern corner of our property. As such the access road will dominate (and block views of countryside) the south, east and north outlook when viewed from all points of the garden.
48. **View of widened A1 and traffic.** The widened A1 will be visible from the majority of the property including the house, the garden, the approach road to the property and point of access to the property.
49. **View of Layby and stationary HGV.** The layby and stationary vehicles will be visible from the majority of the property including the garden, the approach road to the property and point of access to the property.
50. **View of Coronation trees.** The pleasant outlook over the tree lined Coronation avenue will be lost along with hedgerow.
51. **View of Character cottage.** The westerly view of Northgate cottage will be replaced by the Swale access road. This also includes the felling of a number of trees in the woodland.
52. **View of Noise Barrier.** Although the partial noise barrier may assist noise it will not be pleasant to view. The noise barrier will be clearly visible from the house, the front and rear garden a
53. **Access road to the woods at the north.** The access road providing access to the woods at the North will be visible from most of the garden
54. **View of Soil dump.** During construction the soil dump will block views of countryside.

## Noise and Vibration.

55. **Increase in noise levels.** The increase in traffic travelling at higher speeds will significantly increase noise levels in the household and garden. The Applicant recognises that the increased traffic and speeds, (at opening) will raise the level of noise above Significant Observed Adverse Effect (SOAEL) safe levels. In comparing the noise levels between a dual carriageway and the current single carriageway it is very noticeable how much noisier the dual is compared to the single carriage.
56. **Impact upon the garden.** The Applicant does not provide any indication of the adverse noise impact within the garden area where we spend most of leisure time. For example, the point of access to the property will be circa 20 metres from the dual carriageway and totally exposed to the road and increased noise.
57. **Impact on quiet periods.** There will be a greater level of long-distance travel which is less constrained by peak hours. As such it is likely that the most noticeable increase in traffic (and noise) will be in the periods outside of peak hours, particularly the early evening period. This is where we will notice the noise increase the most as the current levels of traffic at this time are very low. Unfortunately, it is when we enjoy using the garden the most.
58. **Noise levels increase with age of road.** It is recognised that it is necessary to regularly resurface the road to minimise the noise impact. Unfortunately, I am not confident that this will happen as suggested. The stretch of the A1 south of this scheme has not been resurfaced in the last 25 years and is heavily pitted and worn.
59. **Partial Noise barrier.** It is disappointing to be learn that there is no scope to extend the barrier to the full extent of my boundary leaving the majority of the property exposed to a significant increase in road traffic volume. This will be particularly noticeable at the point of entry to the property which will be totally exposed to the new carriageway. The constraints on the barrier length leaves the majority of the north facing aspect of the house fully open to the new dual carriageway. This includes 11 windows (8 on the upper tier) which have a direct line of sight to the new carriageway with negligible benefit from the noise barrier. Furthermore, the barrier offers no benefit to those parts of the garden that we spend most of our time and enjoy the most.
60. **Soil Depot Noise.** The close proximity of the soil store and the limited noise mitigation measures, will mean HGV vehicles accessing the soil store will increase noise levels during construction.
61. **No vibration analysis.** The Applicant response states, "Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects." In living at the property, it is very noticeable when large vehicles pass the property at fast speeds the house does vibrate. As this is not frequent it is something that we can tolerate. With increased speeds and HGV traffic we believe that this will become a common occurrence, taking the issue above any reasonable tolerance levels. Given the track record in maintaining other stretches of the A1 we have very low confidence that the road will remain free of irregularities.

## Air quality.

62. **Degradation in air quality.** In reporting on air quality, the Applicant is very focused on demonstrating that government threshold limits will be achieved and appears to have neglected the human element here. As recognised by the Highways England own on-line

literature, increased traffic travelling at faster speeds will result in a degradation in air quality. Any degradation in air quality could have a direct impact upon my family's health.

63. **Accuracy of Analysis.** Although I understand that it is standard industry practice to extrapolate the expected air quality from historical data, I am struggling to understand how an accurate forecast can be derived by such an approach given the wide range of different factors which have an impact upon air quality. Furthermore, there is no option for recourse should the forecast be wrong.
64. **Access Road Fumes in the woodland.** The access road will primarily be used by Northgate Farm and Capri Lodge. At the time of writing Capri Lodge has been split into 2 properties. In addition, the access road will be used by Robson farm, Northumbrian Water and various delivery services. Based upon current usage (even during lockdown) we are seeing over 20 journeys each day. We fully expect this to increase further when the access road is completed. With this level of traffic next to the woodland area there is no doubt that vehicle fumes will be noticeable.
65. **Soil Deposit.** The vehicles depositing the soil will add to air pollution during construction.
66. **Construction Traffic.** Will increase air pollution during the construction period.

### Environmental Impact

67. **Loss of Trees.** The proposed scheme includes plans to fell a large number of mature trees which directly impact upon our enjoyment of the property. These include:
  - a. The coronation Trees
  - b. Trees to the west of the property to facilitate access to the Soil store
  - c. Trees to the west of the property to accommodate a new access road for Swale maintenance
  - d. Trees to the west of the property to facilitate Swale works.
  - e. Possible trees at the front of the property to facilitate new access.
  - f. Possible trees in the woodland to the east to facilitate the new access road.
  - g. Trees to the south of the property to facilitate the PMA culvert.
68. **Loss of Hedgerow.** The proposed scheme includes plans to remove hedgerow. This includes:
  - h. Hedgerow on the western side of the current single carriageway.
  - i. Hedgerow in the woodland to the east of the property to facilitate the new access road.
69. **Impact upon wildlife.** The PMA access road and widening of the A1 will restrict some wildlife from the property.

### Miscellaneous

70. **Safety barrier.** The increased traffic travelling at faster speeds increases the risk of vehicles veering off the road directly into our property. At this stage there are no plans to install safety barriers.
71. **Visual Effect -Noise Barrier.** It would appear that other properties which look out onto a noise barrier have been assigned a significant visual effects rating but this has not been recognised for Northgate Farm. Although the majority of the 70 metre barrier will be visible from the property this is not considered a significant visual effect.
72. **Combined Effect.** The impact on the scheme on the household is wide and far reaching. There is no recognition of this Combined impact in the DCO. The impact includes:
  - a. Visual effect
  - b. Additional Noise

- c. Impact of vibration
- d. Degradation of Air Quality
- e. Impact upon the environment – particularly loss of trees
- f. Loss of public transport
- g. Loss of unfettered access from a Public highway
- h. Land locked to the west of the property
- i. Impact on wildlife of the PMA access road and widening of the A1.

73. **Cumulative Effect.** There is no recognition of the cumulative effect upon Northgate Farm of the Morpeth Northerly bypass scheme and the current A1 dual scheme. The Morpeth bypass had a number of direct impacts upon the property. This included the placement of a very large road sign outside of the property adding to the detrimental visual effect.