

The following provides comments against Northgate Farm PMA Options Technical Note, submitted as part of deadline 8a.

Each comment makes reference to the respective section within the document.

Section 1.1 Introduction

Section 1.1.1

The Applicant highlights that we communicated this issue via Deadline 6. This is correct but it should be recognised that this was first raised with the Applicant in a meeting on the 13th January 2021. This was followed up in Deadline 2 and subsequent deadline submissions. The Deadline 2 Written Representation included the following statement:

- a. *The current point of access is also not wanted by the neighbour whose property the access road has to travel over.*

Section 1.1.2

Alternative Route A was first presented to the Applicant at a meeting on the 13th January 2021 and subsequently further detailed in an email on the 5th February 2021. Whilst it is recognised that there are some benefits for Northgate Farm in this option the overriding motivation in proposing the solution was to appease Mr Davidson and avoid accessing via the front of his property. In making this proposal this entailed a number of compromises which included:

1. Take on the responsibility for constructing a 75-metre tarmac road which would partition the property.
2. With the road running through the centre of the garden we were making a compromise on visual effect and air quality.
3. Accept the loss of additional trees at the front of the property.
4. Take on additional responsibility for land works and landscaping. This included the repositioning of a well-established vegetable garden.

Although it is understood that this option is not favoured by Mr Davidson, as it involves some shared access, it is significantly better than the current proposal. Furthermore, it should be recognised that all three routes require a degree of shared use and maintenance.

Section 1.2.2

The Applicant is correct in highlighting that Alternative Route B does not require agreement between the parties but does not recognise that it would require a major compromise, from Northgate Farm to resolve a problem that was not of its making. Although we were prepared to make compromises for Alternative A this option represents a much larger scale of concession, particularly with the impact upon the woodland. This includes the following:

1. The additional access road would mean that we have two access roads running through our property within the woodland. The additional access road would significantly exasperate all the issues previously raised in respect to the woodland. This includes:
 - a. Privacy
 - b. Wildlife
 - c. Outlook
 - d. Air Quality
 - e. Noise
 - f. Loss of trees

- g. Safety and security
 - h. Environmental impact
2. The construction of the additional tarmac road, stretching the length of Northgate Farm property (estimated at 135 metres), significantly adds to the amount of tarmac on view
 3. The construction of such a road would represent a major undertaking for us.
 4. The road through Northgate would take up a significant percentage of the property imposing constraints on how the property could be used in the future.
 5. The road would partition the property leaving areas of dead space which would not be utilised.
 6. The road creates additional burden and responsibility on the property for maintenance.
 7. The road would require a significant amount of additional land works and landscaping. This would include managing septic tank and water pipes which fall within the route of the road. The well-established vegetable garden would also need to be re-positioned.

Section 2 Current Proposal

As previously documented in detail the current proposal is not a good solution and has a number of major issues, which we recognise cannot be resolved. This includes, but not limited to:

1. To facilitate access into Northgate Farm additional works are required to redesign the front of the property. This includes felling trees which will further open up views of the new Dual carriageway and access roads. Previously the Applicant had placed great store in the benefit of these same trees to screen Northgate Farm from the worse of the visual effect.
2. With the loss of privacy and additional constraints imposed by the access road we understand why this option is not good solution for Mr Davidson.
3. Given the strength of feeling from Mr Davidson and the current circumstances this option is not viable.

Section 3.3.7 Population and Human Health

It is estimated that the new road will be approximately 135 metres in length. While I understand that this is negligible when considering the rest of the scheme, it represents a major loss of garden to ourselves.

Section 3.3.10 Visual.

As previously discussed in the issue specific hearings we understand that the visual receptor sitting outside of the property (on the A1 verge) will not register the additional 135 metre access road, but nonetheless, will have a major visual effect which impacts the use of the garden. This further highlights the limitations of having a single visual receptor which sits outside the property.

Section 3.3.12 Air Quality.

The access road will introduce vehicle fumes and noise further into the centre of the garden. As Northgate Farm would be responsible for constructing the road, I am not sure how the proposed mitigation measures are relevant here.