

This document forms part of Deadline 11 response from Northgate Farm. The Response is intended to address comments made by the Applicant in the Deadline 10 submission referenced by “7.34 Applicant’s Response to Deadline 9”

Table 1-4 – Mark Hawes

We have read the detailed response provided by the Applicant. None of the responses provided have changed our position originally documented in deadline 9. In responding here, we have chosen to pick up specific points raised by the Applicant.

Section 1.1.1

We have referenced the original date here to highlight how long this specific issue has been ongoing without resolution.

Section 1.1.2

We proposed Alternative B with good intentions to try and find a solution to a major issue with the current DCO route. Our neighbour had made it very clear that he did not want us passing through the front of his property. In the absence of any other solution at the time we proposed the alternative, hoping that this would resolve the issue. From our perspective the main objective was to seek unfettered access to the property that would not leave a legacy of issues after the Applicant had finished construction. As highlighted in point 3 the Applicant appears to place the onus on ourselves to solve a problem which has been created by the original choice of route.

Section 1.2.2 Point 2

The Applicant suggests that we can choose the type of surface for the 135-metre road. Whilst other surfaces would be more environmentally friendly, we do not believe that it is feasible to consider other options given the distance and the level of ongoing maintenance that would be required.

Section 1.2.2 Point 5

The Applicant suggests that the property will not be partitioned. I am not sure how the Applicant has come to this conclusion, given that they have acknowledged that they will not be responsible for determining the route of the road. The only way to prevent the property from being partitioned would be to follow the perimeter of the fence line. This is not feasible due to other constraints, while placing the boundary trees of the property at risk.

Section 2 Current Proposal

Point 1

The original statement referenced the works that were required to facilitate the existing DCO access into the property within 1/8a. The references provided by the Applicant relate to the north east corner works within 1/8b which are out of context here.

Point 3

The Applicant suggests that the existing DCO application remains viable. Given the previous communications with our neighbour we know that this is not true. It has been made clear that we will not be given unfettered access.

Section 3.3.7 Population and Human Health

Point 1

The response provided by the Applicant suggests that the length of the road for Alternative B is 120 meters. Given that the Applicant has already stated that they will not be responsible for determining the route within the property I am surprised that they are so confident of the length. In looking to protect key features in the garden and working around constraints we estimate this to be more like 135 metres at this stage (as measured on Google maps). The actual distance would ultimately be determined by a plan. In designing the road within the property additional attention and provision would need to be given to passing points and turning areas for large vehicles. This is not shown on the current illustration.

Point 2

The Applicant suggests that both A and B could be pursued at the choice of Mr Hawes. Given the constraints and impact upon on the property this very much feels like a “Hobson’s choice” that is on offer.

Section 3.3.10 Visual

The applicant suggests that an additional PMA access road running through the centre of the garden would “not represent a major adverse effect on views from the dwelling, when considered in the context of the Scheme as a whole”. As highlighted previously within the visual effect agenda we are struggling to understand this conclusion given the clear visual impact of the road running directly through the centre of the garden of the property. Not forgetting that the following roads will also be visible from the dwelling in the future:

- a. The widened dual carriageway
- b. The access road to the Swale works
- c. The original PMA road which wraps around the property
- d. The access road to the woodland north of the property
- e. The A697 having removed trees masking it.
- f. The layby