From:

To: A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham

Cc:

Subject: Response to Secretary of State Request for further information

Date: 12 November 2021 20:26:08

Attachments: Response to Secretary of State request for further information relating to Northgate Farm access.docx

Dear Sir,

As requested, in the letter dated 29^{th} October 2021 the attached document provides the response from Mark Hawes.

Please do not hesitate to contact myself should you have any query on this response.

Kind regards

Mark Hawes

Northgate Farm

As requested by the Secretary of State in the letter dated 29th October 2021 the following provides an update on the access road to Northgate Farm.

The request raised in the letter reads as follows:

Please could the Applicant and relevant interested parties (including Mr Hawes on behalf of residents of Northgate Farm and Mr Davidson) comment on the status of any further discussions about the location of the access track, and in particular on whether any agreement has been reached as to its location

The two alternative routes, (b) and (c), (as referenced in the letter) were documented by the Applicant when it was recognised that the original option (a) was not viable given the strength of feeling from both Northgate Farm and Capri Lodge. In response the Applicant presented a paper in June 2021 titled "Northgate Farm Private Means of Access Options Technical note, document reference 6.52. This document included a recommendation from the Applicant that option (c) be taken forward as the preferred route. At the time this was not considered to a good solution for Northgate Farm as the route is very invasive travelling through a picturesque garden and a long-established vegetable garden. Our preference was very much for option (b) which minimised the detrimental impact on both Capri Lodge and Northgate farm.

In taking stock of where we are today. Option (a), (as referenced in the letter) remains an unsustainable solution with the route being less than picturesque and the owner of Capri lodge strongly asserting that we should not access through their property. In addition, option (a) would require further trees to be felled at the front of the property thereby further exposing the view of the new carriageway.

Given the current impasse we decided, in the spirit of cooperation, to reach out to the Applicant to explore options for making option (c) workable, by improving the point of access and minimising the impact upon the garden. Although this represents a major compromise for us and our family home, we recognise that this is probably the only option that could get agreement from all three parties. As the discussions are at an early stage, we have yet to reach agreement on the actual route through the garden and compensation for the construction of the road. Going forward I understand that this will be given further consideration by the Applicant to see if an agreement can be reached.

In the same letter it is also noted that a request is made for the Applicant to provide additional information on the three identified routes which includes confirmation of the grid references. Having reviewed the grid references they do not appear to tally with what I was expecting and are not consistent with the "Northgate Farm Private Means of Access Options Technical note, document reference 6.52. For example, the terminating grid reference for Work No. 5b(c) does not correspond to the third route defined within this paper. The grid reference appears to terminate in the middle of a field north of the property. In addition, the starting grid reference appears to be incorrect with 7 digits rather than 6. There appears to be an extra 8 in the reference. I assume that the Applicant will provide a more detailed response on this topic.