

Dear Secretary of State for Transport.

Proposed Duelling Of A1 Morpeth to Ellingham

I have like many welcomed the proposals to upgrade the A1 from Morpeth to Ellingham and sincerely wish for the scheme in general to go ahead. I have however since conception held the view that the proposed works to divert traffic from Warreners House and the surrounding houses Southwards through West View is not the option that will improve safety, which is one of the main reasons for the duelling of the A1. Indeed i am firmly of the opinion that this option will build in additional unacceptable dangers to the residents of West View, Patients of Northgate hospital and the residents of the new housing estates within the former complex of the hospital.

I have addressed this concern by taking two lines of action

1 to object to the proposal on the grounds of health and safety with particular regard to the designers not undertaking a suitable and sufficient design stage risk assessment a duty incumbent on designers under the Construction and Design regulations 2015.

2 Engage in dialect with the designers to try and influence the design of the works within West View should this be ultimately the route which is taken forward.

At this Stage I would comment:-

During the hearings at Stage Four I was asked by the inspector If I would consider talking with The applicants team regarding my concerns as my concerns were quite detailed and were taking up valuable time. This I did in good faith.

With regard to my line of action 1

The applicant has prepared a detailed response (7.22.1 Applicants Responses to deadline 5 Submissions –Appendix i : The Warreners PMA options) as to their reasons the road should be constructed via West View and several times states that **“an alternative PMA would not reduce the health and safety risks during construction”** I have made it very clear during meetings with them that the management of the construction works on site is not my concern.

The main contractor will have in place his Construction Phase Plan coupled with his risk assessments safe systems of work and his companies health and safety procedures. Their established Sub-contractors vetting procedures, and they are in general well versed in site safety. This coupled with intense work by the HSE and other safety companies, Main contractors and subcontractors are well versed in managing construction projects and discharging their duties under the regulations.

The HSE have since the commencement of the 2007 CDM regulation and with the revised regulations in 2015 have concentrated their efforts on the Construction phase of the regulations thus the site inspections have been targeted at ensuring contractors are discharging their Duties under the regulations. The revised regulations in 2015 sort to improve the Regulations

The statement by the applicant that **“an alternative PMA would not reduce the health and safety risks during construction”**. clearly indicates that they do not addressing the duties of the designers under the CDM regulations. The regulations require the designers not only to assess the risks under

construction but, more importantly to assess the risks during the use , maintenance, and ultimately its demolition, this I believe has not been undertaken as the designers are focusing only on the construction phase of the project and not the use maintenance and demolition of the project.

Had the risks with regarding the use of the road, and who that impacts on been assessed that risk assessment would have clearly shown that the impact (people or property at risk during its use) is indeed very high when taking the route South at which point the designer is duty bound to consider the general principals of prevention, and the hierarchy of control, the first of which is to avoid the risk this could have been easily achieved by taking the route North as the number of people and properties it impacts on is minimal and the risk are very very low indeed.

I have previously detailed who and the southerly route impacts on in my previous submissions. Suffice it to say to introduce Agricultural traffic to within 4 metres of front doors, hospital approach roads and new housing estate traffic is very poor design indeed and highlights that a design risk assessment has not be carried out as the Consequences and likelihood of and accidents happening have not been considered as it is crystal clear that bringing the traffic through West View and a hospital complex the consequences are very severe and the likelihood extremely high.

The designers have stated they have designed the roads to Northumberland County Councils design standards. This does not exclude them from their duty to carry out design risk assessment.

I have alluded previously to the HSE good work in ensuring that main contractors know and have embodied their duties under CDM into their safety practices.

The HSE just prior to the Pandemic detailed their priorities for the following year one of those priorities was to target Designers to ensure that the designers complied with their duties under CDM I have understand that this priority has not been followed through yet, due to the pandemic, but I am sure that the HSE will follow this through in due course. With regard to this DCO perhaps the minister would like to look at my concerns.

I did contact the local office of the then minister of construction and requested her secretary to contact me to discuss my concerns. I await her return call.

With Regard to my second line of action:-

A meeting was convened 15th March 2021 and discussions took place regarding a draft design for West View and minutes of that meeting were produced 23 April 2021.

A further meeting was held 15th July 2021 at which point there were more minutes to be produced and several action points the design team and other attendees were to undertake and feed back to me. I was forwarded a copy of (7.22.1 Applicants Responses to deadline 5 Submissions –Appendix i : The Warreners PMA options) A document i was unaware existed.

During the meeting more concerns came to light.

1 The designers confirmed that PMA was an uncontrolled road therefore speed restrictions could not be introduced or enforced. This effectively means a vehicle can travel at whatever speed they desire on the PMA and then break heavily outside in close proximity of numbers 12,11,10,West View.

I requested that traffic calming measure is introduced to prevent this; the answered was we will look at it but it is not our road.

2 Street lighting I asked where the street lighting would terminate.

3 The sketch shows footpaths terminating at number 9, I requested what foot path arrangements are planned for 10,11,12 or will the road terminated at the drive entrances of number 10,11,12.

4 I requested that the design would facilitate the ability for the residents to install measures to prevent children running on to the road. Fencing or gates at present this cannot be achieved as the gates would have to open outwards on to the road.

5 Gas House, The proposals are to move this to the side of the road. This position will leave it vulnerable to collision especially during harvest time, wet weather a time when there is pressure to harvest the crops. It also moves the Gas house closer to my house. I also pointed out we have previously had a fire lit against the existing building this proposal yet again shows the lack of safety consideration during the life span of the building.

6 I have requested information and confirmation regarding the disposal of surface water from the fields north of West View this has been only vaguely responded to, no defined proven solution has been given.

7 Assurances were given that the section of PMA from the turning circle to the adjoining field will be constructed to the same design as West View (tarmac) the latest documents state otherwise Why?

8 Parking places I indicated that whilst three additional parking places had been included on the turning circle the effect of that was to almost totally remove any grassed area outside no,s 10,11,12 reducing it down to one space would leave more existing grass intact and would bring the total parking spaces to 12 in effect a parking space or one visitor to each property.

9 It was agreed that the design would be revised with a view to moving the road further away from the drive of number 11,12. As the proposal put the occupants at greater risk from traffic coming from and to Warreners houses revised proposal are outstanding.

There were other points in addition to these but these are the main ones.

I am disappointed to report that i have not received those minutes, nor have i been informed of any progress with regard to the action points from that meeting. In short i feel that my concerns have not been addressed. I therefore consider the process is flawed and incomplete.

I indicated earlier That at the behest of the inspector I agreed to try and resolve my concerns with the designers and the other team members I am disappointed to note that at no point has the inspector checked with me to ask if my concerns have been resolved.

In View of the above i request that my points are addresses and resolved prior to The completion of The DCO

Yours faithfully

Colin Moor