



Report to the Secretary of State for Transport

By John Yellowley, BSc, CEng, MICE, FIHT.

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372

Date: 21 December 2007

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980

ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

(A509 ISHAM BYPASS CLASSIFIED ROAD)

(SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2006

AND

COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2007

Date of Inquiry: 30 October – 2 November 2007

Ref: DN5067/55/7/09 & DN5067/60/1/10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CASE DETAILS:	1
1 PREAMBLE	2
2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS	3
3 THE CASE FOR NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	5
NEED FOR THE SCHEME AND PUBLIC CONSULTATION	5
DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHEME	8
TRAFFIC AND ECONOMICS	9
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS	12
THE PLANNING POLICY BACKGROUND	13
LAND USE	16
LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE	16
BIODIVERSITY	16
HERITAGE	17
NOISE.....	18
AIR QUALITY	18
WATER ENVIRONMENT	19
ACCESSIBILITY.....	19
PHYSICAL FITNESS AND JOURNEY AMBIENCE.....	19
CONSTRUCTION.....	20
4 THE CASE FOR THE SUPPORTERS	20
KETTERING BOROUGH COUNCIL AND BURTON LATIMER TOWN COUNCIL	20
WELLINGBOROUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL	21
ISE VALLEY PROTECTION GROUP	22
THE FURNACE LANE ACTION GROUP (FLAG).....	23
MR ALAN JENKINSON	24
MR ALAN BROS	25
MR JOSEPH CORNWELL.....	26
MRS ELIZABETH LE COUNT	26
MRS DIANE HULL	27
WRITTEN SUPPORT	27
5 THE CASE FOR THE OBJECTORS	27
REYNOLDS FARMERS LIMITED.....	27
LITTLE HARROWDEN PARISH COUNCIL	30
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	31
CTC, THE NATIONAL ORGANISATION FOR CYCLISTS	32
MR R J MARTIN	33
MRS JEANETTE WHITING	34
MR ROBERT COLES	35
PROFESSOR ALAN WALLER	35
MRS JENNIFER D CURTIS	36
MR T MARTYN SMITH	37
MR DOUGLAS FORRESTER	37
MR NEVILLE J J WOOD	38
WRITTEN OBJECTIONS (STATUTORY OBJECTORS TO THE CPO).....	39
<i>Pytchley Parish Church and A J Middleton Esq</i>	39
<i>D & A Reynolds Limited and J A Bennie & Son</i>	39
<i>Mr P H L Harpur and Mrs N Brown</i>	40
<i>Messrs A D Blaxley & R J Shawley</i>	40
<i>Northants LLP</i>	40

OTHER WRITTEN OBJECTIONS	41
6 REBUTTAL BY NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	41
REYNOLDS FARMERS LIMITED.....	41
LITTLE HARROWDEN PARISH COUNCIL	42
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	42
CTC, THE NATIONAL ORGANISATION FOR CYCLISTS	43
MR R J MARTIN	44
MRS JEANETTE WHITING	44
MR ROBERT COLES.....	45
PROFESSOR ALAN WALLER	46
MRS JENNIFER D CURTIS	46
MR T MARTYN SMITH	47
MR DOUGLAS FORRESTER	48
MR NEVILLE J J WOOD	48
WRITTEN OBJECTIONS (STATUTORY OBJECTORS)	49
<i>Pytchley Parish Church and A J Middleton Esq</i>	49
<i>D & A Reynolds Limited and J A Bennie & Son</i>	49
<i>Messrs A D Blaxley and R J Shawley</i>	50
OTHER WRITTEN OBJECTIONS	50
7 CONCLUSIONS	51
INTRODUCTION	51
THE NEED FOR THE PROPOSED BYPASS	51
POLICY CONTEXT.....	52
THE PROPOSED BYPASS LOCATION.....	52
CARRIAGEWAY STANDARD, JUNCTION TYPE AND ROAD SAFETY	53
TRAFFIC AND ECONOMICS	54
ALTERNATIVE ROUTES	55
REYNOLDS FARMERS LIMITED.....	56
LITTLE HARROWDEN PARISH COUNCIL	56
RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION	57
CTC, THE NATIONAL ORGANISATION FOR CYCLISTS AND MR R J MARTIN.....	57
MRS JEANETTE WHITING	57
MR ROBERT COLES.....	58
PROFESSOR ALAN WALLER	58
MRS JENNIFER D CURTIS	58
MR T MARTYN SMITH	58
MR DOUGLAS FORRESTER	59
MR NEVILLE J J WOOD	59
WRITTEN OBJECTIONS (STATUTORY OBJECTORS)	59
OTHER WRITTEN OBJECTIONS	60
THE ORDERS	60
<i>The Side Roads Order (SRO)</i>	60
<i>The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO)</i>	61
OTHER MATTERS	62
8 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	63
APPENDIX A.....	64
APPEARANCES	64
APPENDIX B.....	66
DOCUMENTS	66

ABBREVIATIONS

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AAWT	Annual Average Weekday Traffic
BCR	Benefit/Cost Ratio
COBA	Cost Benefit Analysis computer program
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
dB(A)	Decibels on the A-weighted scale
FLAG	Furnace Lane Action Group
HA	Highways Agency
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
NCC	Northamptonshire County Council
MKSM-SRS	Milton Keynes & South Midlands Sub-Regional Study
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PVB	Present Value of Benefits
RFA	Regional Funding Allocation
RPG8	Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands
RSS8	Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands
SRO	Side Roads Order
WEAST	Wellingborough East Development

CASE DETAILS:

- The Side Roads Order (SRO) was made by Northamptonshire County Council under Sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 and all other powers enabling them in that behalf, and is known as the Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2006.
- The SRO was made on 19 December 2006 and would authorise the Northamptonshire County Council to make alterations to public and private rights of way on or in the vicinity of the proposed bypass, including the stopping-up and/or improvement of existing highways, the construction of new highways and the stopping-up and provision of private means of access.
- The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) was made under Sections 239, 240, 246 and 249 of the Highways Act 1980 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, and is known as the Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2007.
- The CPO was made on 16 January 2007 and would authorise the Northamptonshire County Council to purchase compulsorily land or rights required for, or in connection with the construction of the proposed bypass and the construction or improvement of highways and accesses in pursuance of the SRO. This would include works for environmental mitigation.
- There were 75 objections outstanding to the Orders at the commencement of the joint local inquires.

Summary of Recommendations: I recommend that the Orders be confirmed as made.

1 PREAMBLE

- 1.1 I held Joint Public Local Inquiries, henceforth referred to as the Inquiry, at the Kettering Park Hotel, Kettering Parkway, Kettering, Northamptonshire, commencing on Tuesday 30 October 2007 at 10.00, for the purpose of hearing representations and objections concerning applications made by the Northamptonshire County Council under Sections 14, 125, 239, 240, 246 and 250 of the Highways Act 1980 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 for the confirmation of the following Orders: the Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2006 (referred to in this report as the SRO); and the Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2007 (referred to in this report as the CPO). The Inquiry closed on Friday 2 November 2007. I carried out unaccompanied site inspections on 1 August, 29 October, and 1 November and an accompanied site inspection on Tuesday 6 November 2007 which commenced at 10.00 and concluded at 14.00 on that day.
- 1.2 The Orders relate to the proposed new bypass of the A509, passing to the west of the main parts of the settlement of Isham. The proposed new bypass has already received planning permission.
- 1.3 The effect of the Orders, if confirmed, would be:
- The SRO would authorise alterations to public and private rights of way on or in the vicinity of this proposed bypass, including the stopping up and improvement of existing highways and the construction of new highways, and the stopping up and provision of private means of access.
 - The CPO would authorise the compulsory purchase of land or rights required for, or in connection with, the construction of this proposed bypass and the construction or improvement of highways and accesses in pursuance of the SRO. This would include land for works of environmental mitigation.
- 1.4 I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport in pursuance of paragraph 7 of Schedule 1 of the Highways Act 1980 and Section 13(2) of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.
- 1.5 The Northamptonshire County Council confirmed that all statutory formalities had been complied with. At the start of the Inquiries there were 75 objections outstanding. Six of these were from statutory objectors including one who had made no objection within the period prescribed. None were withdrawn during the Inquiries. Twelve objectors (2 statutory) appeared in person or were represented.
- 1.6 There were 38 letters of support for the proposals submitted in response
-

to the notice given by Northamptonshire County Council that the Orders had been made. A further 59 letters were received before the close of the Inquiries. The majority expressed either support for the scheme or concern about an alternative route to the east of Isham.

1.7 The main grounds of objection were:

- The environmental impact of the proposals including disruption to wildlife corridors, the effect on landscape and the effects of noise, air quality and loss of visual amenity to residents of properties on the west side of Isham;
- The impact of the proposals on agriculture;
- An alternative route to the east side of Isham alongside the existing railway line would have less impact.
- The proposals would not deal with future growth of traffic resulting from planned development on the east side of Wellingborough;
- The proposals would not extend to Wellingborough and would add to congestion and harm traffic safety in Great Harrowden;
- The provisions for cyclists and pedestrians at each end of the bypass would not be adequate and alternative diversions for footpaths should be adopted.

1.8 This report contains a brief description of the site of the proposals, its surroundings and the proposals themselves together with the gist of the cases presented and my conclusions and recommendations. Lists of appearances and documents are attached as appendices. I have attached all documents and plans submitted to the Inquiries, including proofs of evidence. The proofs are as originally submitted, in other words unless expressly stated they do not take account of how the evidence may have been affected by cross-examination or other aspects of the Inquiries. I have taken account of the outstanding objections made to the Orders, the written representations, the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the approved planning application, the evidence submitted to the Inquiries and all other material considerations.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The A509 is a strategic route of largely single carriageway standard running in a north south direction between Kettering in the north and Junction 14 of the M1 near Newport Pagnell, Buckinghamshire in the south. It intersects with the A14 trunk road south of Kettering at Junction 9 and the A45 trunk road south of Wellingborough.

- 2.2 The village of Isham straddles the A509 between Kettering and Wellingborough. There are a number of dwellings with direct access to the A509. A public house and the church directly overlook the road and the primary school is in close proximity with access off Church Street. The central core of the village, bisected by the A509, is a designated Conservation Area, exhibiting a variety of building styles with an informal layout. A small number of side roads lead from the A509 to larger numbers of dwellings both east and west. Within the village, speed is restricted to 30mph and there is a mini-roundabout at the junction with the unclassified Orlingbury Road. A little further to the north is a signal controlled crossing. On the north west outskirts of the village, Fairfield Road together with Ryehill Close and Winston Drive form a residential development bordered to the north and west and for a significant part of its southern boundary by agricultural land.
- 2.3 Immediately to the north of the village there is a mini-roundabout junction with Burton Latimer Station Road. To the south of the village there is a priority 'T' junction with Finedon Station Road leading to the east and a little further south, a priority cross roads junction with Hill Top Road, classified B574. There are a number of dwellings on the east side of this junction and a linear development of about 22 dwellings on the south side of Hill Top Road, a short distance to the west.
- 2.4 To the south of Hill Top Road, the A509 passes through the small community of Great Harrowden where it is subject to a 40mph speed restriction. There is a priority cross roads junction in Great Harrowden with another leg of the B574 Orlingbury Road on the west side and The Slips on the east side. These roads together with Hill Top Road, the unclassified Orlingbury Road and Burton Latimer Station Road are all restricted to vehicles less than 7.5 tonnes in weight (Doc Ref. IN25).
- 2.5 Throughout this length, notwithstanding local widening in the vicinity of junctions, the carriageway is about 7.3m in width and follows a distinctive rolling terrain crossing the valleys formed by 3 watercourses: Pytchley Brook, Hardwick Brook and one unnamed watercourse to be referred to as 'Little Harrowden Brook', which all feed into the River Ise. The River Ise lies in a valley running in a largely north south direction between Kettering and Wellingborough, on a broadly parallel course with the Midland Railway Line and to its east side. These 2 features also separate the village of Isham from the somewhat larger community of Burton Latimer which lies to the east side of the River Ise.
- 2.6 Land surrounding the village is mainly in agricultural use. To the west of the village at the time of my visit, most of the land appeared to be arable whilst on the east side, land use was more mixed with a larger proportion being available for grazing. Field boundaries generally consisted of mature hedges and intermittent trees with more significant areas of vegetation lining the watercourses. Ashpole Plantation and Cock-o-Roost Spinney are two areas of woodland which lie between Hardwick Brook and Hill Top Road on the west side of the A509. A little further to the west of Isham lie the villages of Pytchley, Orlingbury and Little Harrowden.
-

3 THE CASE FOR NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

The material points were:

Need for the Scheme and Public Consultation

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD7]

- 3.1 The village of Isham suffers from the effects of through traffic. The observed 24 hour annual average daily traffic (AADT) flow on the A509 through Isham at detailed investigation stage was about 21,300 vehicles, 12% of which were Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). Within Isham, the A509 is the main thoroughfare for vehicles and pedestrians. Footways are adjacent to or set back from the carriageway and there are a number of side roads and private access points within the village. At the time detailed investigations into the route of the bypass were being undertaken, the section of A509 from Wellingborough to Kettering was designated a 'Red Route', namely a road with a high number of accidents resulting in fatal or serious injury.
- 3.2 The Northamptonshire County Council's (NCC) objectives for the proposed A509 Isham Bypass are to:
- Reduce community severance currently experienced through the village of Isham by removing through traffic, particularly HGVs
 - Reduce the number and severity of road accidents
 - Reduce congestion on the A509 particularly during peak hours
 - Enhance the local environment of Isham and improve conditions for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians
 - Improve transport links between Kettering and Wellingborough
- 3.3 The Northamptonshire Local Transport Plan 2001/02-2005/06 (Doc Ref. DD49) published in July 2000 identified the Isham Bypass as one of 6 priority road schemes in the county and in July 2001 the NCC Executive decided that the bypass of Isham was one of two top priority schemes whose implementation should be pursued during the lifetime of the Local Transport Plan. Earlier investigations into a route for the bypass had identified a number of options, many of which had been derived from a public consultation held in 1993 when a preferred route lying to the east of the village was chosen.
- 3.4 A Wider Reference Group was established (Doc Ref. IN6 provides details of membership) in November 2001 with a remit to decide on which routes should be taken forward for further assessment and be subject to public consultation. A preliminary assessment of 13 routes (Doc Ref.

DD7 Appendix 1) resulted in 8 routes being selected for further assessment and consultation with the Wider Reference Group. In January 2003, a decision was made on the recommendation of the Wider reference Group to take forward three routes, Routes 2, 5 and 6, for public consultation (Doc Refs. DD7 Appendix 2 and IN7).

3.5 All three routes would commence at the A14 Pytchley Roundabout. Route 2, 4.3km long, would pass to the west of Isham, running southwards to join the A509 Wellingborough Road midway between Hill Top Road and Great Harrowden. There would be two at-grade roundabouts, one at a junction to the north of Isham and the other at the B574 Hill Top Road. An overbridge would carry Orlingbury Road over the bypass. Route 5, 6.5km long, would pass to the east of Isham, running southwards to a junction with Northen Way and Stewarts Road in Wellingborough. At-grade roundabouts would be provided at junctions with Burton Latimer Station Road, Finedon Station Road and the junction with the proposed extension to Northen Way. Route 6, 3.8km long, would pass to the east of Isham and rejoin the A509 midway between Finedon Station Road and the B574 at Hill Top Road. At grade roundabouts would be provided at Burton Latimer Station Road and Finedon Station Road.

3.6 Following the extensive consultation process (Doc Ref. IN10) and detailed analysis of the three options (Doc Refs. IN17, IN18 & IN19), NCC's Executive announced in May 2003 that Route 2 should be designated 'Preferred Route' for the bypass and that preparation work should continue towards a planning application. Reasons for rejecting Routes 5 and 6 included:

- 82% of the consultation questionnaires returned supported the idea of an Isham Bypass, with 62% supporting Route 2, 34% Route 5 and 4% Route 6.
- Environmental considerations relating in particular to Routes 5 & 6 passing through the River Ise flood plain. The Environment Agency had a preference for Route 2 on the grounds that the other routes would involve development within the flood plain. Overall the environmental aspects of the route options were assessed and on balance, Route 2 would have the least adverse impact.
- From an engineering perspective, each route had large earthworks associated with the undulating topography. Route 2 would have the advantage of not being constructed in the flood plain where additional flood alleviation measures would be required.
- Traffic modelling, cost benefit analysis and accident savings showed Route 2 as having the most beneficial cost benefit ratios, best accident savings and good traffic relief.

(Doc Ref. DD7 Appendix 3 includes a comparison summary table of the routes)

- 3.7 At the same meeting in May 2003, NCC decided to investigate an extension of the Isham Bypass, running between Hill Top Road and the north of Wellingborough. The scheme, known as the 'A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement', would bypass the village of Great Harrowden and complete a high quality dual carriageway road between Kettering and Wellingborough. During consultation on the A509 Isham Bypass, supporters of Route 5 suggested this option would offer a comprehensive solution to the A509 Kettering to Wellingborough strategic route. They considered that when compared with the combined schemes of A509 Isham Bypass and A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement, it would perform better. A comparison was undertaken of the combined schemes and Route 5 with additional improvements to Northen Way and Niort Way. The comparison identified that Route 5 would:
- Cost more
 - Offer poorer value for money
 - Save fewer accidents
 - Offer less traffic relief in Isham and Great Harrowden
 - Impact adversely on the flood plain of the River Ise
 - Be less effective as a strategic route within the framework of the sub-regional strategy.
- 3.8 Both the A509 Isham Bypass and the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement offer good benefit to cost ratios as independent schemes and the latter is being promoted as a separate scheme. Following a submission to Central Government in July 2003 (Doc Ref. DD59), provisional acceptance and financial approval for the A509 Isham Bypass was received in December 2003 (Doc Ref. IN11). A funding bid has been submitted for the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement but the scheme has yet to receive provisional government approval.
- 3.9 In July 2006, the Secretary of State for Transport confirmed Regional Funding Allocations (RFAs) to the Chair of the East Midlands Regional Assembly (Doc Ref. IN4). The A509 Isham Bypass was included in a list of approved schemes for funding within the three years 2006/7 to 2008/9. The A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement was included in an indicative list of schemes from 2009/10 to 2015/16. The Department for Transport's funding would be subject to schemes securing all necessary statutory powers, demonstrating sufficient value for money and being supported by a satisfactory business case in line with Departmental requirements. In particular, schemes where the assumed RFA cost exceeds the currently approved maximum contribution would need a revised value for money assessment and exploration of other funding sources before a final decision on whether Departmental

funding for the scheme should be increased.

Description of the Scheme

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD7]

- 3.10 Commencing at the A14 Junction 9 (Pytchley Roundabout), the road would pass to the west of Isham running southwards to rejoin the A509 Wellingborough Road midway between Hill Top Road and Great Harrowden. Between the A14 Junction 9 and Hill Top Road, the bypass would be dual carriageway standard. Each carriageway would consist of a two lane 7.3m wide running surface with 1m wide hard strips on both sides. Verges would typically be 2.5m wide and the central reservation typically 2.75m. A single carriageway would link from Hill Top Road to connect with the existing A509. There would be two roundabouts, one to provide a junction with the existing A509 Kettering Road about 800m south of the A14 Junction 9 and the other at the junction with the B574 Hill Top Road. All the side roads would be single carriageway, providing access via the existing A509 into Isham and maintaining access to the B574. An overbridge would be provided to carry Orlingbury Road over the proposed bypass. The overall length of the bypass would be 4.3km.
- 3.11 Extensive earthworks would be required with cuttings up to a maximum of 9m deep and embankments up to a maximum of 10m high. The proposed bypass would pass within 30m of properties in Fairfield Road and Winston Drive in Isham in a cutting about 8m deep; pass within about 80m of Frisby Lodge in a 7m deep cutting; and within about 30m of the nearest property at Hill Top Road. Detailed ground investigation works have been undertaken to ensure adequate design of the earthworks and that sufficient land for the bypass has been included in the CPO. Cutting and embankment slopes would be constructed as determined by the findings of the investigations and no significantly contaminated land has been found.
- 3.12 The proposed bypass would cross three watercourses which drain into the River Ise. These are Pytchley Brook, Hardwick Brook and Little Harrowden Brook. New culverts would be constructed at Pytchley and Hardwick Brooks and the existing pipe extended at Little Harrowden Brook. Surface water falling within the boundary of the proposed bypass would be collected in a piped drainage system and discharged into the three watercourses. The flow from all three outfalls would be controlled by new balancing ponds and pollution traps with design requirements agreed with the Environment Agency. Where practical, the use of sustainable drainage systems would be used to compliment traditional piped systems.
- 3.13 The proposed bypass would lie outside of the flood plain of the River Ise and would therefore unlikely to be at risk from flooding from the River Ise. The culverted watercourses have been designed to accommodate a 1 in 200 year flood event plus a 50% safety factor and would therefore be unlikely to impact on flows.

- 3.14 The proposed bypass would cross a number of footpaths and a bridleway. Consultation with the public on Rights of Way provision was undertaken between October 2004 and January 2005 and during March and April 2005 with the results reported in 'Summary of Consultation on Rights of Way provision A509 Isham Bypass' dated June 2005 (Doc Ref. DD58).
- 3.15 Footpath GW2 would be diverted to cross beneath the proposed bypass in a combined footpath underpass and culvert at Pytchley Brook. Bridleway GW15 and footpath TM3 would be diverted to cross the bypass on a proposed bridge at 'The Ruts', north west of Fairfield Road. The bridleway would follow 'The Ruts' to the existing A509 Kettering Road. Footpath TM4 would be diverted on both sides of the proposed bypass to the Orlingbury Road where a proposed bridge would carry the side road over the proposed bypass. Footpaths TK18/TM5 would be diverted to a proposed farm accommodation bridge just west of Ashpole Plantation. A further overbridge would be provided south of Hill Top roundabout to allow pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians to cross the proposed bypass in safety.
- 3.16 A cycleway/footway would be provided along the eastern side of the proposed bypass between the A14 Junction 9 and the new Kettering Road roundabout. It would be separated from the edge of the carriageway and the rear of the lay-by by a safety barrier along this length. It would continue along the eastern side of the road from the Kettering Road roundabout towards Isham and a central traffic island would be provided approximately 200m from the roundabout for safe crossing to the western side of Kettering Road. From here the footway would be continued to link with the existing footway in Isham in the vicinity of the cemetery.
- 3.17 For safety reasons, street lighting would be provided at the two roundabouts, extending for a distance of about 100m in each direction from them. The use of flat glass 'cut off' lanterns with a high pressure sodium light source would reduce 'spill' to the night sky and minimise visual impact. Safety fencing would be erected within the central reservation and on verges where required to protect structures and signs with large diameter posts. Lay-bys would be constructed, one to the north of the proposed Kettering Road roundabout for southbound traffic and one to the south of the same roundabout for northbound traffic. The road surface would be a stone mastic asphalt material which would be considerably quieter than traditional hot rolled asphalt surfacing. The proposed bypass is designed to comply with current Highways Agency technical standards and advice notes.

Traffic and Economics

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD9]

- 3.18 Traffic counts, both manual and automatic, and roadside interviews had been carried out in April 2002. These established flows on the existing network in the vicinity of Isham with the A509, south of Great

Harrowden, carrying an annual average weekday traffic (AAWT) flow of 26,000 vehicles and an annual average daily traffic (AADT) flow of 23,000 vehicles. The percentage of HGVs was 10%.

- 3.19 A base year traffic model was established using the traffic assignment model suite of programs, SATURN. Three time periods have been modelled, representing the morning and evening peaks and an off peak period representing the inter-peak. Two user classes, Cars/Light Goods Vehicles and HGVs, have been modelled as a combined all vehicle matrix. The base year model was validated by comparing observed traffic flows with traffic flow outputs from the SATURN model. The majority of the screenlines (imaginary lines or physical features such as rivers or railway lines that adjacent routes cross) were within 15% of the observed flow and 53% of the individual validation flows had statistical test values less than 4, the value considered to indicate an acceptable validation.
- 3.20 Initial traffic forecasting and economic evaluation for an opening year of 2007 and a design year of 2022 was undertaken for the eight routes selected for further assessment and consultation with the Wider Reference Group. Following the selection of Route 2 as the preferred route, this work formed the basis for the A509 Isham Bypass Major Highway Scheme Submission July 2003 (Doc Ref. DD59). Since the date of that submission, the traffic model has undergone a number of revisions to reflect changing levels of planned growth and the programme for implementation, resulting in an opening year of 2009 and design year of 2024.
- 3.21 For the draft Environmental Statement dated October 2004, two sets of forecast flows were included. One set was based on Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands (RPG8) (Doc Ref. IN13). Initially national traffic growth forecasts from the National Road Traffic Forecasts were determined for high and low growth scenarios. The national trip rates were then adjusted by deriving local trip rates based on employment and housing forecasts in TEMPRO (a transport planning standard database) and RPG8. The national growth rates were factored by the locally derived traffic growth rates to produce a robust traffic growth factor which was then applied to the 2002 base trip matrix. TEMPRO data did not include Wellingborough East Development (WEAST) generated traffic and was therefore added to the growthed 2002 base matrix. WEAST is a major mixed use development planned for Wellingborough comprising approximately 3000 houses and 110 hectares of employment land which could potentially generate 4000 jobs.
- 3.22 The second set of forecast flows was based on the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8) and the Milton Keynes & South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (MKSM-SRS) (Doc Ref. DD45 & DD46). The main difference between the growth scenarios is the significantly higher residential (house) building rates in RSS8 which result in significantly higher traffic forecasts. The MKSM-SRS proposes extensive development to be accommodated in the towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough by 2021. The final Environmental Statement only makes reference to the forecast flows from RPG8 as it

was considered that the level of growth required between 2005 and 2009 to realise the forecast in RSS8, particularly in the level of residential building could not be realised.

- 3.23 High growth traffic flows from the RPG8 scenario predict that if no scheme is implemented, about 25,600 vehicles would be travelling on the A509 through Isham in 2009 rising to 30,800 vehicles per day in 2024, indicating an increase from traffic flows in 2002 of 20% to 2009 and 45% to 2024. With construction of the bypass, the high growth traffic forecasts predict that traffic flows through the village would be reduced to 9,500 vehicles per day in 2009 and 15,700 vehicles per day in 2024. This represents a 63% reduction in traffic flows on the existing A509 in 2009 and a 49% reduction in 2024 compared to the Do Minimum in the same year.
- 3.24 Economic appraisal of the proposed bypass has been undertaken using the Department for Transport's software program COBA 11.2. 12 hour traffic flows were provided from the three time periods modelled with the COBA 11.2 Do Minimum and Do Something networks also based on the SATURN networks. Observed accident data for the period 1999-2002 was used in the COBA 11.2 economic appraisal. Between January 1999 and May 2002 there were a total 29 accidents within 20m of junctions on the A509 corridor and 44 accidents within 100m of the A509.
- 3.25 More recent accident data collected between August 2004 and March 2007 on the A509 between the A14 Junction 9 and the A510 Northen Way indicates a total of 23 accidents have occurred: 2 fatal, 3 serious and 18 slight injury accidents. Full details of the recorded accidents between 2002 and 2007 on the A509 North of Great Harrowden to A14 are also provided (Doc Ref. IN14) and summarised for the period 2004 to 2007 (Doc Ref. IN21). Safety measures introduced in Great Harrowden have reduced the number of accidents, resulting in the removal of the A509 from the current list of Red Routes.
- 3.26 Construction costs of £13.9m at 2003 prices including 15% contingencies were used in the economic appraisal for the A509 Isham Bypass Major Highway Scheme Submission July 2003 (Doc Ref. DD59). In 2005, following the Rights of Way consultation, 3 additional bridges were added to the scheme, increasing the gross cost by £1.2m to £15.1m. The cost increase has been reported to the Government Office for the East Midlands on a quarterly basis since April 2005 (Doc Ref. IN32). While the overall outturn costs seem light, NCC is confident that the estimate for the scheme is robust (Doc Ref. IN32) and, in response to my query during the Inquiry, indicated that provision would be available to make up a shortfall of funding from the Department for Transport.
- 3.27 The COBA 11.2 model was validated by comparing COBA modelled journey times for the peak hour flow group 2 and the inter-peak hour flow group 4 on the A509 between the A14 Junction 9 and the A510 Wellingborough, the section to be bypassed by the route. The average observed journey time fell between the modelled journey time for these

two flow groups. If these are also averaged, the modelled journey time reflected very closely the observed journey time. It can be concluded that the COBA journey times are at or less than observed. Therefore the predicted benefits should reflect the true benefits of the scheme.

- 3.28 The results of the economic appraisal submitted in July 2003 indicated that Route 2 would have the highest Present Value of Benefit (PVB) and a Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of between 3.886 Low growth and 3.818 High growth. Route 5 would have a BCR of between 1.121 Low growth and 1.316 High growth and Route 6, a BCR of 0.946 Low growth and 1.302 High growth. The technical analysis of each of three routes shown at public consultation in terms of cost, value for money and accident savings indicated a strong preference for Route 2.
- 3.29 The results of the appraisal of the route subject of the Environmental Statement with revised opening and design years of 2009 and 2024 and higher planned growth, indicated higher values of PVB and an increased BCR of 4.474 Low growth and 4.535 High growth. This analysis did not include the cost of the three additional bridges. When these are taken into account, revised BCRs of 3.229 Low growth and 3.273 High growth are achieved. These figures still reflect good value for money (Doc Ref. IN33).
- 3.30 With the expected level of growth planned to 2021 for Kettering and Wellingborough, the A509 corridor will be under further pressure to cope with ever increasing levels of traffic. Even if predicted growth is not realised, existing levels of traffic on the A509 are almost double the design capacity for a single carriageway, contributing to unreliable journey times and traffic congestion. The provision of a dual carriageway standard Isham bypass would provide additional capacity in the A509 corridor between Kettering and Wellingborough while providing traffic relief to the village of Isham. Provision of the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement would provide relief to Great Harrowden and further improve journey time reliability between Kettering and Wellingborough.

Environmental Impact Assessment Process

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.31 A five stage approach to the environmental impact assessment was adopted which can be summarised as follows:
- Consultation/scoping exercise to compile relevant background data and identify potential issues and constraints;
 - Baseline surveys - site walkover visits, detailed specialist surveys and discussions with relevant statutory and other consultees;
 - Impact assessment – predicting the likely environmental impacts of the scheme during construction and operation and evaluating the

significance of such impacts;

- Mitigation – identifying measures to avoid, reduce or eliminate potential adverse environmental impacts and establishing what the residual impacts might be;
- Reporting the assessment – preparation of an Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary, supported by Appendices and Figures.

3.32 A draft Environmental Statement was submitted for consultation to NCC in 2004. A revised Environmental Statement was submitted with the planning application for the A509 Isham Bypass to the planning authority in August 2005 (Doc Refs. DD3, DD4, DD5 & DD6).

The Planning Policy Background

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.33 The Government's White Paper 'The Future of Transport' (Doc Ref. DD30) sets the direction of transport to 2030. It states that by 2030 we need a 'road network providing a more reliable and freer flowing service for both personal travel and freight'. It goes on to state that road networks will be enhanced through 'new capacity where it is needed, assuming that any environmental and social costs are justified'. The proposed bypass would comply with the broad objectives of the White Paper by improving capacity and journey time along the A509 whilst minimising the environmental and social costs of the new road.
- 3.34 Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and their predecessor Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) set out Government policy on different aspects of land use planning. The proposed bypass would support the existing communities of Kettering and Wellingborough as well as reduce the adverse effect that the current route of the A509 has on the residents of Isham. It would therefore be in accordance with the aims of PPS 1: *Delivering Sustainable Development* (Doc Ref. DD31) which seeks to promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of development.
- 3.35 PPS 7: *Sustainable Development in Rural Areas* (Doc Ref. DD32) sets out objectives for rural areas. The proposed bypass would have an adverse impact on the quality of the landscape surrounding the village but would support the existing community by improving the quality of life for the residents and the setting of the Isham Conservation Area. The proposed bypass cannot be accommodated other than in the open countryside and a full landscaping scheme has been proposed to reduce the impact on the rural environment. It would result in the loss of 38 hectares of agricultural land and some disruption to a number of farming enterprises. However, the soils are representative of the district and there is no opportunity to site the road on poorer quality land.

- 3.36 PPS 9: *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation* (Doc Ref. DD34) sets out the key principles to ensure that the impacts on these matters are fully considered. There is little of significant ecological impact along the route with no designated sites affected by the scheme. There would be some loss of less valuable habitat such as hedgerows, trees and scrub together with habitat fragmentation, but these impacts would not result in significant harm. Ecological enhancement measures would include planting and profiling of balancing ponds and wildflower grassland on roadside verges and embankments.
- 3.37 PPG 13: *Transport* (Doc Ref. DD38) seeks to integrate planning and transport at a national, regional and local level, aiming to promote more sustainable transport choices and reduce the need to travel, especially by car. However, it notes that the car will still have an important role to play especially in rural areas and will remain the only real option for travel in some areas. The proposed bypass would improve the quality of a strategic route. Although it would not reduce the need to travel, it would facilitate a more attractive route for cyclists who would be able to use the existing road through Isham and the new dedicated cycleway alongside the northern part of the bypass.
- 3.38 PPG 15: *Planning and the Historic Environment* (Doc Ref. DD39) emphasises the importance of protecting the historic environment with particular reference to designated features such as listed buildings or Conservation Areas. An embankment would be constructed adjacent to Great Harrowden Hall Registered Park and garden which would have a limited impact on its setting. The reduction in traffic travelling through Isham Conservation Area would improve its character and ambience as well as enhance the settings of the listed buildings which are sited within that Conservation Area.
- 3.39 PPG 16: *Archaeology and Planning* (Doc Ref. DD40) states that the preservation of archaeological remains is a material consideration in the planning process. A series of adverse effects on archaeological remains of regional importance have been identified. Given their relatively poor condition it is considered that a programme of preservation by recording would be appropriate to safeguard their historic and archaeological value in this case.
- 3.40 PPS 23: *Planning and Pollution Control* (Doc Ref. DD41) notes that development can have a significant impact on air quality, noise and land contamination and that the Environmental Statement is usually the most convenient way of ensuring these matters are considered. PPG 24: *Planning & Noise* (Doc Ref. DD42) sets out how the planning system can be used to minimise the adverse impacts of noise. The impacts of the proposed bypass on air quality and noise are dealt with in more detail later in this section but overall, fewer residents would be annoyed by noise, whilst there would be improvements to air quality around residential areas.
- 3.41 PPS 25: *Development and Flood Risk* (Doc Ref. DD43) aims to ensure
-

that flood risk is taken into account at all stages of the planning process, that new development takes account of climate change and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. A Flood Risk Assessment was carried out for the proposed bypass which concluded that the scheme was not expected to increase the risk of local flooding; the risk of flooding of the road itself would be very low and the proposed culverts would have little impact on flows.

- 3.42 The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8) (Doc Ref. DD45) seeks to develop the region with significant levels of housing and employment to the year 2021. It includes Regional Transport Objectives and, in the Southern Sub Area where the proposed bypass would be situated, seeks the development of transport infrastructure and services needed to accommodate major planned housing and employment growth consistent with the MKSM-SRS (Doc Ref. DD46).
- 3.43 The MKSM-SRS sets out the framework to manage and promote growth in the sub-region. It allocates 25,900 new houses to Kettering and Wellingborough between 2001 and 2021 and anticipates that 43,800 new jobs will be created in Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough in the same period. Northamptonshire Policy 4 states that new development should be planned to take account of committed infrastructure. The proposed bypass is included in the MKSM-SRS as a committed infrastructure scheme and would facilitate its development targets. It would complement regional transport objectives by promoting accessibility and improving regional linkages. The proposed bypass is included as a Major Road Improvement Scheme in the Northamptonshire Local Transport Plan 2006/7-2010/11 (Doc Ref. DD54).
- 3.44 It was established during the Inquiry that a number of policies in the Northamptonshire Structure Plan and the Kettering and Wellingborough Local Plans (Doc Refs. DD48, DD50, DD51 & IN22) relating specifically to the proposed bypass had not been saved beyond 27 September 2007. It was recognised that there would be some conflict with local planning policy that seeks to protect the open countryside from unsuitable development and the settings of Pytchley Conservation Area and Great Harrowden Hall. However, the proposed bypass would be integrated with planning policy at a local, county, sub regional and regional level which seeks to provide adequate infrastructure for the region's growth and to relieve the village of Isham from the adverse effects of traffic.
- 3.45 The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (Doc Ref. DD55) forms part of the Local Development Framework for North Northamptonshire which replaces the County Structure Plan and the Local Plans of each Council. The proposed bypass is a named scheme in Policy 2 which seeks to strengthen connections to surrounding areas and would support Objective 5 which seeks improvements to public transport and road corridors to achieve development of a strong network of settlements.

Land Use

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.46 The Agricultural Land Classification puts most of the study area in the best and most versatile categories of Grades 2 and 3a, passing to poorer Grade 3b and 4 land on the lower valley sides and floors. The great majority of the study area is under winter wheat, oil seed rape and winter beans, produced in very large fields. There would be eight farm enterprises affected by the proposed bypass. Mitigation measures include correct soil handling and reinstatement, payment of appropriate compensation, creating access to severed land and repairing damage to field drains. With these mitigation measures in place, only two enterprises (Mr Brown, Manor House farm and Reynolds Farmers Limited) would suffer a moderate or negative impact due to land loss and disruption. Impacts on the other enterprises would be minor or insignificant.

Landscape and Townscape

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.47 The proposed bypass would have a large adverse impact on the landscape as it would cross three valleys against the lie of the land, necessitating embankments up to 10m in height and cuttings down to 9m in depth. Landscape mitigation measures would aim to integrate the bypass into the surrounding landscape, screen unattractive views from properties and footpaths, retain existing planting where possible and create new copses to complement those existing.
- 3.48 The proposed bypass would have an adverse visual impact on 87 properties. The number of properties experiencing moderate and substantial impact would reduce as the landscape mitigation scheme matures. The proposed bypass would benefit the character of Isham village by removing through traffic and result in a moderate beneficial impact on townscape.

Biodiversity

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.49 The proposed bypass would be likely to have a moderate adverse impact on the ecological features identified in the assessment, mainly due to the cumulative adverse impacts on features of local conservation value. No statutory or non-statutory sites of importance for nature conservation located within 2km of the bypass would be directly affected by the proposals. There would be no direct or indirect impacts on South Field Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
- 3.50 There would be some indirect impacts on Big Covert County Wildlife Site,

a mature woodland adjacent to a meandering tributary of the River Ise. It is likely there would be an overall reduction in the value of the site for wildlife due to increased isolation arising from severance of interconnecting hedges and a reduction in the habitat quality for breeding birds. Taking account of proposed mitigation measures, the proposed bypass would be likely to have a slight adverse impact on the ecological value of this site.

- 3.51 Construction of the bypass would cause some habitat loss and fragmentation caused by severance of agricultural land, hedgerows, mature trees, scrub and Pytchley and Hardwick Brooks. This would restrict the dispersal of fauna and have an adverse impact on the fauna which use the hedgerow habitats for foraging, nesting and feeding. Some of the habitats which would be lost provide, or have the potential to provide, important habitats for legally protected species including badgers, roosting bats, water voles, otters and breeding birds.
- 3.52 However, the mitigation measures including pollution control to avoid reduction in the water quality of watercourses and the provision of badger tunnels to maintain links between setts and foraging areas, would offset some impacts on key ecological features and redress some of the loss and severance of habitats. A greater total length of hedgerow would be planted than that lost and the targeted replanting of defunct hedgerows, lowland grassland planting and planting of native species trees would meet the targets of the Northamptonshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan.

Heritage

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.53 The proposed bypass would have a moderate adverse impact on cultural heritage (prior to the undertaking of mitigation measures), taking into account the proposed removal of features and sites of regional significance. This overall impact would be reduced to slight adverse, based on the principle that full investigation and recording of archaeological information would form part of the mitigation strategy.
- 3.54 Surveys and trial trenching identified features found mainly in and around the known crop mark complex north of Hill Top Road (Iron Age/Saxon in date) and on the ridge north west of Isham which are believed to be of regional importance. Full excavation of the features identified at Hill Top would be carried out prior to construction. This work would be based on a full project design and would aim to answer regional research questions. An archaeological watching brief would be undertaken to observe the removal of deposits north west of Isham. Mitigation of the effects on the historic landscape would involve integrating the bypass into the surrounding landscape and reducing its visual impact through sensitive design of boundaries and barriers.

Noise

[Main Source Doc Refs. DD11 & DD13]

- 3.55 The impact of the proposed bypass when in operation has been assessed as beneficial in comparison with the equivalent future Do Minimum scenario in the design year 2024. The proposed bypass would offer relief from noise annoyance to an estimated 40 people in the 'significant' Isham study area under the RPG8 traffic forecast scenario and to an estimated 63 people under the RSS8 scenario. The adverse effects of the bypass would be minimised by locating the road in cutting where it passes closest to existing properties at Isham and Hill Top Road.
- 3.56 The only properties identified as potentially qualifying for sound insulation under the Noise Insulations Regulations (1998) would be the westernmost properties at Hill Top Road under the RSS8 scenario. Although not qualifying under the Noise Insulation Regulations (1998), the residents of five properties in Winston Drive (Nos 17, 19, 21, 23 & 25) and one in Fairfield Road (No 68) would experience 'substantial (ie >10dB(A)) deteriorations to their noise environment if no additional mitigation measures were employed. This would be due to the fact that their outlook would change from a generally rural environment to include the direct effect of traffic noise from the proposed bypass.
- 3.57 With a low noise road surface and a noise barrier at the top of the cutting slope adjacent to odd Nos 17 to 25 Winston Drive, the reduction in noise levels from the bypass would be likely to be sufficient to re-classify the increase in noise for Nos 17, 25 Winston Drive and 68 Fairfield Road as 'significant' instead of substantial. For Nos 19, 21 and 23 Winston Drive, the category of change would remain as 'substantial' although residents would benefit from reductions in noise of between 4.6-5.2dB(A).

Air Quality

[Main Source Doc Refs. DD11 & DD13]

- 3.58 The impact of the proposed bypass on local air quality and the associated re-distribution of traffic on the existing road network would be beneficial, offering significant improvement. Almost 700 properties would have improved air quality and just over 100 would experience deterioration under the RPG8 traffic forecast scenario. Under the RSS8 scenario, the same number of properties would experience worse air quality but fewer (360) would experience improvement. No properties are expected to have NO₂ (oxides of Nitrogen) concentrations above the Air Quality Standard for either traffic growth scenario.
- 3.59 There could be an increase in greenhouse gases of up to 58% and an increase in total emissions of up to 124% over the equivalent Do Minimum scenario due to increased travel distances. With the proposed bypass in operation, even within 20m of the kerbside, air quality would be very much better than the air quality objectives set out in the Air

Quality Limit Value Regulations 2001 and therefore air quality mitigation measures would not be considered necessary.

Water Environment

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.60 Overall, the proposed bypass would be likely to have a slight adverse impact on the water environment.
- 3.61 The following mitigation measures would be recommended with respect to the operation of the road:
- Trapped gullies, through which surface water from roads and impermeable parking areas should be discharged as a first measure to reduce pollution;
 - Three reed bed/balancing ponds (one for each Brook receiving road run-off) as a secondary measure to remove likely contaminants and to attenuate storm flows to greenfield run-off rates;
 - Pollution incident containment would hold potential accidental spillages from the higher risk roundabouts and especially at sensitive locations, including the crossing of Hardwick Brook.

Accessibility

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.62 The public rights of way would experience a loss of amenity value due to the introduction of new traffic to this area. The minor diversions of rights of way to safe crossing points or provision of overbridges would ensure that people wishing to use them would therefore be able to do so and should result in no more than slight adverse impacts.
- 3.63 The existing degree of severance would be significantly reduced through the village of Isham with the provision of a bypass and the community to some extent could 'claim back' its village amenities. Pedestrians, cyclists and residents should feel safer with the reductions in volumes of traffic within the village of Isham. The overall impact on accessibility has therefore been assessed as beneficial.

Physical Fitness and Journey Ambience

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.64 The proposed bypass should result in an increase in the number of cyclists and pedestrians within Isham, due to the reduction of traffic. A

cycleway would also be provided north of Isham. The overall impact of the proposed bypass in terms of improving the potential for physical fitness has been assessed as slight beneficial.

- 3.65 Journey ambience for travellers on the A509 through Isham is adversely affected by the stress of dealing with a large volume of traffic on a route designed to carry a lesser volume of traffic. Although the bypass would increase the flow and speed of traffic, factors resulting in fear, the width of the road would produce better and safer opportunities for overtaking with a superior design standard. The overall impact on journey ambience for the traveller is assessed as slight to moderate beneficial.

Construction

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD11]

- 3.66 The impacts of construction would be temporary in nature and with mitigation measures in place, adverse impacts should be limited. The key consideration during the road construction would be the timing of the clearance works and major construction activities. Noise control measures would be agreed with the local authority to ensure construction noise would be minimised; stringent measures would be taken to protect the ecology and the drainage system of the area during the construction phase; construction traffic would be restricted to main roads; and within the site boundary, dust and dirt nuisance would be kept to a minimum by employing appropriate working practices.

4 THE CASE FOR THE SUPPORTERS

The material points were:

Kettering Borough Council and Burton Latimer Town Council

[Main Source Doc Refs. SUP/39/1, SUP/40/1 & SUP/41/1]

- 4.1 Both Councils have expressed support in their written representations for Isham in its bid for a bypass and for Route 2, the route to the west of the village. The support is based partly on the engineering, environmental and value for money analyses done by NCC and partly on the particular interests of the residents represented by the two councils.
- 4.2 Burton Latimer's population is over 6,000 people and is by the far the largest settlement affected by the proposed bypass. Residents experience long delays at the Burton Latimer Station Road and the Finedon Station Road junctions with the A509 when travelling to Wellingborough and the A45 to Northampton, Isham and other rural destinations south west of Kettering.

- 4.3 Footpaths between Burton Latimer and Isham are some of the best used in the area and additional voluntary access has been negotiated with landowners in the Ise Valley. A Pocket Park (Doc Ref. IN27) has been developed in the Ise Valley on the south side of Burton Latimer Station Road as a haven for wildlife and passive recreation. Future plans for the area have identified the Ise Valley as a space to be retained to prevent coalescence of the two settlements and as part of the Nene Valley Park for conservation of the water environment. Recent consultations have confirmed residents' opposition to further development in the Ise Valley, exemplified by the formation of the Ise Valley Protection Group.
- 4.4 A route through the Ise Valley would have to be raised above the flood plain where it comes nearest to Burton Latimer and would in consequence have a greater adverse impact on the lives of Burton Latimer residents in terms of noise, pollution and visual intrusion. Routes through the valley have previously been considered for other road schemes but dismissed on engineering, environmental and value for money grounds. It has been argued that the valley could easily take a road because of the railway. However with the A14 to the north and the A6 to the east, residents are well qualified to judge the difference between a railway and a busy road: the first has a few trains an hour which pass and are followed by silence whereas the second makes a continuous noise by day and during part of the night.
- 4.5 The proposed bypass would offer the best solution to Isham's traffic problems and the requirements of the strategic road network with the least adverse impact on the Ise Valley, the natural environment and local residents.

Wellingborough Borough Council

[Main Source Doc Refs. SUP/45/1 & SUP/45/2]

- 4.6 The Borough Council of Wellingborough has always supported the need for a bypass of Isham. The Council has been fully involved with the consultation process leading to the selection of a preferred route and made its comments at the subsequent consultation phases relating to the Environmental Statement and Rights of Way. The Council has made no objection to the preferred route adopted by NCC or to the subsequent planning application.
- 4.7 The road system in Wellingborough has been developed to allow access to both the north and south from the developments in the east of the town (Doc Ref. SUP/45/2). The intention, supported by the Council, is not to encourage 'through' traffic which it is envisaged should use an upgraded A509 in its entirety between the A14 and the A45 Wilby Way junction to the west of Wellingborough.

Ise Valley Protection Group

[Main Source Doc Refs. SUP/23/1, SUP/23/2, SUP/4/1 & SUP/4/2]

- 4.8 The Ise Valley Protection Group was formed in 1997 as a result of an open meeting attended by residents of Isham, Burton Latimer, Finedon and Harrowden. The agreed mission of the Group is to resist development, particularly an Isham Bypass, in the Ise valley bordered by Isham, Burton Latimer, North Wellingborough and South Kettering. The case for the Group was led by the Chairman, Mr John Lambert with additional evidence from Mr Richard Marshall, a member of the Group and Parish Footpath Warden.
- 4.9 The Group fully supports the route of the proposed bypass and considers the consultation process was fair and comprehensive. The Group was included in the 'Wider Reference Group' which was set up to embrace the opinions of local residents and organizations.
- 4.10 The comparison of routes summarised by NCC (Doc Ref. DD7 Appendix 3) proves that Route 2, to the west of the village, would be superior in accident reduction and direction of traffic and would achieve a 67% level of traffic removal from the A509 through Isham. Of the three routes considered during the consultation period, Route 2 was favoured by 62% and a majority of Isham residents.
- 4.11 The Ise Valley represents a green lung between the town of Burton Latimer and the village of Isham. Photographs taken in 1998 (Doc Ref. SUP/4/2) demonstrate the valley is prone to flooding. The public rights of way are in constant use by walkers and horse riders who enjoy the peace and tranquillity and the wildlife to be seen alongside the river. Constant noise and pollution from a road in the valley would be intolerable. The Parish Footpath Warden, with the support of Isham Parish Council, supports the proposed diversion of public footpaths on the west side of Isham necessitated by the proposed bypass.
- 4.12 Isham needs this bypass urgently to avoid further disruption, pollution and danger to pedestrians caused by the ever increasing volume of traffic, particularly HGVs arising as a result of the proximity of the A14 and the resultant convenience for commercial traffic to reach Wellingborough, Milton Keynes and the A45 trunk road.
- 4.13 Attempts have been made to compare the cost of the proposed bypass and the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement with the cost of Route 5. The Group requested that if further comparisons are to be made then the an additional cost to Route 5 for necessary improvements to Northern Way and Niort Way to the point west of Gleneagles Drive where the Isham to Wellingborough improvement would join Niort Way should be included (Doc Ref. SUP/23/2).

The Furnace Lane Action Group (FLAG)

[Main Source Doc Refs. SUP/32/1, SUP/35/3, SUP/35/4, SUP/35/5]

- 4.14 FLAG represents the residents of a small rural community living in Furnace Lane which was formed in 2003 as a direct result of the proposed Routes 2,5 and 6 for a bypass of Isham. The case was led by the chairperson, Mrs Yvonne Blood, with additional evidence given by Miss Shelley Harris and Mr Martin Lawrence. In reporting the evidence presented, I have concentrated on the points which are unique to each witness.
- 4.15 Mrs Blood (Doc Ref. SUP/32/1) described the effect Route 5 would have on the residents of Furnace Cottages in Furnace Lane. Route 5 would put a dual carriageway within 30m of the cottages destroying the valley behind and in front the properties. It would place them between a dual carriageway and a mainline railway. Light pollution would have an adverse effect on the beautiful night skies within the valley.
- 4.16 The Ise Valley forms a natural protection to the historic settlements of Harrowden, Finedon and Wellingborough and the consequences of development on the flood plain would be dire. The footpaths and bridleways in the valley receive the most amount of use in comparison with the western routes. The picturesque valley contains a rich and diverse wildlife, full of biodiversity, is an important resource and should be protected not developed.
- 4.17 FLAG fully supports Route 2, the route to the west of Isham, and seeks its early implementation to provide traffic relief, prevent accidents and to contribute to providing better links for the proposed growth outlined in the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (Doc Ref. DD55). FLAG considers that the consultation process has been both fair and reasonable. Route 2 would have the least environmental impact and would be the most cost effective.
- 4.18 Miss Shelley Harris (Doc Ref. SUP/35/3) further emphasised the support of FLAG for the route of the proposed bypass and the adverse effects of an alternative route within the Ise Valley. The proposed bypass would have the best links to accompanying road infrastructure making it sustainable in terms of future development.
- 4.19 The valley is a natural flood defence and one that should be afforded protection and respect. The construction of a road would lead inevitably to coalescence of the neighbouring communities. The area within the valley has been identified as an area requiring strategic gaps to safeguard against coalescence and unsustainable development. Noise and air pollution would have devastating consequences for the wildlife and birds that breed along the valley. The valley has also been identified via several projects which are aimed at enhancing this area of natural beauty and rich wildlife, conserving it for future generations for all to enjoy.

- 4.20 Mr Martin Lawrence (Doc Ref. SUP/35/5) presented statistics from the Northamptonshire Casualty Reduction Partnership for the period January 2003 to December 2005 for the A509 Great Harrowden (Wellingborough to Isham) and noted its designation as a 'Red Route' for accidents. The proposed bypass would contribute to the development of safer and stronger communities, the provision of safer roads and pavements and promote a dynamic and responsive economy. It is also supported by the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy as a tributary road link to the preferred area of projected growth for the future.
- 4.21 Further delays with the bypass would perpetuate the continuation of an accident black spot and continued congestion would also adversely hamper the response times and success of emergency vehicles along this route to save lives.
- 4.22 Comparisons of Route 2 with Route 5 show that Route 2 is the best performer in the economic appraisal and would result in additional traffic relief to Isham. Route 5 would terminate at an already congested industrial park with no provision for an extension to relieve the flow of 15,400 cars. This would add to the costs for Route 5. Furthermore, the costs for Route 5 do not include the cost of a flyover at Furnace Lane for emergency access to the 23 cottages. Additionally, the proposed bypass complements the preferred transport strategy for a link to the A45 as identified in the Core Spatial Strategy.
- 4.23 FLAG considers that the proposed bypass would enhance the local environment of Isham and Harrowden considerably improving conditions for motorists, pedestrians and horse riders and strongly supports its adoption. It would also support the extensive plans to safeguard and enhance the Ise Valley.

Mr Alan Jenkinson

[Main Source Doc Ref. SUP/1/1]

- 4.24 Mr Jenkinson has lived in Fairfield Road, Isham for 54 years. He described the effects of the construction of the A1-M1 Link Road (A14) encircling the south of Kettering and, at the same time, the development of the Northern Ring Road of Wellingborough on traffic levels in Isham. An Isham Bypass Action Group was first formed in 1988 as a response to these new roads which left Isham as the 'piggy in the middle'. The Action Group was naturally disbanded after about four years as its representatives could not agree which side of the village the bypass route should go.
- 4.25 If Isham collectively could not decide on a preferred route, the villagers soon became aware that neighbouring towns and villages were keen to tell them and the planners where it should go. This was understandable as the route would affect them to varying degrees. The County Council and its advisers are to be congratulated on the manner in which subsequent consultations were developed taking into account the views

of a wide variety of special interest representation groups and the public through exhibitions and questionnaires. Isham acknowledges the financial pressures which the scheme has had to overcome before eventually becoming a top priority bid.

- 4.26 Over the years the volume of traffic has increased considerably, including the size and length of the HGVs. The village has fought long and hard for the safety measures that now exist, including initially the 30mph speed restriction and subsequently the mini-roundabouts and signal controlled crossing. None have been as effective as the loyal, long serving School Crossing Patrol Officer who shepherds the school children across the middle of the A509 at peak traffic times. How many more years must Isham continue to suffer with this through traffic burden? The plea from the village is still therefore 'A bypass at the earliest opportunity please'. Finally, Isham means 'Home on the Ise'. Do not let us separate our Home from the Ise.

Mr Alan Bros

[Main Source Doc Ref. SUP/37/1]

- 4.27 Mr Bros is a resident of Burton Latimer and takes a keen and active interest in proposed developments in and around the town. He recognises that the issue of a bypass has created many divided factions locally. He supports the choice of route from a practical point of view as at peak times, accessing the A509 is very difficult and slow. The impact of the chosen western route on the residents of Isham and the surrounding area appears to be lessened by running the road in cuttings. From a personal point of view, he supports the chosen route as the impact of the alternative eastern routes would be huge and would ruin what is a very pleasant and much used green buffer between the two settlements of Isham and Burton Latimer.
- 4.28 He described the effect of noise and fumes and the visual impact which would result from an eastern route in the valley, particularly on the Pocket Park and walkways used by residents of both communities. The eastern side of Isham also contains the flood plain and is prone to fog. Such a route would have a major impact on the residents of the eastern side of Isham and the western side of Burton Latimer. A further problem of light pollution would arise from the location of a roundabout between the communities.
- 4.29 The County Council have employed independent specialists to investigate and report on the choice of route with due process and procedure followed, resulting in the recommendation for the western route. The recommendation also fits the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, specifically the aims to maintain a green framework of open spaces and promote a network of sub-regional corridors designed as green lungs between settlements. The choice of a western route allows both Isham and Burton Latimer to maintain this green buffer and protect their separate identities. The proposed route should be accepted whilst

funding and government support is available as the alternative would be at best many more years of delay and deliberation or at worst, no funding or no bypass at all.

Mr Joseph Cornwell

[Main Source Doc Ref. SUP/21/1]

- 4.30 Mr Richard Marshall presented Mr Cornwell's evidence. Mr Cornwell has been a resident of Isham for 20 years and lives with his wife and two children on the west side of the village in a house fronting the existing A509. He welcomes and endorses the Isham Bypass as it would rid the village of lorry and car congestion, noise and visual nuisance as well as decreasing all but local traffic. The road would be sunk into a dip and therefore not spoil their views of the countryside.
- 4.31 He described the impact of the ever increasing volume of traffic on the village. He considers the A509 is far too busy a road to be routed through a village which has so much housing in close proximity to it. Conversation is impossible anywhere near the road side, making communication difficult and ruining the quality of life for villagers. It is difficult to pull out into the traffic stream towards Kettering either due to congestion at peak times or as a result of traffic ignoring the speed limit. Turning right to Wellingborough is impossible at peak times.
- 4.32 The western route would be absolutely the best solution to rid us and all the inhabitants of Isham village of this awful problem. After many years discussion, the decision of the majority for the western route should be accepted and he supports the NCC proposal completely.

Mrs Elizabeth Le Count

[Main Source Doc Ref. SUP/36/1]

- 4.33 Mrs Le Count lives at Station Farm on Finedon Station Road where she has built up a business from bare land in 1991. The business concentrates on hens. Her property would be seriously affected by Route 5 as shown at public consultation. She submitted a petition to the Inquiry in the name of the Ise Valley Protection Group containing about 251 signatures opposing development in the Ise Valley and supporting the NCC choice of route. The signatures were collected from customers visiting her Free Range Shop at the farm. She also submitted photographs of the immediate surroundings of the farm. The valley is prone to fog and she is confident that choosing the western route would avoid some horrendous accidents. She therefore supports the proposed bypass to the west of the village.

Mrs Diane Hull

[Main Source Doc Ref. SUP/46/1]

- 4.34 Mrs Hull is a resident of Burton Latimer. She described the process that had been followed over a number of years since 1997 to create new footpaths in the Ise Valley between Isham and Burton Latimer. The footpaths, created in 2004, improve the links between Burton Latimer and Isham and provide access for people to enjoy the countryside. Two people who helped create these footpaths have sadly passed away and it is important to Mrs Hull that the footpaths should stay in the same peaceful environment in their memory. She would strongly object to Route 5 through the Ise Valley which would introduce pollution and noise from thundering traffic. Route 2, the western route would be in a cutting and needs no large holding ponds.

Written Support

- 4.35 The total of 97 letters received up to the close of the Inquiry included 12 from authors who appeared or were represented at the Inquiry. In addition to the petition submitted by Mrs Le Count, two further petitions with a total of about 173 signatures were submitted on behalf of the Ise Valley Protection Group. The majority of the original 38 letters received in response to the notice that the Orders had been made expressed clear support for the chosen route. Whilst generally in support of the proposed Isham Bypass, many of the later letters were clearly opposed to an eastern route for the bypass through the Ise valley (Doc Ref. ID4). In his letter dated 9 October 2007, Mr Philip Hollobone, Member of Parliament for the Kettering Constituency wrote in support of the westerly route for the bypass. No major issues in addition to those presented at the Inquiry were raised in all these letters.

5 THE CASE FOR THE OBJECTORS

The material points were:

Reynolds Farmers Limited

[Main Source Doc Ref. OBJ/1/1]

- 5.1 The objections on behalf of Reynolds Farmers Limited were presented by Mr David Bletsoe of Henry H Bletsoe & Son. Reynolds Farmers Limited farm at Little Harrowden and their holding, known as Frisby Lodge, would be affected by the Orders. Plots 12 and 12A – 12P, which cover a total area of 12.957 hectares are located on their land. The proposed bypass would sever Frisby Lodge Farm (Doc Ref. OBJ/1/1 Aerial Photograph 1).
- 5.2 The route of the proposed bypass, Route 2, was chosen following a consultation exercise and a feasibility study of various routes.

Subsequent to the consultation, NCC proposed an extension, known as the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement – Route 2.4 (Doc Ref. OBJ/1/1 Plan 3). The combined Route 2 and Route 2.4 should be compared with Route 5, to the east of Isham, which offers a similar connection between the A14 and Wellingborough.

5.3 The advantages for choosing Route 5 include:

- Located in an area already blighted by the railway line
- Less impact on ecological corridors and environmental habitats
- Less impact on farm holdings and on less productive land
- Affects fewer properties
- The Harrowdens and Hill Top would not be severed
- When compared like for like the combined Route 2/2.4 is similar in cost to Route 5
- Not causing safety problems south of Hill Top Road
- Removes problems of safety and queuing instead of shifting them from Isham to Harrowden
- Removal of a 'rat run' to the A14 through the Harrowdens

5.4 Reynolds Farmers Limited feel the bypass should follow alternative Route 5 which was not considered on a like for like basis with Route 2 and the extension on Route 2.4.

5.5 If it is found that Route 2, the proposed bypass, would be the correct route to follow, Reynolds Farmers Limited are concerned that it would have a severe impact upon Frisby Lodge, which is an area with considerable environmental interest with two plantations and a large wood connected via various hedgerows and wildlife corridors. The client has undertaken considerable environmental enhancement to Frisby Lodge and created a wildlife haven in what is otherwise a landscape characterised by open farmland.

5.6 Ashpole Plantation and Cock-o-Roost Spinney would be isolated from Big Covert, a site of nature conservation value. The road would destroy 1,700m of established hedgerow and the client would be forced to remove a further 1,300m of hedgerow in order to regularise awkward shaped field boundaries to ensure the farm remains farmable by modern machinery.

5.7 Reynolds Farmers Limited would prefer to see the alignment of the proposed bypass being shifted further to the east as broadly shown in green on Plan 4 (Doc Ref. OBJ/1/1). Alternatively, this variation of the route could shift to the east of Hill Top Road as shown blue on Plan 4. This route would then join into the Route 2.4 or 2.1 of the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement shown blue, green and orange on Plan 5. This would have the following significant benefits:

- Ashpole Plantation and Cock-o-Roost Spinney would not be severed from Big Covert maintaining the existing important ecological and wildlife habitats;
- The majority of the internal hedges would not be affected retaining the already established wildlife corridors;
- The severance to the agricultural holding would be significantly reduced, removing the requirement for an accommodation overbridge;
- The impact on the dwelling at Frisby Lodge would be significantly reduced;
- The road would be closely aligned to the existing A509, reducing the impact caused by the scheme on the environment, agricultural holdings and neighbouring properties;
- There would be reduced impact to the fields eliminating the need for removing the existing hedges to create fields suitable for modern agricultural practice;
- The amount of cut and fill required would be reduced creating less of an impact on the landscape;
- If the road was to the east of Hill Top, it would have a significantly reduced impact upon the various properties at Hill Top, which would not be as close to the road nor severed from the remainder of Little Harrowden.

5.8 Mr Bletsoe then explained that as a result of discussions with NCC he was withdrawing Section 4 'Mitigation Works' of his Proof of Evidence and Summary Proof of Evidence (Doc Ref OBJ/1/1). He concluded by requesting that due account should be taken of the alternatives put forward to address the concerns put forward on the impact of the farm, the wildlife corridors and connections to woodland. A route close to the railway line would have least impact due to the presence of that railway and if that was not possible then the route should be moved east of the two spinneys in order to maintain the corridors and Big Covert.

Little Harrowden Parish Council

[Main Source Doc Refs. OBJ/78/1, OBJ/78/2 & OBJ/78/3]

- 5.9 The objections on behalf of Little Harrowden Parish Council were presented by Councillor Stephen Clack (vice chair). The Parish Council recognises that it is sadly inevitable that when much needed construction projects are undertaken, high quality farm land will be concreted over, centuries old rights of way curtailed and traditional communities divided. It is therefore imperative that such effects are minimised. The Parish Council considers these effects have not been satisfactorily minimised with the proposed bypass.
- 5.10 Route 10 (Doc Ref. DD7 Appendix 1) was one of the 13 route options initially identified for the bypass. Passing to the west of Isham, it could be expected to provide traffic relief to the village similar to the proposed bypass. It would be smaller, cheaper and just as efficient. The Isham to Wellingborough Improvement has not yet been approved and therefore it must be logical and prudent to opt for the cheapest option rather than adding extra length that finishes at residential cross roads rather than at a rural 'T' junction. In view of the reduced number of objections, the reduced number of statutory orders, the reduced cost and yet similar relief offered, the Parish Council commends Route 10 as the first suitable alternative.
- 5.11 The Parish Council voted strongly in favour of Route 5. However this was a somewhat reluctant choice. Of the final three options presented, Route 5 remains the better option although subsequent development plans for the expansion of Wellingborough (WEAST) would offer an alternative approach. This would involve improving the A45/A6 junction at Rushden, linking to the A6/A14 junction at the northern end. Similar to Route 13 but with much of the infrastructure already in place, this would prove less disruptive, less contentious and just as effective in offering non local traffic, together with the newly created local WEAST traffic, an efficient north-south link.
- 5.12 The Parish Council is concerned that the proposed bypass would cut across sites of archaeological significance and objects to the Orders on the basis that nothing appears to have been done to preserve, or excavate and investigate these. The Parish Council also objects to the location of the southern termination of the bypass in what it considers to be a dangerous position where it would also greatly impair the quality of life for the Little Harrowden residents in Hill Top Road, Hillside and Hill Top itself. On the basis that the mitigating work would only be effective within 10-12 years of completion, the Parish Council is concerned about the interim and objects on these grounds.
- 5.13 The Parish Council contends that the entire route selection process was flawed in that there was an alarming bias from certain quarters towards the selection of Route 2. It considers figures have been misrepresented in that Route 5 (£16.17m) was stated to be more expensive than Route 2 with the added Isham to Wellingborough Improvement (£18.95m). If

this is the case then other matters may be called into question. The Parish Council respectfully requested that the Orders not be confirmed.

Ramblers Association

[Main Source Doc Refs. OBJ/7/1, OBJ/7/2 & NCC/7/2]

- 5.14 Evidence on behalf of the Ramblers Association was given by Mr Robert Coles, the Local Footpath Secretary. The Association was consulted and contributed its views on proposals for dealing with Rights of Way which would be affected by the proposed bypass. The Association has been left with a number of locations where it believed there could and should be a number of improvements to the proposed solutions.
- 5.15 At the north end of the proposed bypass (Doc Ref. OBJ/7/2 Plan 39A Location 1), the Association considers the combined cycleway/footway would be safer and considerably better environmentally if it was to be routed along the much earlier A509, away from the busy dual carriageway with its problems of lighting from vehicles and cycles. This route would also enable views of the valley to the east to be enjoyed and the Association does not accept that problems would be created by such a route being hidden away when out in the country.
- 5.16 The Association is content with the proposed diversions for footpath GW2 and bridleway GW15 shown in the Orders in the vicinity of Pytchley Brook. It notes the creation of a new route for bridleway GW15 and considers this a substantial improvement. NCC has consulted on further alterations to bridleway GW15 and other rights of way to the west of this location (Doc Ref. NCC/7/2) which the Association considers are a necessary part of the proposed bypass. Financial restraint on the Rights of Way budget and Legal Department mean there is no guarantee these further changes would go ahead. The Association requested that all these changes should be sanctioned within the SRO for the proposed bypass.
- 5.17 The Association considers that the diversion of footpath TM4 (Doc Ref. DD1, Sheet 1 of 2, Inset 3) on the east side of the proposed bypass should be a cross-field path, diverted in a straight line to a new kissing gate at the new Orlingbury Bridge (Doc Ref OBJ/7/2 Plan 32A Location 4). The proposed diversion would be a headland path where budget restraint on the highway authority would make it unlikely that the necessary maintenance would be carried out. The Association also seeks an extension to footpath TM4 northwards on the west side of the proposed bypass for about 267m to access the proposed accommodation bridge at 'The Ruts'. This would be a welcome improvement providing choice for villagers.
- 5.18 The Association considers that footpath TK18 which exists on Frisby Lane is a vitally important route into the countryside. The lane is particularly pretty north of Frisby Lodge where it is double hedged and lined with oak and ash trees (Doc Ref. OBJ/7/2 Photograph). The Association seeks a

revised diversion (Doc Ref. OBJ/7/2 Plan 33A Location 5 Option A) which would continue footpath TK18 along the lane until it would meet the new highway boundary which it would follow to Hardwick Brook before crossing the road in a combined culvert/underpass. On the east side, footpath TM5 would be re-aligned to meet the end of the culvert/underpass. This would result in a more direct path to Isham and ensure the lane was retained.

- 5.19 A further concern of the Association in this area is the location for the farm accommodation bridge which would result in the need to widen Frisby Lane for farm machinery. Under the revised diversion for footpath TK18 proposed by the Association, the accommodation bridge could be moved further south (Doc Ref. OBJ/7/2 Plan 35A Location 5 Option D) where it would be served by a track to and from Frisby Lodge. This would also ensure the lane was retained and help the farmer by keeping the bridge private.

CTC, The National Organisation for Cyclists

[Main Source Doc Refs. OBJ/8/1, OBJ/8/2, OBJ/8/3 & OBJ/8/4]

- 5.20 Evidence on behalf of CTC was given by Mr John Cutler, the local representative for planning and transport matters of the CTC, authorised to speak on Northamptonshire issues. CTC recognises that conditions in Isham would be improved and that is very greatly welcomed. However, CTC considers that the scheme objective to improve transport links between Kettering and Wellingborough has been interpreted narrowly to mean facilitating motor vehicle journeys. Such an approach is not justifiable on a road that has historically been an important cycling corridor. In 2001, the Isham Parish Council made it clear it expected residents to be able to walk and cycle into Kettering again as a benefit of the scheme. The ultimate aim would be to create a good cycle track between Wellingborough and Kettering.
- 5.21 CTC made representations in September 2005 and January 2006 to the Development Control Department of the County Council drawing attention to regional and national policies which supported the view that cycling should be encouraged in the corridor between Kettering and Wellingborough. The representations also drew attention to the difficulty in crossing the A14 Junction 9 Pytchley Roundabout, concern about the cycleway alongside the new road between the Kettering Road Roundabout and the A14, and the half kilometre gap between Hill Top and Great Harrowden at the southern end of the scheme. However, these matters remain unresolved.
- 5.22 CTC recognised that the Highways Agency (HA) was the highway authority responsible for the A14 Junction 9 and that despite negotiations between HA and NCC, no facility has been provided and no date proposed for implementation of one. A similar situation exists at the A14 junction with the A43 to the north east and, it appears, with no prospect of it being addressed. CTC sought my support in ensuring that cycle

route problems were addressed in the design stage of the road and not postponed until after construction, a time when nobody would have the will or the funds to deal with them.

- 5.23 CTC was concerned that the design of the cycleway at the northern end alongside the southbound carriageway would be substandard. CTC would prefer a route for the cycleway which would make use of the existing A509 as far as possible (Doc Ref. OBJ/8/4). This would avoid the problems of spray and headlight dazzle caused by being near fast traffic which CTC considers to be a more significant hazard than being remote from the road and isolated when outside an urban area. Such an approach is supported in the extracts supplied from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Doc Ref. OBJ/8/1 Appendix 3).
- 5.24 CTC was concerned that the design of the southern end of the scheme would be hazardous to cyclists and would prevent use of the route between Isham and Wellingborough or Wellingborough and Kettering. Traffic would be funnelled into a single carriageway and there would be a gap between Hill Top and Great Harrowden. Even if there was a means provided at the southern end of the proposed bypass to rejoin the old A509 there would be a difficulty getting to/from Great Harrowden.
- 5.25 Constructing a cycleway link from the proposed bypass to Great Harrowden using land formerly occupied by the A509 would represent very good value for money. It would enable the southern part of the proposed route to be used during the uncertain period while the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement was awaited. CTC did not accept that because it was beyond the end of the scheme, it was not a matter for consideration. CTC pointed out that this argument did not appear to apply to the new footway to be constructed to link Isham village footways with the new cycleway/footway at the north end of the proposed bypass.

Mr R J Martin

[Main Source Doc Ref. OBJ/9/1]

- 5.26 Mr Martin expressed similar concerns to CTC in respect of the combined cycleway/footway between the proposed Kettering Road Roundabout and the A14 Junction 9 at the north end of the bypass. Such facilities can be open to abuse by parked vehicles forcing users into the road. HGVs create a 'whirlwind' effect making users unsteady. In poor weather users would be subject to spray from the road surface with the added chill factor in winter. At night the lights of oncoming vehicles would have a blinding effect. He was concerned that when budgets come into play then the work would be done with very little thought and in the cheapest way. The old A509 would be ideal for cyclists and pedestrians alike, overcoming the disadvantages of the proposed facility. He did not accept that people would be open to assault or attack by being separated from the new road and he drew attention to a number of such cycle paths that are in the locality.

Mrs Jeanette Whiting

[Main Source Doc Ref. OBJ/63/1 & OBJ/63/2]

- 5.27 Mrs Whiting owns 25 Winston Drive, a detached house on the western edge of the village which would be in close proximity to the proposed bypass. At the time she and her husband bought the property in July 2000, they did so in the knowledge that any future bypass was designated to the east of the village. Mrs Whiting was a member of the Wider Reference Group established by NCC in 2001 as part of the consultation process. Although the Group agreed to take Routes 2, 5 and 6 to public consultation, she felt their views were negated by the fact that all 13 of the routes were shown as part of the consultation.
- 5.28 Mrs Whiting contrasted the effects of the extensive earthworks needed for Route 2 with Route 6 which would naturally follow the railway corridor and which was recognised by house buyers in the 1990s as being the route for the bypass east of the village. She considered that conflicting information on the costs of the various routes had been given in different documents during scheme development. Route 5 would also be more effective at providing a link road between Kettering and Wellingborough whereas Route 2 would require further expenditure to link it to Wellingborough.
- 5.29 Her understanding of the key objective of the Isham bypass is to provide traffic relief to the village and this would be met most effectively by Route 6. Route 10 was rejected because it would not address the accident problem at Hill Top and yet this is where the proposed bypass would finish. She therefore assumed that there was a wider agenda and that all routes should be considered in total length between Kettering and Wellingborough to achieve a strategic link. Planned growth for development in the east of Wellingborough means that the infrastructure would be in place to link up with an eastern bypass. All routes should be evaluated to meet the same objective.
- 5.30 She considered that the proposed bypass would not be cost effective in terms of meeting the overall scheme objective, providing traffic relief and addressing the eastern development of Wellingborough. It would destroy a beautiful landscape, divide the community and absorb Isham into Burton Latimer.
- 5.31 She was concerned about the direct effects of the bypass on her family from air pollution and noise. She would like to see the proposed bypass moved further away from Winston Drive as the previous scheme to the east was at least a field away from properties. In the event of the proposed bypass going ahead she requested consideration should be given to a number of detailed matters relating to the mitigation of these effects on land between the proposed bypass and her property. These included the use of living willow boundary; the height, length and position of a noise barrier and further barriers; the provision of triple glazing to reduce noise; and the opportunity to buy the small piece of land between the top of the cutting and her garden boundary.
-

Mr Robert Coles

[Main Source: Objection letter dated 13 February 2007 and Doc Refs. OBJ/30/1-3.]

- 5.32 Mr Coles has lived in Little Harrowden for almost all of his life where the countryside and landscape surrounding the village have been of vital importance to his family and other residents. He objected to the adverse effects which would result from constructing a modern dual carriageway on undulating land where the excavations for deep cuttings and very high embankments would heavily scar the landscape and take many years to heal. He was particularly concerned at the impact on the land between Hardwick Brook and Hill Top Road. It includes three wooded areas, the majority of hedgerows have been retained and the farmer works with nature to attract wildlife. He considered the proposed bypass would inflict irreversible damage on the landscape and the environment. The fragmentation of the farmer's holding would result in pressure to grub out hedgerows to enable the farm to remain viable.
- 5.33 With the construction of the most southerly section of the bypass, there would be three roads in existence between Hill Top Road and Little Harrowden Brook: the original turn pike road on the east side, the new A509 built in 1968 and the proposed bypass. If the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement was built a few years ahead, it would amount to a potential unmitigated disaster.
- 5.34 He considered that a through route built in one operation should have been developed from the start. This could have been constructed lower down the River Ise Valley where the undulating landscape is almost non-existent. A road parallel to the railway would not have resulted in such enormous devastation. Mr Coles had analysed the costs of the routes assessed prior to public consultation (OBJ/30/3). This indicated to him that the cost of the single carriageway tie-in at the south end of the scheme would be £2.07m and that the additional cost of the Isham Bypass with the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement would be £3.51m more than Route 5.
- 5.35 The effect of the proposed bypass would be to impose traffic levels considered unacceptable in Isham on Great Harrowden. With the dual carriageway terminating at Hill Top Road, there would inevitably be a 'rat run' through the village of Little Harrowden. He concluded that a complete rethink was required and requested that the Orders should not be confirmed.

Professor Alan Waller

[Main Source: Objection Letter dated 12 February 2007 & oral evidence]

- 5.36 Professor Waller is a resident of Orlingbury, a past chair of Orlingbury Parish Council but gave evidence in a personal capacity. He considered that the wrong route had been chosen and the process for its selection

was flawed. Undue weight had been given to those protecting the Ise Valley where a new route would have avoided new countryside intrusion, given help to Weetabix traffic from Burton Latimer and provided a link to planned developments in the east of Wellingborough. Route 2 would be shorter and would not do the same thing as Route 5. He understood that Route 2 with the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement would be more expensive than Route 5.

- 5.37 He had been invited to a meeting of the Wider Reference Group to select routes for public consultation but felt that NCC representatives made it clear from the start which route was preferred and he considered that the analysis was leveraged around that solution. He felt there was a hidden agenda where, in his view, common sense had not been followed. The opportunity for housing infill may have had a bearing on the choice. He considered that the Ise Valley Protection Group were over-represented and had a substantial input.
- 5.38 He stated that he had no vested interest in the route choice and that as the proposed bypass would not link to the east of Wellingborough, a true comparison with Route 5 was not possible. Detailed analysis of the routes was unnecessary as the proposed bypass would not make sense.

Mrs Jennifer D Curtis

[Main Source Doc Ref. OB/64/1]

- 5.39 Mrs Curtis lives at 23 Winston Drive in Isham. Her evidence dealt with the problems that the proposed bypass would create for drivers in the area, the effect on local businesses, the harm to the landscape and wildlife and the effect of noise and pollution on those who would be living in close proximity to it.
- 5.40 The heavy traffic problems in the village would be transferred further down the A509 towards Wellingborough leading to accidents at the junction where the road would revert to a single carriageway. Drivers would be encouraged to travel faster over a short distance adding to the national problem of speeding. She considered that many HGVs and other traffic would not use the bypass, particularly at non-peak times, preferring the shorter route and avoiding a potentially dangerous bypass. Exiting the village onto the roundabouts would prove hazardous at peak times. Local businesses (shop and pub) would suffer from the loss of much casual trade with a harmful effect on the life of the village.
- 5.41 She perceived the high volume of traffic was only peak time related and that it could be very quiet at weekends and at some periods during the working day. A through route to Wellingborough, parallel to the railway line to the east of the village would be preferable as no firm financial provision has been made, and may never be made, to continue the proposed bypass to join the roads circling Wellingborough.

- 5.42 The natural beauty of the countryside would be altered forever by the proposed bypass with the loss of good quality agricultural land and the welfare of a wide variety of wildlife would be put in jeopardy.
- 5.43 Currently she enjoys virtually no pollution, no noise, no fumes, no traffic odours and is not subject to any street lighting at the rear of her property. The proposed bypass would pass within about 14m of the rear boundary and greatly affect noise and pollution, also raising concern about the flow of the water table beneath the property. The proposed bypass would also be within not much greater distance of other properties in the villages of Isham and Little Harrowden. She considered that anyone involved with planning the bypass would not permit this if they lived in any of these properties.

Mr T Martyn Smith

[Main Source: Letter dated 12 September 2007 and OBJ/67/1]

- 5.44 Mr Smith lives at 3 Winston Drive in Isham. He gave evidence in support of his view that the proposed bypass would not address the whole picture of traffic movement in North Northants. The narrow brief provided by NCC was to bypass Isham. In isolation, all the bypass would achieve would be to shift traffic congestion from Isham to Great Harrowden.
- 5.45 Since the project began there have been significant housing developments on the east sides of both Kettering and Wellingborough. Both towns need a ring road on the east side and a better road system now to deal with the flows. A route to the east of Isham would connect the two towns. Whilst he accepted one of the reasons for choosing the western route was that 80% of traffic from Kettering travelled west when the A509 joined Niort Way, when the planned growth comes to pass there would be a rapid growth of traffic on the east side of both towns.
- 5.46 It has also been suggested that a new loop road to the south of the A14 may be necessary and the A43 from Northampton through Kettering to Corby is being considered for an upgrade to a dual carriageway. He considered that before building an Isham bypass, there should be integrated proposals agreed by the Government, the Department for Transport, the County and Borough Councils. Otherwise there could be a need to build another relief road between Kettering and Wellingborough in the future to deal with rapid expansion. Land to the east side of Isham should be used to link the two towns.

Mr Douglas Forrester

[Main Source Doc Ref. OBJ/69/1]

- 5.47 Mr Forrester is no longer living at 43 Fairfield Road, Isham but is currently building a new home on the plot behind. He did not dispute the need for a bypass but considered the natural and common sense route

should be along the Ise Valley. Route 5 would link better with Wellingborough industry, keep noise pollution in one area, service the existing industry in the valley, have far less visual impact on the countryside and help complete the Wellingborough Ring Road.

- 5.48 A route along the valley would be mainly through scrub land. Most of the footpaths and the Pocket Park are on the east side of the railway and would be unaffected by the road. He acknowledged the impact of noise which would be caused by traffic and the presence of housing at Finedon Sidings but considered the impact would be less than the equivalent impacts from the proposed bypass to the west.
- 5.49 The proposed bypass would result in a scar on the rural landscape and destroy prime agricultural land. The Isham to Wellingborough Improvement extension to the bypass would cause an even bigger scar on the landscape and affect many more houses. When Route 2 was chosen NCC stated there were no plans to extend it to through to Wellingborough yet the extension was announced soon after. He considered that NCC's ownership of land to the south east of the A14 Junction 9 may have affected the decision as a route to the east may have limited opportunities for its development. He did not accept that with Route 5 costing less than the proposed bypass with its extension to Wellingborough that the proposed bypass could be claimed to be more economically viable.
- 5.50 History has shown that where bypasses have been provided, planning permission is given for housing on land between the village and the bypass. If this were to happen between Route 2 and the village, Isham would be ruined. If the valley route was chosen, the presence of the flood plain would limit the opportunity for infill and Isham would retain its village feel. He was surprised that Isham Parish Council had not expressed its views on the proposed bypass.
- 5.51 Once NCC had made the decision to adopt Route 2 and funding was allocated, many who opposed it lost heart. He acknowledged that the Ise Valley Protection Group had been vociferous in presenting and promoting their views. However, the common sense route should be through the valley and there are as many people opposed to Route 2 as there are against a valley route.

Mr Neville J J Wood

[Main Source Doc Ref. OBJ/74/1]

- 5.52 Mr Wood chose to live on the western side of Isham 25 years ago when there were proposals for a bypass to be adjacent to the railway line in the east. He objected to the proposed bypass being to the west of the village and requested that a number of points should be addressed. He sought assurance that the new road would have a noise reducing surface and that as the area does not currently suffer from light pollution, there would be no lighting on the road other than at the roundabouts. He

queried whether noise reducing baffles shielded by trees and planting would be provided on the embankment over Hardwick Brook which is due south of his home. In this location, the prevailing winds would carry all the noise and pollution from fumes into the village. The volume of traffic would create congestion where vehicles filtered back onto the single carriageway at Hill Top roundabout. A dual carriageway would add to the overall cost and might not be really necessary. Finally he felt that further information on relative land and proposed levels should have been provided to objectors to help in assessing the overall impact of the proposed bypass.

Written Objections (Statutory Objectors to the CPO)

Pytchley Parish Church and A J Middleton Esq

[Main Source: Objection Letters dated 8 & 10 February 2007 from Berrys, Doc Refs. OBJ/2/1, NCC/2/1 & NCC/2/2]

- 5.53 Pytchley Parish Church is the owner and A J Middleton Esq is the occupier of land labelled 'E' on the plan attached to the letter dated 8 February 2007. The objection was firstly that there would be no provision for access to the retained land to the west of the bypass and secondly that the owner does not wish to part with the title of any land which would not be absolutely essential for the construction of the road. NCC had resisted the request for an agricultural access onto the adjacent roundabout for health and safety reasons. In a letter dated 24 October 2007 (Doc Ref. OBJ/2/1) on behalf of the owner, the agent sought the right to make use of or extend the balancing pond which would be constructed on Plots 4C, 4D, 4E, and 4F. In a letter dated 24 October 2007 to Atkins Northamptonshire Highways on behalf of A J Middleton Esq (In Doc Ref NCC/2/1), the agent confirmed that there were no outstanding issues with regard to his client. In a letter dated 31 October 2007 to Atkins Northamptonshire Highways on behalf of the owner and occupier (Doc Ref NCC/2/2), the agent confirmed amongst other matters that his client wished to retain title to Plots 4A and 4B.

D & A Reynolds Limited and J A Bennie & Son

[Main Source: Objection Letter dated 7 February 2007, Doc Refs. OBJ/3/1, OBJ/3/2 and NCC/3/1]

- 5.54 D & A Reynolds Limited occupies land labelled 'F' on the plan accompanying the objection letter dated 7 February 2007 and lying to the south side of Orlingbury Road. Initially the agent sought a statement to clarify exactly what was proposed in respect of the land to be acquired and noted that his client did not wish to part with title for of any land in Plot 11 over and above that required for the carriageway and verges. In a letter dated 24 October 2007 (Doc Ref. OBJ/3/1), the agent expressed concern over Plots 11E and 11F for the creation of a balancing pond. His clients would prefer to grant a licence for this work or, if title was acquired, to have rights to extend, improve or make use of the facility.

- 5.55 J A Bennie & Son occupy land labelled 'C' on the plan referred to above, lying to the north side of Orlingbury Road. The agent sought information on the intended use of the plots included in the CPO and indicated a preference to retain the title of areas other than those accommodating the proposed bypass. In a letter dated 24 October 2007 (Doc Ref. OBJ/3/2) the agent confirmed that his clients wish to retain ownership, albeit with a licence granted to the acquiring authority, of Plots 10A, 10B, 10C, 10G and 10H and saw no reason why title should be required for Plots 10A, 10B and 10C. He also expressed concern about access from Orlingbury Road to the retained land for any future development and sought speed reduction measures to slow down traffic.

Mr P H L Harpur and Mrs N Brown

[Main Source: Objection Letter dated 7 February 2007, Doc Refs. NCC/4/1 and NCC/4/2]

- 5.56 Mr Harpur is the owner and Mrs Brown the tenant of Plots 7, 7A, 7C, 7D, 7E and 7F. The agent sought information on the intended use of the plots and noted that unless an area was specifically required for the scheme, his clients would not wish to part with the title to any additional areas. A later letter dated 31 October 2007 (Doc Ref. NCC/4/2) to Atkins Northamptonshire Highways referred to the owner as Burton Latimer Estates and confirmed that that the only outstanding issues to be addressed related to accommodation works and how the land would be farmed whilst the works were in progress.

Messrs A D Blaxley & R J Shawley

[Main Source: Objection Letter dated 8 February 2007 & Doc Ref. NCC/5/1]

- 5.57 Mr Blaxley is the owner and Mr Shawley the tenant of the land labelled 'B' on the plan accompanying the letter dated 8 February 2007. The owner did not wish to part with title to Plots 9A, 9B, 9C and 9D and sought assurances on the design of the overbridge to accommodate agricultural requirements. In a letter dated 23 October 2007 (Doc Ref. NCC/5/1) to Atkins Northamptonshire Highways, the agent confirmed that the proposal for the bridge would be in order, mutually acceptable terms for the purchase of Plot 9A had been agreed with NCC and that his client wished to retain ownership of Plot 9D.

Northants LLP

[Main Source: Objection Letter dated 15 February 2007 & Doc Ref. OBJ/6/1]

- 5.58 Northants LLP own various patches of land in the parish of Little Harrowden which are shown as Plot Nos 15-16J in the CPO. In a letter dated 29 October 2007 to the Government Office for the North East, the

agent for Northants LLP confirmed that an agreed position had been reached with NCC and that the client was now able to withdraw the objection to the scheme.

Other Written Objections

- 5.59 The written objections included 27 in the form of a standard letter from the occupiers of 14 properties in Hill Top Road and Little Harrowden. The letter raised one issue which was not covered by those appearing at the Inquiry, namely health and safety concerns that the proposed bypass would pass within the blast area of the pyrotechnics store located in Big Covert and would also cross the route of the buried aviation fuel line. Other than this matter, in my view, no major issues in addition to those presented at the Inquiry were raised in the remaining letters of objection.

6 REBUTTAL BY NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

The material points made in rebuttal by the order-making authority were as follows:

Reynolds Farmers Limited

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD61, NCC/1/1 and NCC/1/2]

- 6.1 In its bid for funding, NCC noted that the proposed bypass for Isham was important if Isham was to be relieved of its existing problems but that it was also likely to be part of a longer term strategy which could involve further road improvements for the A509 between Isham and Wellingborough. NCC resolved to consider options for the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement (IWIMP) in May 2003, a transport improvement which would complement planned growth set out in the then emerging Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy. Unfortunately despite two applications, provisional funding for IWIMP has not yet been secured but is anticipated in the period 2011-2016. This means that the construction of the Isham bypass would be likely to occur some years before IWIMP.
- 6.2 Supporters of Route 5 have suggested this option would offer a comprehensive solution to the A509 Kettering to Wellingborough strategic route. A comparison has been undertaken between the aforementioned combined schemes and Route 5 with additional improvements to Northen Way and Niort Way. This indicated that Route 5 would cost more, offer poorer value for money, save fewer accidents, offer less traffic relief in Isham and Great Harrowden, impact adversely on the flood plain of the River Ise and be less effective as a strategic route within the framework of the Sub Regional Strategy.
- 6.3 Plans have been drawn up of the variations to the proposed bypass

suggested by the objector (Doc Ref NCC/1/2). Alternative Route 3 is an interpretation of the route moved further east and shown green on the objector's Plan 4 (Doc Ref OBJ/1/1). On a comparable 1998 price base, this route would cost £1.7m more than the proposed bypass and involve more significant earthworks. A comparable amount of agricultural Grade 2/3a land would be required and part of Cock-o-Roost Spinney would be lost. The COBA BCR would be significantly less than the proposed bypass and the alternative would provide less traffic relief to Isham. The overall environmental assessment would be slightly worse than the proposed bypass.

- 6.4 Alternative Route 3B is an interpretation of the part green and blue route shown on the objector's Plan 4. This route would cost £0.8m more than the proposed bypass. An additional junction would be required with Finedon Station Road which, due to the volume of traffic, would need to be a roundabout rather than the priority junction shown. The COBA BCR is estimated to be worse than the proposed bypass and traffic relief to Isham would be less. The overall environmental assessment would be slightly worse than the proposed bypass.

Little Harrowden Parish Council

- 6.5 NCC did not respond directly to the objection of the Parish Council. The main issues raised are generally covered in responses to other objections.

Ramblers Association

[Main Source Doc Ref. NCC/7/1 & letter dated 31 August 2007 from NCC to the Ramblers Association in DD61]

- 6.6 The provision of the cycleway/footway at the north end of the proposed bypass was subject to consultation reported in the Summary of Consultation on Rights of Way Provision (Doc Ref. DD58). The majority of respondents supported the cycleway in the proposed location although some suggested use of the old A509. The main factor in the decision was the consequence of users being remote from the open road. Proposed landscaping would increase the isolation of users. The facility would be separated from the carriageway by means of a safety barrier which has been accepted by the safety audit team as a satisfactory and safe arrangement.
- 6.7 The further proposals for changes to the rights of way network west of the bypass near Pytchley Brook are not a direct consequence of the proposed bypass and are not needed to permit its construction. A separate process is required and whilst no written agreement can be provided to confirm that the whole route would be available on completion, NCC would endeavour to implement the proposed modifications through a separate and parallel rights of way diversion order.

- 6.8 NCC acknowledges the concern regarding lack of maintenance of headland paths. Improved maintenance regimes are required and NCC are working towards that objective. The extension of footpath TM4 northwards is not necessary as a consequence of the proposed bypass but the suggestion would be referred to the NCC Rights of Way Manager for consideration.
- 6.9 The location of the bridge carrying the diversion of footpath TK18 was selected to meet the needs of pedestrians and agriculture. It was supported by the majority of respondents to the rights of way consultation. Engineering constraints also dictate the location. There are no proposals to remove significant lengths of hedgerow north of Frisby Lodge although it is recognised that the restrictive width between them may prohibit use by certain agricultural vehicles. Further consultations with the landowners are on-going concerning alternative arrangements.

CTC, The National Organisation for Cyclists

[Main Source Doc Refs. NCC/8/1, IN24 & letter dated 28 August 2007 from NCC to Mr Cutler in DD61]

- 6.10 Discussions have been held with the HA in regard to the provision of crossing points over the east facing slip roads at the A14 Junction 9 roundabout. However the provision of such a crossing is a matter for the HA. NCC will continue to press the HA to provide this facility for 2009 when the proposed bypass would be completed.
- 6.11 The response to CTC on the location of the cycleway/footway at the north end of the proposed bypass is the same as that provided to the Ramblers Association in paragraph 6.6 above. In response to CTC's concern regarding the standard of the facility in the vicinity of the lay-by, NCC submitted Plan 126A (Doc Ref IN 24) which indicated that a separate footway would be provided alongside the lay-by, separated from the combined cycleway/footway by a safety barrier.
- 6.12 At the southern end of the bypass, measures to properly provide for cyclists would be considered during the detailed design stage as would other cycling issues raised in the safety audit. Implementation of the Isham to Wellingborough Improvement would enable the existing A509 between Hill Top and Wellingborough to become a local access road, more suitable for cyclists. NCC believes that funding for this improvement would be forthcoming. It would not be appropriate however for cycling measures well outside the limits of the proposed bypass to be provided.
- 6.13 Overall the proposed bypass would allow the existing A509 through the village to be used by cyclists where reduced traffic volumes and speeds would make the route pleasanter and safer.

Mr R J Martin

- 6.14 The response to Mr Martin on the location of the cycleway/footway at the north end of the proposed bypass is the same as that provided to the Ramblers Association in paragraph 6.6 above.

Mrs Jeanette Whiting

[Main Source Doc Refs. NCC/63/1 & letter dated 8 August 2007 from NCC to Mr & Mrs Whiting in DD61]

- 6.15 It is acknowledged that the previously preferred route for a bypass to the east of Isham, announced in January 1994, was identified on land searches. However, it is responsible and appropriate that when considering options for an Isham Bypass many years later that all the evidence available at that time should be taken into account. Properties affected by the proposed bypass would, where appropriate, be entitled to apply for compensation in accordance with the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- 6.16 Based on a 2007 opening year for comparison purposes, the proposed bypass would reduce traffic through Isham by 67%, Route 5 would result in a 45% reduction and Route 6, 82%. This demonstrates very effective relief which would be superior to Route 5 and compares favourably to Route 6. Route 6 would be shorter than Route 2. It also would pick up more local traffic particularly from Burton Latimer but other factors make Route 6 less favourable. The construction of a bypass to the west of the village would have no implication on Isham being absorbed into Burton Latimer. The majority of trips using the A509 have destinations or origins on the west side of Wellingborough. This means that any route to the east would incur additional travel time and distance for these trips and use unsuitable single carriageway links such as Northen Way.
- 6.17 NCC acknowledges that the proposed route would adversely impact on the landscape. However, mitigation measures have been proposed which would reduce this and link with the surrounding landscape. Route 5, next to the railway in the Ise valley would have less substantial earthworks. However, other factors such as development within the flood plain, impact on the water environment and the necessity to provide flood compensation storage would have resulted in additional earthworks other than embankment provision.
- 6.18 In replacing the existing priority junction at Hill Top Road with a roundabout designed to current standards, the proposed bypass would improve safety there. In conjunction with the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement, the remainder of the single carriageway would be replaced by a dual carriageway. Both these schemes would provide good positive economic benefits but NCC acknowledges that government finance would be unlikely to be available to construct both schemes together.

- 6.19 The implication of moving the bypass further away from property boundaries at Winston Drive would be detrimental in respect to alignment and agricultural severance. Benefits in regard to improved air quality and noise would be negligible. The mitigation measures which include placing the road in cutting, sympathetic landscaping, provision of noise barriers and a low noise road surface, would be discussed with residents. NCC would endeavour to provide a solution which accords with residents' preferences and meets the requirements of the conditions attached to the planning permission.

Mr Robert Coles

[Main Source: Letter dated 31 July 2007 from NCC to Mr Coles in DD61]

- 6.20 Landscape mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the impact of the proposed bypass and link with the surrounding landscape. In the area of greatest concern to Mr Cole, south of Orlingbury Road, dense tree and shrub planting would be provided through to the cutting west of Ashpole Plantation. The majority of the cutting would be sown with species rich grassland and the crests of the cutting planted with tree lined hedgerows, and trees and shrubs. Tree and shrub planting and species rich grassland would continue to the roundabout at Hill Top Road.
- 6.21 The balancing pond north of Hardwick Brook would be surrounded by wetland grasses with occasional wetland trees and further wetland trees and shrubs at its northern extent. Arable headland grasses would be used at the interface with adjacent fields for agricultural reasons. Big Covert, Ashpole Plantation and Cock-o-Roost Spinney would remain intact. NCC considers the landscape proposals would go a long way towards compensating for the loss of hedgerow and where possible the planting proposals would help to rationalise field shapes.
- 6.22 The route of the proposed bypass was chosen in May 2003 based on technical investigation together with consideration of the results of public consultation. 82% of responses supported the idea of a bypass and of those who supported a bypass, 62% preferred the chosen route. Route 5, on the east side of the village was supported by 34%. Within Isham itself, 76% supported a bypass with 48% preferring the chosen route and 45% preferring Route 5. The eastern routes involve development within the flood plain of the River Ise and the preference of the Environment Agency for the route to the west of the village required significant consideration. The environmental aspects of the route options were assessed and, on balance, the preference on environmental grounds was for the proposed bypass. This route also showed the most beneficial BCRs, best accident savings and good traffic relief.
- 6.23 The termination of the proposed bypass south of Hill Top Road junction is recognised as a constraint which would be addressed by the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement. The appraisal guidelines included considering the impacts of the proposed bypass on the wider community.

Professor Alan Waller

[Main Source Doc Refs. NCC/61/1 & Letter dated 9 August 2007 from NCC to Professor Waller in DD61]

- 6.24 The reasons for the choice of route have been clearly stated in NCC's engineering evidence to the Inquiry (Doc Ref. DD7). The use of the Wider Reference Group clearly demonstrates the intention to fully involve people in the decision making process. The full public consultation process was most rigorously and transparently carried out. Professor Waller may not like the proposed bypass but he has not produced any evidence to support his accusations. The allocation of land for housing development and the consideration of any specific proposals would be the responsibility of Wellingborough Borough Council.
- 6.25 The landscape and environment evidence (Doc Ref. DD11) demonstrates how the proposed bypass would be landscaped and mitigation measures introduced. Every effort would be made to reduce the impact of the highway scheme on the environment. A full Environmental Statement had been produced, consulted on and all the mitigation measures contained within it would be carried out.
- 6.26 At a 1998 price base, the proposed bypass was estimated to cost £10.3m and Route 5, £15.9m. A further detailed comparison was made between the proposed bypass combined with the preferred route for the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement and, Route 5 with additional improvements to Northen Way and Niort Way. The combined scheme would cost £18.9m at 2002 prices compared to Route 5 with additional improvements costing £21.5m.

Mrs Jennifer D Curtis

[Main Source Doc Refs. NCC/64/1]

- 6.27 The proposed roundabout at Hill Top Road would provide a recognised change in carriageway standard from single to dual, replace the existing priority junction and reduce accidents. Vehicles would travel faster on the proposed bypass but increased speed would be appropriate to the environment and standard of the road. The A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement is being promoted by NCC. It would remove heavy traffic from Great Harrowden and create a dual carriageway between Kettering and Wellingborough. The economic and environmental benefits are very positive and future government funding is anticipated.
- 6.28 There are prohibitions which deter HGVs from accessing the existing A509 and traffic from Morrisons, Latimer Park and Weetabix sites now benefit from a new link to the A14. These measures would ensure that HGV through traffic would not continue through Isham. The roundabouts either side of Isham village would accommodate local traffic entry and queue times would not be significant. There may be some consequential

loss of passing trade for local businesses. However, the proposed bypass would be beneficial in overall terms to townscape.

- 6.29 National guidance on flow ranges for different standards of carriageway indicates the suggested flow for a single (S2) carriageway is up to 13,000 vehicles per day and for a dual carriageway (D2AP), between 11,000 and 39,000 vehicles per day at opening. The existing flow on the A509 is in excess of 23,000 vehicles per day and the forecast flow would be around 28,000 in the opening year of 2009/10. A dual carriageway road would therefore be the appropriate standard.
- 6.30 The response to the suggestion of a through route to Wellingborough along the railway line to the east of the village is the same as given to Mr Coles in paragraph 6.22 above. NCC acknowledges the proposed bypass would adversely impact the countryside and result in the loss of good quality agricultural land. Landscaping incorporated in the proposals would mitigate the impact.
- 6.31 NCC acknowledges the adverse impact of the proposed bypass on some properties in Winston Drive, including that of Mrs Curtis. The response is the same as that provided to Mrs Whiting in paragraph 6.19 above.

Mr T Martyn Smith

[Main Source Doc Ref. NCC/67/1]

- 6.32 The proposed bypass has been assessed using the latest available planning data throughout the appraisal process. This includes information taken from RSS8, the MKSM-SRS and the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (Doc Refs. DD45, DD46 & DD55). These documents include development proposals for Kettering and Wellingborough and the WEAST development. The proposed bypass would provide additional capacity within the A509 corridor and alleviate current congestion in and around Isham.
- 6.33 In conjunction with the proposed A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement, Great Harrowden would be relieved and the completion of a dual carriageway link between Kettering and Wellingborough would support future development. Great Harrowden already suffers from traffic congestion with the A509 carrying flows well in excess of the capacity of a single carriageway road. The problem already exists and is not a simple transferral of traffic from one village to another.
- 6.34 Proposals for providing relief to heavy traffic flows on the A14 around Kettering are currently being considered but NCC is not aware of any timescale having been identified yet. NCC is also aware of the 'Pulse Park' development and its infrastructure.

Mr Douglas Forrester

[Main Source Doc Ref. NCC/69/1]

- 6.35 The response to the suggestion that the natural route would be along the Ise Valley to the east of the village is the same as given to Mr Coles in paragraph 6.22 above. Route 5 would also have the greatest visual impact on properties, with 97 adversely affected in 'Year 1 Winter' and 92 adversely affected in 'Year 15 Summer'. The figures for Route 2 are 82 properties in 'Year 1 Winter' and 80 in 'Year 15 Summer'. Figures are taken from the Stage 2 Environmental Appraisal (Doc Refs. IN17, IN18 & IN19).
- 6.36 NCC acknowledges that noise levels and pollution for properties in close proximity to the proposed bypass would increase significantly. By their very nature, bypasses remove traffic from densely populated areas into less densely populated areas where little or no traffic existed. Considered as a whole, the net effect of the proposed bypass is an overall net improvement in terms of noise and local air quality.
- 6.37 NCC also acknowledges the impact of the proposed bypass on Grade 2 and 3a agricultural land and that the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement would also be likely to impact on high quality agricultural land.

Mr Neville J J Wood

[Main Source Doc Ref. NCC/74/1]

- 6.38 The response to the objection to the route of the proposed bypass is the same as given to Mr Coles in paragraph 6.22 above. NCC confirmed that a low noise road surface would be used in construction of the proposed bypass which would provide a reduction in noise at source of approximately 3dB(A). NCC also confirmed that there would be no lighting on the proposed bypass other than at the roundabouts. Extensive tree and shrub planting would be provided on the embankment across Hardwick Brook. Predicted noise levels in the vicinity of Mr Wood's home would not be any greater than current noise levels from the existing road network and hence no specific noise attenuation would be proposed at this location. Due to the relative distances from the proposed route and the existing network, there would be no predicted deterioration in air quality.
- 6.39 The response to Mr Wood's query on the justification for a dual carriageway is the same as given to Mrs Curtis in paragraph 6.29 above. The proposed roundabout at Hill Top Road would accommodate capacity although it is accepted that that the proposed single carriageway south of this roundabout would exceed the flow range for this type of road.

Written Objections (Statutory Objectors)

Pytchley Parish Church and A J Middleton Esq

[Main Source Doc Ref. NCC/2/1]

- 6.40 In a letter from Atkins Northamptonshire Highways dated 24 October 2007 to the objectors' agent, NCC sought confirmation on whether access for the land had been agreed with the adjacent landowner. Although not a preferred option on safety grounds, NCC was prepared to offer an agricultural access to the land from the proposed roundabout junction of the bypass with the existing A509. If confirmation of the alternative track arrangement has not been successfully concluded, then this access arrangement could be agreed. In response to my question, NCC confirmed in the Inquiry that as local highway authority, it was within its power to provide such an access without the SRO.
- 6.41 In a letter dated 31 October 2007 to the objectors' agent, Atkins Northamptonshire Highways stated that NCC would not be agreeable to permitting future rights to enlarge or modify the balancing pond. The balancing pond is essential infrastructure to enable effective operation of the road. The design is subject to planning consent and careful assessment by the Environment Agency to ensure appropriate storage capacity and run-off rates. Future additional run-off would not be accommodated as part of the present design and any future modifications would be subject to statutory planning requirements.
- 6.42 In the same letter, confirmation was given that Plots 4A and 4B have been included in the CPO for the purpose of essential landscape mitigation. In principle NCC would not need to take title but specified conditions would be imposed if the client retained the land. To ensure delivery of the scheme requirements, the land in question would remain in the CPO.

D & A Reynolds Limited and J A Bennie & Son

[Main Source Doc Ref. NCC/3/1]

- 6.43 In a letter dated 31 October 2007 to the D & A Reynolds Limited's agent, Atkins Northamptonshire Highways stated that NCC would not be agreeable to permitting future rights to enlarge or modify the balancing pond for the same reasons as given in paragraph 6.41 above. There would also be regular maintenance requirements, safety issues and matters regarding occupiers' liability, contamination issues and management of future discharge.
- 6.44 In a letter dated 31 October 2007 to J A Bennie and Son's agent, Atkins Northamptonshire Highways gave further clarification of the purpose of Plots 10A-10H and confirmed that, in principle, NCC would not need to take title to Plots 10A, 10C and 10D which were required for essential

landscape mitigation. However, specified conditions would be imposed if the client retained the land and to ensure delivery of the scheme requirements, the land in question would remain in the CPO.

- 6.45 The agent's comments in respect of speed reduction measures on Orlingbury Road were noted but it was not clear what significant concerns would be created by the proposed bridge.

Messrs A D Blaxley and R J Shawley

[Main Source Doc Ref. NCC/5/1]

- 6.46 In a letter dated 31 October 2007 to the objectors' agent, Atkins Northamptonshire Highways confirmed that Plot 9D had been included for the purpose of essential landscape mitigation. In principle NCC would not need to take title but specified conditions would be imposed if the client retained the land. To ensure delivery of the scheme requirements, the land in question would remain in the CPO.

Other Written Objections

[Main Source Doc Ref. DD61]

- 6.47 NCC responded to the issue of health and safety concerns over the proximity of the proposed bypass to the blast area of the pyrotechnics store and the crossing of the buried aviation fuel line by confirming that throughout the development of the scheme, consultation and correspondence had been exchanged with owners and operators of this type of infrastructure. Should the proposed bypass progress to construction, dialogue would be maintained and any necessary requirements would be incorporated into the scheme such that operational and public safety issues would not be compromised.

7 CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

- 7.1 Bearing in mind the submissions and objections I have reported, I have reached the following conclusions, reference being made in square brackets to earlier paragraphs where appropriate.
- 7.2 The principles and main issues raised are dealt with on a topic by topic basis. I then set out my conclusions on the case of the objectors who appeared at the Inquiry before dealing with the written objections. I reach a conclusion on each of the Orders before the Inquiry, relating that conclusion to the statutory tests which the Order concerned must satisfy.

The Need for the Proposed Bypass

- 7.3 The need to relieve the village of Isham of through traffic was self-evident from the short time I spent in the village. With the village lying between the 2 regionally important towns of Kettering and Wellingborough, the A509 provides the most direct and convenient route both between them and for other north/south journeys. With an AADT on the route of 23,000 vehicles with some 10% HGVs [3.18], the traffic forms a very disruptive element within the village scene.
- 7.4 The road through the village is relatively straight and level such that only the limited traffic calming measures bring a measure of control. I have no doubt that the high level of traffic impacts adversely on the daily lives of the community, particularly those living alongside it. The core of the village is a Conservation Area which straddles the existing road and is inevitably degraded by the presence of the traffic.
- 7.5 Junctions with side roads both north and south of the village are also a source of delay and congestion, particularly at peak times. The junctions and the lengths of de-restricted road between them have a poor accident record [3.24] which up until recently resulted in the A509 Great Harrowden (Wellingborough to Isham) being classified a 'Red Route', one with a high number of fatal and serious accidents [3.1 & 3.24]. The designation was lifted in April 2007 as a result of measures introduced in Great Harrowden, south of the proposed bypass, which reduced the number of accidents.
- 7.6 Support for the principle of a bypass, as measured by the response to the public consultation questionnaire, at 82% [3.6] is high. Within Isham itself, 76% supported a bypass [6.22]. Notwithstanding that some objectors felt that the value of the bypass would not be fully achieved unless it formed a complete strategic link between Kettering and Wellingborough, few argued there was no need for a bypass.
- 7.7 The decision to route the proposed bypass to the west of the village has

understandably divided the community within the village with 48% preferring the chosen route and 45% preferring Route 5 on the east side of the village. When the views of the wider community are taken into account, support for the chosen route rises to 62% [6.22]. Most of the supporters who appeared at the Inquiry were keen to protect the environment of the River Ise Valley, lying to the east of the village. I also heard support on behalf of both Kettering and Wellingborough Borough Councils who noted the strategic role of the route [4.5 & 4.7].

- 7.8 I conclude there is a need for a bypass and the case was well made by NCC and the supporters.

Policy Context

- 7.9 The provision of a bypass is supported at regional, sub-regional, county and local level by planning policies which seeks to provide adequate infrastructure for the region's growth [3.44]. Whilst some of the adverse impacts would conflict with the aims of national Planning Policy Statements and Guidance, I find that the measures taken to mitigate these impacts would prevent them being disproportionate to the overall benefits which could be achieved. The proposed bypass has also been granted planning permission which adds weight to my conclusion that it would therefore not conflict with the overall thrust of planning policy.

The Proposed Bypass Location

- 7.10 The location was chosen following consideration of 13 route options [3.4], lying either east or west of the village. I consider the involvement of the Wider Reference Group demonstrated a clear intent by NCC to embrace a variety of interests and opinions in arriving at the preferred route. The public consultation exercise and environmental assessment on the short list of three routes was comprehensive and enabled NCC to take a balanced view in reaching its decision.
- 7.11 Crossing three valleys against the lie of the land necessitating high embankments and deep cuttings was acknowledged by NCC as having a large adverse impact on the landscape [3.47]. The loss of high quality agricultural land would be regrettable but it would be subject to compensation. Two enterprises would suffer a moderate or negative impact but the impact on others would be minor or insignificant. No evidence was put to me to suggest that any holding would become unviable and the variations in the bypass route suggested by Reynolds Farmers Limited would not take any lesser area or quality of land.
- 7.12 Noise and local air quality effects show a net improvement for the area [3.56, 3.59]. Passing relatively close to properties on the west side of Isham, in particular those in Winston Drive, and on Hill Top Road would result in adverse visual and noise impacts on the living conditions of their occupiers [3.48, 3.57]. Nevertheless, I note that mitigation measures would reduce these adverse impacts to a degree. Whilst the effects upon those people who would be worse off are naturally resented, I consider

that in no case would they be unacceptable.

- 7.13 The proposed bypass would also have a moderate adverse impact on biodiversity and a slight adverse effect on water environment [3.60]. However, although there would be an overall reduction in the value of the Big Covert Country Wildlife Site, I consider that the mitigation measures proposed, including pollution control of the watercourses, would be comprehensive and appropriate.
- 7.14 Although there were objections to the environmental impact of the proposed bypass, I heard no evidence questioning the approach used by NCC in the production of the Environmental Statement or the summary assessments. Any bypass in such an area would inevitably have some detrimental effect. However, I conclude that the overall environmental benefit to the village which would result from the proposed bypass would substantially outweigh the detriment to the surrounding area.

Carriageway Standard, Junction Type and Road safety

- 7.15 The main objection to carriageway standard was the effect of changing from a dual to a single carriageway at the proposed roundabout at Hill Top Road. I am satisfied from the evidence given by NCC [6.29] that the provision of a dual carriageway would be fully justified by the forecast traffic flows. I also accept that where it is necessary to change the standard, that a roundabout would be the most convenient and safest way to achieve it.
- 7.16 I note the improvement in the accident record through Great Harrowden in recent years resulting from the introduction of speed restriction and enforcement measures. The proposed A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement would continue the dual carriageway standard from the roundabout at some point in the future thereby bypassing Great Harrowden but in the meantime, I conclude that the proposed standards are appropriate for their purpose. The roundabouts would also provide a safe and convenient access for local traffic to join and leave the A509.
- 7.17 There were three objections (Ramblers Association, CTC and Mr Martin) to the route of the proposed cycleway/footway facility at the northern end of the bypass alongside the carriageway. I note that although this option was supported by a majority of the respondents to the consultation on Rights of Way [6.6], it was the only option put forward by NCC. Whilst it might not be as pleasant as a purpose built route using parts of the former A509, it would provide a much improved route for non-motorised users between the village and the A14. The provision of the safety barrier between the facility and the carriageway would, in my view, ensure a safe and convenient route.
- 7.18 It is disappointing to note that currently there is no facility and none planned to get non-motorised users across the A14 Junction 9 into Kettering. The roundabout is the responsibility of the Highways Agency. I saw for myself the number of entry and exit points to this roundabout

and the high speed of traffic using it which would make crossing it a perilous journey either on foot or bicycle. Whilst there is also a gap in the facilities available on the Kettering side of the junction, the provision of the facility on the proposed bypass would be likely to increase demand and, unless a continuous route is provided, could adversely affect safety at the junction. I consider this is not a deficiency of the proposed bypass as such but I recommend that the respective highway authorities co-ordinate their efforts to address the problem in the event of the bypass proceeding to construction.

- 7.19 At the southern end of the route, CTC sought the provision of a cycleway/footway from the end of the bypass to Great Harrowden where it would link with an existing facility. NCC confirmed that the existing A509 from Hill Top Road to the southern tie-in would be kept available for cyclists and pedestrians with the form of connection at the tie-in subject to later detailed design [6.12]. However, it was unwilling to provide the extension to Great Harrowden as it was beyond the scope of the project.
- 7.20 In my opinion, the proposed bypass, including the cycleway/footway at the northern end would be likely to significantly improve facilities for non-motorised users in the area generally and to encourage longer journeys by cyclists in particular. The existing road from Great Harrowden to the southern tie-in with the high forecast flows, steep gradient and relatively narrow width would be hazardous for cyclists. Notwithstanding the proposed A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement which could provide relief in the future, in my view, a cycleway/footway extension from the tie-in to the existing cycleway in Great Harrowden would be fully justified here. I recommend that further consideration is given to its provision.

Traffic and Economics

- 7.21 I accept that throughout the scheme development, the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8) and the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (Doc Refs. DD45 & DD46) introduced a degree of uncertainty in the traffic forecasts. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that every attempt has been made to update the forecasts where necessary and to adequately model planned growth in the study area. The provision of dual sets of forecasts for the environmental assessment has ensured that the worst case scenarios have been considered.
- 7.22 Although a number of objectors considered that an alternative route along the Ise Valley would deal better with planned growth, particularly to the east of Wellingborough and also Kettering, there was no substantive challenge to the traffic forecasts or economic analysis provided by NCC. The proposed bypass would provide a 63% reduction in traffic flow through the village in 2009 [3.23] and BCRs of 3.229 Low Growth and 3.273 High Growth [3.29].

- 7.23 The increase in cost resulting from the introduction of three additional bridges in 2005 was only revealed towards the end of the Inquiry [3.26]. There also appeared to be some uncertainty as to the cost base of the estimate and whether the 'outturn' prices included for inflation to the year of opening. Whilst I accept that the costs have been provided in good faith, NCC acknowledged that the figures seem light for a project of this size. However, the figures have been reported to the Government Office for the East Midlands subsequent to the financial approval granted in 2003 and no indication has been given that the increase would be unacceptable or the scheme cost inconsistent with comparable size projects in the region.

Alternative Routes

- 7.24 Variations to the route of the proposed bypass were proposed by Reynolds Farmers Limited [5.7]. The effect of these would be to move the route away from their land. However, NCC provided evidence to demonstrate that both of these would cost more, provide poorer value for money and have a slightly worse environmental assessment [6.3, 6.4]. I see no merit in these variations other than the undoubted reduction in harm to the objector's enterprise. However, in my opinion, that would not be sufficient in itself to justify considering these variations further.
- 7.25 Little Harrowden Parish Council suggested a shorter and cheaper route to the west of the village. Although NCC did not submit any evidence in rebuttal, it is clear that the initial assessment of such a route as one of 13 options did not indicate sufficient advantage for it to be considered further. In my opinion, it would not deal with the accident problems south of the village at Finedon Station Road or Hill Top Road junctions and would not easily facilitate a future extension towards Wellingborough.
- 7.26 The majority of the objectors would prefer a bypass to the east side of the village, many citing the presence of the existing Midland Railway Line, the less undulating land form, its cost and the fact that it would link with existing roads on the east side of Wellingborough as its principle advantages. Route 5 was one of the three routes presented for public consultation in 2003. There was no substantial challenge to the environmental assessment that was carried out at that time to compare routes east and west of Isham and given in evidence by NCC [3.6].
- 7.27 Route 5 did not perform as well as Route 2 to the west and, in my opinion, the critical matters were the views of the Environment Agency on the effect on the River Ise floodplain and the reduced traffic relief in Isham. I saw for myself, the variety of land uses including houses, agriculture, industry and recreation within the valley and agree with the supporters that it is worthy of protection from the intrusion a new road would introduce.
- 7.28 I recognise that comparing a route which provides part of a strategic link
-

between Kettering and Wellingborough on the west side with one that provides a complete link on the east side is somewhat unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, I do not accept the argument put forward that Route 5 would necessarily be cheaper than the combined A509 Isham Bypass and the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement. No details of the additional improvements necessary to Niort Way and Northen Way were provided by NCC but I accept that some would be necessary which would be likely to eliminate any notional cost advantage. In addition, the majority of trips using the A509 have destinations or origins on the west side of Wellingborough [6.16] and would thereby incur additional travel time and distance. This leads me to conclude that Route 5 would not provide an alternative which would overcome any significant adverse impacts arising from the proposed bypass and is therefore not worthy of further consideration.

Reynolds Farmers Limited

- 7.29 I have carefully considered the alternative Route 5 and variations to the proposed bypass put forward on behalf of the objector. For the reasons given above, I conclude that whilst they would clearly reduce the impact on the farm enterprise, adverse impacts would be transferred to others and I see no merit in giving those routes any further consideration.

Little Harrowden Parish Council

- 7.30 I do not agree with the objector that the process of route selection was flawed. The evidence put to the Inquiry indicates to me that from the outset, NCC established a process for consultation [3.4] that went beyond the conventional approach and carried out appropriate assessments on the options available. The reporting and decision making process was transparent and supported both by the majority of the responses received and by the technical and environmental assessments. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the alternative Route 10 would not merit further consideration.
- 7.31 I do not accept that nothing appears to have been done to preserve or excavate and investigate sites of archaeological importance which the bypass would cross. NCC gave evidence on the surveys and trial trenching carried out to date and that full investigation and recording of archaeological information would form part of the mitigation strategy [3.54]. I am satisfied that these measures would be a proportionate response to the issue.
- 7.32 Inevitably the landscape planting to mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed bypass would take time to mature and become truly effective. Nevertheless, in my view, placing the road in cutting where it runs adjacent to dwellings would ensure that those adverse effects would not be unacceptably harmful when the bypass opened to traffic.

Ramblers Association

- 7.33 I have carefully considered the improvements suggested by the Association. For reasons given above [7.17] I have concluded that the cycleway/footway proposed by NCC at the north end of the bypass would provide a safe and convenient route. Whilst there would be some benefit to the wider network of rights of way if the further improvements on which NCC have consulted in the vicinity of Pytchley Brook were implemented at the same time, I agree with NCC that they would not form an essential part of the proposed bypass. I therefore do not accept they should be added as modifications to the SRO.
- 7.34 For a similar reason, I do not accept that an extension to footpath TM4 northwards on the west side of the bypass is necessary or justified as a consequence of the proposed bypass. On the east side of the proposed bypass, in my opinion, the diversion of TM4 along the field boundaries would provide a reasonably convenient route. I do not agree with the Association that the maintenance regime issues acknowledged by NCC would provide sufficient justification for the alternative cross-field route.
- 7.35 I agree with the Association that the lane north of Frisby Lodge is particularly attractive. Nevertheless, the diversion of footpath TK18 to cross the bypass on a farm accommodation bridge, in my opinion, provides a reasonably convenient route. I note that Reynolds Farmers Limited do not object to the proposed location of the bridge which I accept has been determined to meet engineering and farm operational constraints. In these circumstances, I do not agree that the alternative would offer any significant advantage and note it was not the preferred option in the rights of way consultation.

CTC, the National Organisation for Cyclists and Mr R J Martin

- 7.36 For the reasons given above [7.17] I have concluded that the cycleway/footway proposed by NCC at the north end of the bypass would provide a safe and convenient route. Whilst noting that its omission is not a specific deficiency of the proposed bypass, I agree that continuation of such a facility across the A14 Junction 9 and onwards into Kettering would be very desirable and have recommended that the respective highway authorities address the matter [7.18]. At the southern end of the bypass, I accept that conditions for cyclists on the length of existing road to Great Harrowden would be hazardous. Whilst the situation would not be physically different from that existing now, I have recommended [7.20] that further consideration is given to the provision of an extension of the cycleway from Great Harrowden to the southern tie-in of the proposed bypass.

Mrs Jeanette Whiting

- 7.37 It is regrettable that information provided in response to searches indicated a bypass route to the east of Isham at the time Mr & Mrs Whiting bought their property. Nevertheless, I am satisfied such

information was given in good faith and I agree with NCC that given the passage of time, it was responsible and appropriate to reconsider all available options when the bypass was identified as a priority road scheme. For the reasons given above [7.28] I have concluded that Route 5 would not merit further consideration.

- 7.38 I agree with NCC that moving the proposed bypass further west in the vicinity of Winston Drive would not result in more than a negligible improvement in noise or air quality for the affected residents. I am satisfied that the conditions attached to the planning permission and the mitigation proposals given in evidence should ensure that the resulting impacts would not be unacceptable.

Mr Robert Coles

- 7.39 I have noted Mr Coles analysis of the costs of the routes assessed prior to public consultation. However, I do not agree that such an analysis can provide anything more than an indication of relative costs and does not form a sound substitute for the evidence provided by NCC. Furthermore, assessment of competing options depends on more than simply comparing capital cost and for the reasons given above I have concluded Route 5 would not merit further consideration. Nor do I agree that the proposed bypass with a roundabout on Hill Top Road would result in unacceptable traffic levels passing through the village of Little Harrowden.

Professor Alan Waller

- 7.40 For reasons given above [7.10] I disagree that that the consultation process leading to route selection was flawed. Neither do I agree that route selection can be made without a thorough assessment of all the issues which allows the balancing of advantages and disadvantages of all the options. I accept that Professor Waller has no vested interest in route choice but he did not present any detailed evidence to challenge the assessment carried out by NCC and I have concluded above [7.28] that Route 5 would not merit further consideration.

Mrs Jennifer D Curtis

- 7.41 I have addressed Mrs Curtis' concerns on the carriageway standard and safety of the proposed bypass above [7.15, 7.16]. I have also concluded [7.28] that Route 5 would not merit further consideration. I recognise that the proposed bypass would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of her home. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that adequate mitigation would be provided which should ensure that the resulting impact would not be unacceptable.

Mr T Martyn Smith

- 7.42 I have concluded above that the proposed bypass is necessary and in line
-

with planning policy [7.8, 7.9]. I am satisfied that the traffic forecasting has adequately taken account of planned growth in the area and I do not agree that the proposed bypass would not be integrated with such proposals. I have concluded that Route 5 would not merit further consideration [7.28].

Mr Douglas Forrester

- 7.43 I have concluded that the process for route selection was thorough and comprehensive [7.10] and that Route 5 would not merit further consideration [7.28]. I agree with NCC that the issue of housing infill between the proposed bypass and the village would be a matter for Wellingborough Borough Council to consider in line with its planning policies. Nevertheless, no evidence has been put to me to indicate that Isham has been identified as a community for significant growth and this matter does not alter my conclusion on the merit of Route 5.

Mr Neville J J Wood

- 7.44 NCC provided the assurances Mr Wood sought regarding the low noise surface for the new road and the location of lighting [6.38]. I have addressed Mr Wood's concerns on the dual carriageway standard above [7.15] and concluded that Route 5 would not merit further consideration [7.28].

Written Objections (Statutory Objectors)

- 7.45 No formal modification of the SRO has been put to me by NCC to provide a new means of access to the retained land belonging to Pytchley Parish Church to replace Access Reference X1 to OS parcel No. 0073 in the SRO. However, NCC has formally offered to provide an agricultural access from the adjacent proposed roundabout [6.40] which would be in accordance with the agent's request if an alternative means of access from adjacent land in the ownership of NCC cannot be agreed. I acknowledge the reluctance of NCC to provide the access direct to the roundabout when a safer location could be achieved elsewhere. In the circumstances, I conclude that a reasonably convenient means of access to the retained land would be provided in either event.
- 7.46 Two written objections (Pytchley Parish Church and A J Middleton Esq, D & A Reynolds Limited) sought to retain title to, or to have further rights to enlarge and modify, the balancing ponds at Pytchley Brook and Hardwick Brook. I am satisfied that the reasons given by NCC [6.41] justify the need for acquisition of this land within the CPO.
- 7.47 Three written objections (Pytchley Parish Church and A J Middleton Esq, J A Bennie and Son, Messrs A D Blaxley and R J Shawley) sought to retain title to certain plots included in the CPO for the purposes of essential mitigation. I note that none of the objectors challenged the need for the mitigation or its location. I also note the willingness of NCC to negotiate

a licence for these areas subject to conditions. I conclude that the inclusion of these plots in the CPO is fully justified in order to mitigate the impact of the proposed bypass.

- 7.48 No evidence was provided to explain how the introduction of the bridge to carry Orlingbury Road over the proposed bypass would alter the speed of traffic where it passed J A Bennie and Son's retained land. I consider that conditions would be largely unchanged on this length of road and conclude that no further speed reducing measures would be necessary as a result of the proposals.

Other Written Objections

- 7.49 No objection or representation was made on behalf of the operators of the pyrotechnics store located in Big Covert or the aviation fuel line. I note the confirmation from NCC that the operators have been consulted and this leads me to conclude that there would be no unacceptable impact on health and safety resulting from the construction or operation of the proposed bypass on these facilities.
- 7.50 Other than this matter I consider there were no major issues raised in the remaining objections which have not already been addressed in my conclusions.

The Orders

The Side Roads Order (SRO)

- 7.51 The SRO would be in exercise of powers conferred by sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980. These require the Secretary of State for Transport to be satisfied that alternative routes to highways being stopped up are reasonably convenient and that for any private means of access, another means of access is proposed, or no means of access is reasonably required.
- 7.52 I have carefully considered the alternatives suggested by the Ramblers Association and the further improvements proposed to enhance the footpath and cycleway network suggested by them together with CTC and Mr Martin. However, I have concluded that in these cases, the routes proposed in the SRO are reasonably convenient [7.33, 7.34, 7.35]. Some further suggestions were outside the direct scope of the SRO but I have concluded there would be some merit in a short extension of the cycleway at Great Harrowden being pursued in parallel with the proposed bypass [7.20].
- 7.53 I find it somewhat unsatisfactory that a new means of access to replace Access reference X1 to OS parcel No. 0073 has not been formally included in the SRO. Nevertheless, NCC do not dispute that an access is reasonably required and have confirmed to the objector's agent that an agricultural access would be provided to the adjacent roundabout without

need for modification of the SRO if a more suitable and safer location cannot be agreed [6.40].

- 7.54 With this assurance, **I therefore conclude** that the relevant criteria would be satisfied and that the SRO should be confirmed.

The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO)

- 7.55 Under the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, as interpreted by the advice in Office of the Deputy Prime Minister Circular 06/2004, the Secretary of State for Transport may have regard to whether for each plot of land to be acquired compulsorily:

- there is a compelling case for acquisition in the public interest;
- this case justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land;
- the promoter has a clear idea how it is intending to use the land it seeks to acquire;
- the promoter can show that all necessary resources to carry out its plans are likely to be available within a reasonable timescale;
- the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any impediment to implementation.

- 7.56 In my recommendations to the Secretary of State I must test whether each of these criteria have been satisfied. This includes a balance of the benefits and disadvantages of the proposals in the public interest. The standard of proof applicable in these circumstances is the balance of probabilities.

The Public Interest

- 7.57 The principle of the proposed bypass enjoys a wide measure of support both in the village of Isham and in the surrounding communities. I have concluded that the bypass is needed and that it would be in line with the overall thrust of national, regional, sub-regional, county and local planning policy [7.9]. I have carefully considered the case for an alternative route to the east of the village and more local variations of the proposed bypass. I have concluded that none of these would merit further consideration [7.24, 7.25, 7.28]. I conclude therefore that construction of the proposed bypass would be in the public interest.

Human Rights

- 7.58 The benefits of the scheme to the travelling public and to the majority of

local residents in Isham would be substantial. The impact of the proposed bypass on the environment in the vicinity has been judged acceptable, in the broad public interest, by the granting of planning permission, and I see no basis to disagree with that judgement. No dwellings would be purchased and no agricultural or other enterprise would be made unviable by the land taken [7.11]. The compensation legislation would apply to the land affected by the CPO. I conclude that the benefits of the proposed bypass justify interference with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected.

Clear Intention for Use of the Land

- 7.59 NCC has demonstrated that the land to be acquired is needed for the proposed bypass or for temporary purposes associated with its construction. There would be sufficient land to provide the essential mitigation but it would not go beyond that. I conclude that the acquiring authority has a clear idea of how it is intending to use the land that it seeks to acquire.

Resources and Timescale

- 7.60 In July 2006, the Secretary of State for Transport included the proposed bypass in a list of approved schemes for funding within the three years 2006/7 to 2008/9 (Doc Ref. IN4). NCC acknowledged that the overall costs seem light but nonetheless expressed confidence that the estimate for the scheme is robust and that there would be provision for a funding shortfall from the Department for Transport [3.26]. I therefore conclude that the necessary resources will be available in a reasonable timescale.

Impediment to Implementation

- 7.61 No matter was raised during the Inquiry which would suggest any impediment to implementation of the proposals.
- 7.62 **I conclude** that the CPO should be confirmed.

Other matters

- 7.63 I conclude that it would be highly desirable for the reasons given in paragraphs 7.18 to 7.20 for further consideration to be given to the provision of facilities for non-motorised users at the northern and southern ends of the proposed bypass.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 I recommend that the Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2006 should be confirmed as made.
- 8.2 I recommend that the Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2007 should be confirmed as made.

John Yellowley

INSPECTOR

APPENDIX A**APPEARANCES****For the Order Making Authority, Northamptonshire County Council**

Mr Toby Davey of Counsel, instructed by Northamptonshire County Council

He called:

Mr Hugh Smith BTech, CEng, MICE	Project Manager, Atkins/Northamptonshire Highways
Mr David William Ellwood BA (Hons), DipLA, MLI	Principal Landscape Architect, Atkins
Mr Paul Eagle	Transport Planning Project Manager, Atkins
Mr Tony Fletcher BSc (Hons), CEng, MICE	Head of Development Services Department, Atkins

Supporters***Organisations***

Kettering Borough Council & Burton Latimer Town Council	Councillor Christopher Groome Municipal Offices, Bowling Green Road, Kettering NN15 7QX
Wellingborough Borough Council	Paul Thompson BSc, CEng, MICE, Sustainable Infrastructure Manager, Swanspool House, Wellingborough NN8 1BP
Ise Valley Protection Group	Mr John Lambert, Chairman 4 The Millglade, Isham NN14 1HT Mr Richard Marshall, Member & Parish Footpath Warden, 11 South Street, Isham NN14 1HP
Furnace Lane Action Group	Mrs Yvonne Blood, Chair, 3 Furnace Cottages , Furnace Lane , Finedon Sidings NN9 5NZ Miss Shelley Harris, 10 Furnace Cottages, Furnace Lane, Finedon Sidings, NN9 5NZ Mr Martin Lawrence, 10 Furnace Cottages, Furnace Lane, Finedon Sidings, NN9 5NZ

Individuals

Mr Alan Jenkinson	17 Fairfield Road, Isham NN14 1HF
Mr Alan Bros	9 Mallard Drive, Burton Latimer NN15 5TG
Mr Joseph Cornwell	10 Wellingborough Road, Isham NN14 1HR represented by Mr Richard Marshall, 11 South Street, Isham NN14 1HP

Mrs Elizabeth Le Count	Station Farm, Finedon Station Road, Nr Finedon NN9 5NX
Mrs Diane Hull	99 Queensway, Burton Latimer NN15 5QQ

Objectors

Statutory Objectors

Reynolds Farmers Limited	Agents: Henry H Bletsoe & Son, Chartered Surveyors, Oakleigh House, Thrapston, Northamptonshire NN14 4LJ represented by: Mr David Bletsoe MA DipArb MRICS FAAV MCI Arb
Little Harrowden Parish Council	Councillor Stephen Clack, 8 The Willows, Little Harrowden NN9 5BJ

Non-statutory Objectors

Organisations

Ramblers Association	Represented by Mr Robert Coles, Local Footpath Secretary, 15 Wellingborough Road, Little Harrowden NN9 5BE
CTC, the national organisation for cyclists	Represented by Mr John Cutler, Northamptonshire Representative, Ardua, Harlestone Road, Chapel Brampton, Northampton NN6 8AW

Individuals

Mrs Jeanette Whiting	2 Worrall Avenue, RAF Akrotiri, BFPO 57 (in respect of 25 Winston Drive, Isham)
Mr Robert Coles MBE	15 Wellingborough Road, Little Harrowden NN9 5BE
Professor Alan Waller OBE	Garden House, Rectory Lane, Orlingbury NN14 1JH
Mrs Jennifer D Curtis	23 Winston Drive, Isham NN14 1HS
Mr T Martyn Smith	3 Winston Drive, Isham NN14 1HS
Mr Douglas Forrester	55 Brickhill Road, Wellingborough NN8 3JP
Mr Neville J J Wood	5 Ormond Place, Orlingbury Road, Isham NN14 1JL
Mr R J Martin	36 The Ridings, Desborough, Kettering NN14 2LP

APPENDIX B**Documents****Report
Document
Reference****Made Orders**

DD1	The Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2006.	ENG 01
DD2	The Northamptonshire County Council (A509 Isham Bypass Classified Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2007.	ENG 02

Environmental Statement

DD3	Environmental Statement Volume 1 - Text	ENV 01
DD4	Environmental Statement Volume 2 - Illustrations	ENV 02
DD5	Environmental Statement Volume 3 - Appendices	ENV 03
DD6	Environmental Statement Non-technical Summary	ENV 04

Northamptonshire County Council Evidence in Chief

DD7	NCC Engineering Proof of Evidence	ENG 03
DD8	NCC Summary of Engineering Proof of Evidence	ENG 04
DD9	NCC Traffic and Economics Proof of Evidence	TAE 01
DD10	NCC Summary of Traffic and Economics Proof of Evidence	TAE 02
DD11	NCC Proof of Evidence on Landscape & Environment	ENV 05
DD12	NCC Summary of Proof of Landscape & Environment	ENV 06
DD13	NCC Proof of Evidence on Noise & Air Quality	NAA 01
DD14	NCC Summary of Proof of Noise & Air Quality	NAA 02

Legislation

DD15	Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (1999)	ENV 07
------	--	--------

Design Standards and Advice and Guidance

DD16	Design Manual for Roads & Bridges Volume 11	ENV 08
DD17	Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies DETR 2000	ENV 09
DD18	Traffic Analysis Guidance DfT 2004	TAE 03
DD19	Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment, Institute of Environmental Assessment and the Landscape Institute.	ENV10
DD20	Calculation of Road Traffic Noise DfT 1988	TAE 04
DD21	TD 9/93 Highway Link Design	ENG 08
DD22	TD 16/93 Geometric Design of Roundabouts	ENG 09
DD23	TA 23/81 Junctions & Accesses: -Determination of Size of Roundabouts and Major/Minor Junctions	ENG 10
DD24	TD27/05 Cross Sections and Headroom	ENG 11

DD25	TA 46/97 Traffic Flow Ranges for Use in Assessment of New Rural Roads	ENG 12
DD26	TD 42/95 Geometric Design of Major/Minor Priority Junctions	ENG 13
DD27	TD 30/87 Design of Road Lighting for All Purpose Trunk Roads	ENG 14
DD28	TA 69/96 The Location and Layout of Lay-bys	ENG 15

Planning and Transport Policy Documents

DD29	Integrated Transport White Paper (1998)	ENV 11
DD30	The Future of Transport - White Paper (2004)	ENV 12
DD31	PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)	ENV 13
DD32	PPS 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004)	ENV 14
DD33	PPG 9: Nature Conservation (2001)	ENV 15
DD34	PPS 9: Biodiversity & Geological Conservation (2005)	ENV 16
DD35	PPS 11: Regional Spatial Strategies (2004)	ENV 17
DD36	PPG 12: Development Plans (1999)	ENV 18
DD37	PPS 12: Local Development Frameworks (2004)	ENV 19
DD38	PPG 13: Transport (2001)	ENV 20
DD39	PPG 15: Planning & the Historic Environment	ENV 21
DD40	PPG 16: Archaeology & Planning (1990)	ENV 22
DD41	PPS 23: Planning & Pollution Control	ENV 23
DD42	PPG 24: Planning & Noise (1994)	ENV 24
DD43	PPG 25: Development & Flood Risk (2001)	ENV 25
DD44	PPS 25: Development & Flood Risk	ENV 26
DD45	Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8) (2005)	TAE 05
DD46	Milton Keynes & South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (2005)	TAE 06
DD47	Sustainable Communities in the East of England (2003)	TAE 07
DD48	Northamptonshire County Structure Plan (2001)	TAE 08
DD49	Northamptonshire Local Transport Plan 2001/02-2005/06	TAE 09
DD50	Transportation extracted from Kettering Local Plan (1995)	TAE 10
DD51	Transport and Communications extracted from Wellingborough Local Plan (1999)	TAE 11
DD52	Transport and Communications extracted from Wellingborough Local Plan Alteration (Adopted 2004)	TAE 12
DD53	Northamptonshire Minerals Local Plan 1991-2016	TAE 13
DD54	Northamptonshire Local Transport Plan 2006/7 - 2010/11	TAE 14
DD55	North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (2007)	TAE 15

Scheme Documents

DD56	Scheme Plan No. 51F	ENG 05
DD57	Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Report	ENG 06
DD58	Summary of Consultation on Rights of Way Provision	ENG 07
DD59	A509 Isham Bypass Major Highway Scheme Submission (2003)	TAE 16

DD60	Technical Note A14 - A509 (issued 2006)	TAE 17
DD61	Objections and Responses to Objectors	ENG 16

NCC Documents Submitted during the Inquiry

IN1	Response to Inspector's Questions	
IN2	Location of Notices for the Public Inquiry	
IN3	Answers to Inspector's Questions No.2	
IN4	Letter dated 6 July 2006 from the Department for Transport re Regional Funding Allocations	Q5
IN5	A509 Isham Bypass Questionnaire for local residents	Q3
IN6	Appendix D to the Environmental Statement Vol 3 (Replacement)	Q15
IN7	Public Consultation Plans of Routes 2, 5 & 6	Q3
IN8	Extract from the Northamptonshire Local Transport Plan 2006/7 - 2010/11	Q1
IN9	Management Summary and Report by County Planning, Transportation & Environment Officer 27 May 2003	Q2
IN10	Summary of Consultation on Alternative Routes	Q15
IN11	Letter dated 19 December 2003 from Government Office for the East Midlands re. 2004/5 Local Transport Capital Expenditure Settlement,	Q2
IN12	Not used	
IN13	Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands (RPG8)	Q30/19
IN14	Table of Recorded Accidents 2002 - 2007 with accompanying map for the Isham Bypass A509 North of Great Harrowden to the A14.	Q31
IN15	Revised Appendix 5 to Mr Fletcher's Proof of Evidence	Q48
IN16	Summary Position Statement of Statutory Objectors	
IN17	Environmental Appraisal Volume 1, Stage 2 (July 2003)	Q18
IN18	Environmental Appraisal Volume 2 - Illustrations, Stage 2 (July 2003)	Q18
IN19	Environmental Appraisal Volume 3 - Appendices, Stage 2 (July 2003)	Q18
IN20	Summary of Consultation on Draft Environmental Statement	Q3
IN21	Table 5.2a: Breakdown of accident data within 100m of junctions on the A509 corridor	Q36
IN22	Direction under Paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning & Compulsary Purchase Act 2004: Policies contained in the Wellingborough Local Plan adopted April 1999 (including Local Plan Alteration adopted March 2004).	Q19a
IN23	Figure INSPQ2- No.43 (Road Segment Link Numbers)	Q43
IN24	Plan 126 A: Footway/Cycleway Cross Sections (A14 to Kettering Road Roundabout)	
IN25	Plan 124A: Weight Restrictions in and around Isham	Q21
IN26	Plan 125A: Plan & Long Section October 2007	Q6
IN27	Northamptonshire's Pocket Parks	
IN28	Figure 3 Forecast Traffic Flows 2009 and 2024	Q52

IN29	INSPQ2- No.49 - Properties Affected by Noise	Q49
IN30	INSPQ2 -No.46 - Clarification of Table 7.2	Q46
IN31	Additional Information to compare Route 5 with Isham Bypass & Isham to Wellingborough Improvement	Q4
IN32	Notes to Inspector regarding funding	Q32
IN33	Additional Note to Inspector regarding Costings	-
IN34	Folder containing copy of Planning Permission, Report to Development Control Committee dated 17 January 2006 and associated plans	

NCC Rebuttals submitted during the Inquiry

NCC/1/1	Rebuttal to Reynolds Farmers Ltd
NCC/1/2	Plan No 120A 'Alternative Route 3' & Plan No 122A 'Alternative Route 3B Plan and Longitudinal Section'
NCC/7/1	Rebuttal to Mr. Robert Coles (Ramblers Association)
NCC/7/2	Plan 105A 'Consultation on Rights of Way Diversions etc' referred to by Mr Coles in his evidence
NCC/8/1	Rebuttal to Mr John Cutler on behalf of CTC
NCC/61/1	Rebuttal to Professor Alan Waller
NCC/63/1	Rebuttal to Mrs Whiting
NCC/64/1	Rebuttal to Mrs J D Curtis
NCC/67/1	Rebuttal to Thomas M Smith
NCC/69/1	Rebuttal to Mr Douglas Forrester
NCC/72/1	Rebuttal to Mrs Susan Wood
NCC/73/1	Rebuttal to Mr Lewis Wood
NCC/74/1	Rebuttal to Mr Neville Wood
NCC/75/1	Rebuttal to Mr Wraith Wood

NCC Correspondence submitted during the Inquiry

NCC/2/1	Bundle of correspondence and meeting notes with Berrys re Pytchley Parish Church including NCC letter dated 31/10/07
NCC/2/2	Letter from Berrys to NCC dated 31/10/07 re Pytchley Parish Church
NCC/3/1	Bundle of correspondence and meeting notes with Berrys re J A Bennie & Son including NCC letter dated 31/10/07
NCC/4/1	Bundle of correspondence and meeting notes with Berrys re Burton Latimer Estates & Mrs H Brown including NCC letter dated 31/10/2007
NCC/4/2	Letter from Berrys dated 31/10/07 to NCC re Burton Latimer Estates & Mrs H Brown
NCC/5/1	Bundle of correspondence and meeting notes with Berrys re A D Blaxley & R J Shawley including NCC letter dated 31/10/07

Documents submitted by Supporters appearing at the Inquiry

SUP/1/1	Proof of evidence from Mr Alan Jenkinson
SUP/4/1	Proof of evidence from Mr Richard Marshall

SUP/4/2	Photographs of flooding in the Ise Valley in 1998 submitted as part of evidence by Mr Marshall
SUP/21/1	Letter from Mr J Cornwell to be read during the inquiry
SUP/23/1	Proof of evidence from Mr John Lambert on behalf of the Ise Valley Protection Group with Meeting Notes from the Ise Valley Protection Group, attached attendance list and a bundle of nine letters apologising for absence from the meeting.
SUP/23/2	A statement by Mr. John Lambert regarding cost comparisons of routes.
SUP/32/1	Proof of evidence from Mrs Yvonne Blood on behalf of the Furnace lane Action Group
SUP/35/1	Proof of evidence dated 8 October 2007 from Miss Shelley Harris on behalf of FLAG with a letter dated 11 October 2007
SUP/35/2	Proof of evidence from Mr Martin Lawrence of FLAG
SUP/35/3	Revised Proof of Evidence dated 11 October 2007 submitted by Miss Harris on 2 November 2007
SUP/35/4	Maps (4 OS extracts) for accident statistics referred to by Miss Harris
SUP/35/5	Revised Proof of Evidence submitted by Mr Lawrence on 2 November 2007, including an OS extract map and information on Red Routes.
SUP/36/1	Photos and a petition submitted by Mrs Elizabeth Le Count as her proof of evidence
SUP/37/1	Proof of Evidence from Mr Alan Bros
SUP/39/1	Proof of Evidence from Cllr Christopher Groome
SUP/40/1	Letter of support dated 29 October 2007 from Kettering Borough Council (Simon Richardson, Development Manager)
SUP/41/1	Letter of support dated 8 October 2007 from Burton Latimer Town Council (Town Mayor Cllr Michelle Evans)
SUP/45/1	Proof of Evidence from Mr Thompson on behalf of Wellingborough Borough Council
SUP/45/2	Map of Outline Planning Submission Sept.06 for Wellingborough Masterplan submitted by Mr Thompson
SUP/46/1	Proof of evidence from Mrs Diane Hull

Documents submitted by Objectors during the Inquiry

OBJ/1/1	Proof of Evidence for Reynolds Farmers Ltd, presented by Mr D Bletsoe
OBJ/2/1	Letter dated 24/10/07 from Berrys on behalf of Pytchley Parish Church
OBJ/3/1	Letter dated 24/10/07 from Berrys on behalf of D&A Reynolds Ltd & Mr & Mrs D Reynolds
OBJ/3/2	Letter dated 24/10/07 from Berrys on behalf of J Bennie & Son with accompanying plan

OBJ/6/1	Letter dated 29/10/07 from S J Berwin withdrawing objection on behalf of Northants LLP
OBJ/7/1	Proof of Evidence from Mr Coles on behalf of the Ramblers Association
OBJ/7/2	Further Proof of Evidence from Mr Coles on behalf of the Ramblers Association
OBJ/8/1	Proof of Evidence for Mr John Cutler
OBJ/8/2	Kettering Cycling Map from Mr Cutler
OBJ/8/3	Photographs and positional map provided by Mr Cutler
OBJ/8/4	Suggested Cycle Routes (N) & (S) provided by Mr Cutler
OBJ/9/1	Proof of Evidence submitted by Mr R J Martin
OBJ/30/1	Proof of Evidence submitted by Mr Coles on the Compulsory Purchase Order 2007
OBJ/30/2	Additional Proof of Evidence from Mr Coles submitted during the inquiry
OBJ/30/3	Cost Comparison Table submitted during the inquiry by Mr Coles
OBJ/35/1	Statement of Withdrawal by Mr Terry Francis
OBJ/63/1	Proof of Evidence for Mrs Jeanette L Whiting
OBJ/63/2	NCC letter dated 6 December 2004 to members of the Wider Reference Group for the A509 and submitted during Mrs Whiting's evidence
OBJ/64/1	Proof of Evidence for Mrs Jennifer Curtis
OBJ/67/1	Proof of Evidence for Mr T M Smith
OBJ/69/1	Proof of Evidence provided by Mr Forrester
OBJ/74/1	Proof of Evidence from Mr Neville Wood
OBJ/77/1	Letter against Route 2 from John & Ginny Evans dated 25/10/07
OBJ/78/1	Proof of evidence from Cllr Stephen Clack presented on 31/10/07
OBJ/78/2	Document produced by Cllr Clack (Details of the NCC Site Visit for The Isham Bypass on 15 March 2003)
OBJ/78/3	Document produced by Cllr Clack (Details of the NCC Site Visit to the A509 Isham to Wellingborough Improvement on 8 June 2004)

Inquiry Documents

ID1	Inspector's Pre-Inquiry Questions No 1
ID2	Inspector's Pre-Inquiry Questions No 2
ID3	Daily Attendance Sheets
ID4	Folder of additional representations in support of the Orders