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11.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter is concerned with the impact of the bypass on Non Motorised Users (NMU's), i.e. pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians, as well as impacts on the wider community. The proposed bypass will be north of Morpeth linking the A197 north east of the town with the A1 trunk road to the west. The scheme includes provision for new cycling, pedestrian and equestrian facilities alongside the new bypass, as well as improved links to the existing NMU network where the route intersects footpaths and rural roads.

11.1.1 Legislation and Guidance
This assessment has been produced with reference to the following national policies, legislation and guidance:
- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000;
- Countryside Act 1968;
- National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949;
- Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development;
- Planning Policy Statement 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas;
- Planning Policy Statement 11 – Regional Spatial Strategy;
- Planning Policy Statement 12 – Local Spatial Planning;
- The Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism;
- Highways Agency Strategic Plan for Accessibility; and

The following Regional Policy Documents have also been consulted:
- Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East to 2021 (RSS);
- Regional Economic Strategy for the North East (RSS Component); and
- Regional Transport Strategy for the North East (RSS Component).

The Following Local Policy Documents and Plans have been consulted:
- The Emerging Northumberland Local Development Framework (LDF); and
- Northumberland Local Transport Plan (2011 – 2026).

Local Transport policy for Northumberland is set out in its current Local Transport Plan (LTP) which runs from 2011 to 2026. The main focus of the Northumberland LTP is to improve accessibility. Northumberland’s accessibility issues have three main aspects: the first is that those in rural communities find it difficult to access jobs, education, shops and services. This is due to limited public transport services and the distances that need to be travelled to main centres via a limited road network with a number of bottlenecks such as Morpeth. The second is that people in parts of south east Northumberland may suffer from social exclusion because of the impacts of poverty and the decline of local industry. The third is that, following on from the issues present in South East Northumberland, there is the need to improve accessibility for existing and new industries and thus assist in addressing social exclusion and unemployment. Improved access to the A1 is therefore crucial to achieving improved business accessibility.

The proposed bypass clearly has a strong role in improving accessibility for residents and businesses in the Morpeth area and the south of Northumberland. Indeed, as part of the Economic Impact Report, the Scheme is defined as having a ‘regeneration area’ that extends around Morpeth, Ashington, Bedlington and Blyth and an ‘area of influence’ that extends as far as Amble and Warkworth to the north and Cramlington to the south. These areas can be seen on Figure 11.1.

With reference to specific LTP policies the bypass directly supports the following:
- **Support Economic Growth** - Support Northumberland’s economic competitiveness and growth by delivering reliable and efficient transport networks;
• **Improved Access to Services** - promoting greater equality of opportunity by improving peoples’ access to services;
• **Safer and Healthier Travel** - Improve transport safety and security and promote healthier travel; and
• **Quality of Life** - Ensure that transport helps to improve quality of life for residents, employers and visitors.

In terms of transport policy, the bypass can be summarised as having a broad and wide ranging local, sub regional and regional impact.

11.2 **METHODOLOGY**

This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 8 (Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Impacts), HMSO, London 1993 and the Department of Transport’s Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) June 2003.

The baseline situation is the existing condition and the preferred option is the situation with the bypass in place. The assessment of the impacts of the scheme considers the direct impacts of the proposed bypass, and the indirect impacts resulting from changes in traffic flows arising from the proposals, on the following:

- Journey Severance;
- Changes in Amenity,
- Community Severance; and
- Physical Fitness.

11.2.1 **Scope of Assessment**

The assessment is in accordance with the DMRB. It will discuss existing travel patterns and the anticipated impact the scheme would have on routes, journey lengths and amenity experience. It will further discuss issues of current and potential community severance as a result of the scheme, along with any appropriate options for mitigation. The bypass also provides new opportunities for accessibility and to increase physical fitness for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, which will also be detailed in this chapter. It will also discuss the potential impacts of new development and the scope for mitigation.

11.2.2 **Journey Severance**

Severance is described as changes to a route that will hinder users or ultimately stop them using a public right of way (PRoW), principally by increasing journey lengths and times. Severance occurring as a result of a road scheme prevents or discourages pedestrians from using a route.

The assessment of severance specifically relates to pedestrians, as both cyclists and equestrians can travel faster and are therefore less susceptible to severance (as specified in the DMRB guidance). However, it is recognised that cyclists and equestrians may still be affected by severance. The anticipated severance, brought about by the implementation of the Morpeth Northern Bypass, has been assessed in this chapter using the DMRB guidance.

DMRB Volume 11 Section 8 details the assessment of new severance according to a three point scale:

- **Slight** - General current journey pattern is likely to be maintained, but there will probably be some hindrance to movement (e.g. journey will be increased by up to 250m);
- **Moderate** - Some residents particularly children and elderly people are likely to be dissuaded from making trips. Other trips will be made longer or less attractive (e.g. journey increased by 250 - 500m); and
- **Severe** - People are likely to be deterred from making trips to an extent, sufficient to induce a re-organisation of their habits. This would lead to a change in the location of centres of activity or in some cases to a permanent loss to a particular community. Alternatively, considerable hindrance will be caused to people trying to make existing journeys (e.g. an increase in length of journey more than 500m).

The assessment has been conducted as if the bypass was open and takes account of both direct and indirect (e.g. increase in the volume of traffic) severance for pedestrians, as specified by the DMRB. The impact of the scheme has been assessed using the following factors:

- Number of people whose journeys will be affected;
- Presence of vulnerable groups (children, elderly, disabled);
- Type of crossing and road; and
- Provision of mitigation.
For the purpose of the severance assessment it is recognised that an NMU can access the proposed bypass from all PRoW that connect to it.

There is also the potential for a road scheme to have a beneficial impact by relieving existing severance. DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 8 provides guidance on the relief of severance, resulting from a scheme, through the reduction of vehicle traffic. Table 11.1, taken from the DMRB guidance, categorises relief from severance by reduction in existing traffic levels. Relief of severance is not significant where traffic flows are already relatively low; the guidelines do not apply to roads with an existing AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) flow of less than 8,000 vehicles. Where particularly vulnerable user groups are relieved from severance the description may need to be amended to reflect this change.

**Table 11.1 Categorizing the Level of Relief from Severance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built Up Area</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30-60%</td>
<td>+60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-75%</td>
<td>75-90%</td>
<td>90%+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Where the existing road is passing through a village or on the perimeter of a built up area
2. Where the existing road substantially bisects a village or small town this figure may be halved
3. Where the existing road substantially bisects a village or small town this figure may be reduced to 60%

There is the potential for existing NMU’s, on existing routes, to experience severance as a result of an increase in journey length due to a diversion, or relief from severance as the diversion no longer exposes users to the same volume of traffic. Table 11.2 illustrates how the combination of severance and relief from severance on a route will be assessed to provide an overall severance assessment.

**Table 11.2 Cumulative Severance Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severance</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Slight Severance</th>
<th>Moderate Severance</th>
<th>Substantial Severance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Slight relief from Severance</td>
<td>Moderate relief from Severance</td>
<td>Substantial Relief from Severance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Slight Severance</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Slight relief from Severance</td>
<td>Moderate Relief from Severance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate Severance</td>
<td>Slight Severance</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Slight relief from Severance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Severe Severance</td>
<td>Moderate Severance</td>
<td>Slight Severance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the cumulative severance assessment of all routes, a range of assessment values will be produced. The DMRB does not include methodology for the overall assessment of severance resulting from the scheme. Therefore, guidance on assessing the overall severance has been adapted from the Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) Sub-objective 3.6.2 for severance. The number of people affected by each of the categories of cumulative severance will be calculated. An overall assessment for the scheme is based on the following guidance:

- The overall assessment is likely to be Neutral if increases in severance are broadly balanced by relief of severance;
- The overall assessment is likely to be Slight where increase in severance is generally slight, or the total numbers of people affected across all levels of severance is low (less than 200 per day);
- The overall assessment is likely to be Large where the increase in severance is large, or the total numbers of people affected across all levels of severance is high (greater than 1000 per day); and
- The overall assessment is likely to be Moderate in all other cases.

**11.2.3 Changes in Amenity**

Amenity is defined as the relative pleasantness of a journey, DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 8. The DMRB details that assessment of the amenity of a journey should consider:

- Changes in the degree and duration of people’s exposure to traffic;
- Fear and safety;
- Noise, dirt and air pollution;
Safety issues;
Visual intrusion associated with the scheme and associated structures;
Volume and composition of traffic;
Footpath width;
Distance from traffic;
Screening from the road;
Segregated provision;
Route information (signage);
Provision of street furnishings;
Crossing facilities; and
Quality of the landscape and townscape.

The DMRB states that a descriptive approach should be employed. For the purposes of this assessment it has been assumed that for the do minimum scenario the existing amenity of the routes will not have changed. Details on the changes in visual intrusion and quality of landscape and townscape will be taken from Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact. The number of weekly NMU journeys affected by a change in amenity will be calculated based on the results from the User Surveys. The overall assessment of the change in amenity, as a result of the scheme, will be determined by comparing the number of weekly NMU journeys experiencing a reduction or change in amenity.

11.2.4 Community Severance
The DMRB specifies using community facilities to determine likely desire lines for travel by NMU’s, but direct impact on community facilities also requires consideration. Community facilities are defined in DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 8 and includes educational and medical facilities, post offices, shops, recreational areas, places of worship and care facilities.

Existing facilities, within the communities surrounding the proposed bypass, have been identified and any direct impacts on these facilities will be determined. For any facilities which have been directly affected, it will be determined whether this is likely to result in the total loss of this facility or a reduction in its value. Consideration of the magnitude of this impact on the local community has been undertaken, including whether any this facility can be substituted by another.

Although PRoW can be considered as community facilities, the impact on these will be considered in terms of severance and amenity using the methodology discussed earlier. The indirect impacts on community facilities, through potential reduced access, will be assessed using the severance methodology.

11.2.5 Physical Fitness
The DfT’s Transport Assessment Guidance recognises the importance of the assessment of physical fitness resulting from the implementation of any scheme (Unit 3.3.12, The Physical Fitness Sub-Objective, April 2009).

Determining the impacts of a scheme on an individual’s physical fitness is dependent on the type of scheme identified. In accordance with the guidance, those schemes deemed to have a neutral or slight impact on physical fitness e.g. schemes such as highway construction, and schemes that do not involve walking and cycling infrastructure as their main component, can be assessed by the inclusion of a qualitative statement. This is likely to be the case with the development of the bypass, in that there are likely to be benefits to some users in terms of potential improvements to physical fitness, whilst the construction may also be detrimental to others.

11.2.5 Limitations and Assumptions
For the purposes of this assessment no significant limitations or assumptions have been identified.

11.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS
The baseline conditions assessment has focused on the following:
- Journey Severance - Public Rights of Way and Crossings;
- Changes in Amenity - Current Amenity;
- Community Severance - Current Community Facilities and a brief overview of public transport; and
- Physical Fitness.

11.3.1 Journey Severance - PRoW Impacts
There are five PRoW’s that are directly affected by the proposed bypass (See Figure 8.1):
Public Footpath (PF13) to Mitford – A typical rural public footpath, although the route requires an unsatisfactory crossing of the A1 dual carriageway which acts as a barrier to straightforward NMU movements from Morpeth to rural areas to the west. No observed pedestrian movements during fieldwork;

A192 pedestrian footways – Standard footways. No observed movement during fieldwork;

The U6010 – An unclassified, adopted highway of a typical rural standard. No observed movements during fieldwork (this is shown on Plate 11.1 in Figure 11.5);

Public Footpath (PF9) to Hebron – Typical rural public footpath. No observed movements during fieldwork; and

A197 Pedestrian footways – Shared pedestrian and cyclist facilities.

11.3.2 Changes in Amenity - Current Amenity
The baseline situation, with respect to current journey amenity, has two defining features. The first is related to congestion within the centre of Morpeth. Peak time congestion, on roads such as the A197 and A192, reduces amenity for residents and visitors and detracts from what is a medieval market town, with corresponding narrow streets and dense urban form. Congestion is particularly a problem at Mafeking Roundabout and across Telford Bridge, as this part of the network forms a notable bottleneck, not only for Morpeth but for the wider sub-region as well.

Secondly, the radial roads from Morpeth town centre are well specified A class roads. The countryside through which the bypass will run is typical Northumberland farmland with some stands of woodland and a pleasant general ‘deep rural’ atmosphere, despite its relative proximity to Morpeth, but the relative lack of PRoW’s means that it is largely unseen at present.

Pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian journey amenity levels should be considered to be good on these radial roads and PRoW’s due to the surrounding environment.

11.3.3 Community Severance - Current Community Facilities
Morpeth is a historical medieval market town that, despite the expansion of residential areas during the 20th Century to the south and west of the River Wansbeck, has a centralised distribution of community facilities and services. This is demonstrated on the following figures:

- Figure 11.2 Education Facilities in Morpeth
- Figure 11.3 Leisure Facilities in Morpeth
- Figure 11.4 Community Service Facilities in Morpeth

As might be expected the most evenly distributed are the schools. However, with few exceptions they tend to be located in relative close proximity to one of the principal main roads through the town (the A192 and A197). The centralised distribution is particularly apparent with respect to leisure and community facilities within the town, and this in large part reflects the distribution of buildings suitable to those purposes which tends to be in the older part of the town.

11.3.3.1 Public Transport Services in Morpeth
Details of the main public transport bus services in Morpeth, with a focus on those services that cross the Telford Bridge on the A197, are shown in Table 11.3 below. Morpeth is well served with local and regional bus services into the major centres, such as Newcastle. However, due in part to the existence of a limited local road network and a series of congestion points such as central Morpeth, these services are less attractive than should be the case. Bus services will therefore benefit from reduced traffic levels on the Telford Bridge. A192 and A197. Longer distance services will also benefit from the option to use the bypass to avoid the centre of Morpeth or to access the central shopping area from the north and therefore bypass the potential congestion at the Telford Bridge.

Further issues relate to school transport services for the King Edward VI School. Due to access restrictions on Cottingwood Lane, school services must deposit pupils in Morpeth Bus Station to continue their journey on foot. This places further pressure on peak congestion periods in the town centre.

Morpeth benefits from being on the East Coast Main Railway with a limited intercity service stopping pattern. Currently there are 8 northbound and 5 southbound services per day enabling trips to the rest of the UK without interchange at Newcastle being necessary. There is also an hourly local rail service which facilitates employment, education and leisure trips to Newcastle, the rest of Tyne and Wear, Northumberland and County Durham.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Frequency (mins.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,2a</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Kirkhill</td>
<td>Blyth</td>
<td>Morpeth - Bedlington</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Newbiggin</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>North Seaton - Ashington - Pegswood</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>East Hartford - Cramlington</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Kirkley Hall College</td>
<td>Ashington</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, 30c, 32b</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Thropton</td>
<td>Rothbury</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322,445</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Blagdon</td>
<td>Hepscott</td>
<td>120 x 4 times daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Shilbottle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twice Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Wallington / Cambo</td>
<td>Mitford</td>
<td>Twice Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Lynemouth</td>
<td>Chantry Sch</td>
<td>Pegswood</td>
<td>School bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>Morpeth, Alnwick, Seahouses and Bamburgh,</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>Morpeth, Shilbottle then A1 direct</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>Morpeth - Amble</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>St Benet Biscops School</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Ashington</td>
<td>School Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Hexham</td>
<td>Belsay - Matfen - Corbridge</td>
<td>1 service Tuesday Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14, X15</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Pegswood</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X18</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Ashington</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Wansbeck Est. - Guide Post - Morpeth</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X65</td>
<td>Arriva Northumberland</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>Swarland - Shilbottle</td>
<td>2 services per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Astley Private Hire</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Stobhill</td>
<td>Lancaster Park - Northgate</td>
<td>9 services daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M17</td>
<td>Astley Private Hire</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>Stobhill Grange</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 services per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.3.4 Physical Fitness Baseline
As noted above there are five PRoW’s that are directly impacted by the bypass proposals. Four of the five routes were found to have no observed movements during fieldwork, and one of these routes (PF13 to Mitford) has an unsatisfactory crossing of the A1 trunk road.

Aside from the PRoW routes the centre of Morpeth is shown to be heavily trafficked, which may deter NMU trips. Pedestrian crossing facilities in the centre of Morpeth are regularly spaced, facilitating the crossing of the main shopping area on Bridge Street. Further to this, high traffic volumes may deter the uptake of cycling in the town centre.

11.4 IDENTIFICATION OF IMPACTS
The impacts of completing the bypass have been assessed against the baseline conditions which have been set out in Section 11.3.

11.4.1 Journey Severance - Impacts
The impacting terms of journey lengths for NMU’s of the bypass will be relatively limited overall. The impacts on the five PRoW’s, with which the bypass directly interacts, are indicated in Table 11.4 below.

Table 11.4 Bypass Impact on PRoW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRoW</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Magnitude of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF13 to Mitford</td>
<td>Although the bypass does not sever the footpath it is proposed that PF13 will be stopped up over its current route from Lancaster Park crossing the A1. The line will be diverted through the new St. Leonard’s Underpass to connect with St. Leonard’s Lane to the west of the trunk road, providing a significantly safer crossing of the trunk road and improved access to the wider NMU network via the new facilities provided as part of the bypass.</td>
<td>Slight Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A192</td>
<td>The footways adjacent to the A192 will be integrated into the layout for the Northgate Roundabout by means of at-grade crossing points. Although the crossing points will introduce minor additional inconvenience, NMU’s will benefit from greater access to the wider NMU network via the new facilities provided as part of the bypass.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U6010</td>
<td>The U6010 is accommodated via the introduction of Fulbeck Lane Bridge to carry it over the bypass. The U6010 will operate as normal but with a connection to the cycleway alongside the bypass. NMU’s will benefit from greater access to the wider NMU network via the new facilities provided as part of the bypass.</td>
<td>Slight Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF9 to Hebron</td>
<td>The footpath will be facilitated with an at-grade crossing of the bypass. NMU’s will benefit from greater access to the wider NMU network via the new facilities provided as part of the bypass.</td>
<td>Slight Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A197</td>
<td>The footways adjacent the A197 will be integrated into the layout of the Whorral Bank Roundabout by means of at-grade crossing points. NMU’s will benefit from greater access to the wider NMU network via the new facilities provided as part of the bypass.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bypass itself is well specified with crossing facilities to facilitate pedestrian movement. The proposed shared cycleway/footway with adjacent extra wide verge will also provide high standard facilities to allow new growth in pedestrian, cycle and equestrian movements. In addition to the NMU facilities to be provided alongside the bypass, two further enhancements to the wider NMU network are also proposed:
• A segregated cycle link from Fairmoor to Morpeth with on carriageway advisory cycle lanes extending south through Fairmoor and the Northgate roundabout to the outskirts of Morpeth; and
• A new footpath from the Pegswood Moor Community Park leading south to join the footpath network in the Wansbeck valley.

There are also indirect impacts on journey lengths and travel patterns in the centre of Morpeth. Figures 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 demonstrate the location of community facilities in the Morpeth area and the route of the proposed bypass. Almost all facilities lie within urban Morpeth to the south of the bypass, and thus are not penalised through lengthened journey times or worsened local travel patterns. Indeed, the opposite is true with facilities benefiting from a reduction in traffic through central Morpeth and thus safer and easier access. Those factors and the compact nature of the settlement should result in existing local travel patterns being reinforced, which is to the benefit of residents and visitors.

The net impact of traffic reductions in Morpeth should marginally shorten journey lengths and time, as pedestrians and cyclists feel more comfortable crossing and re-crossing the highway space in the town. Similarly, travel patterns will adjust slightly to take advantage of reduced traffic volumes but, again, the cumulative impact will be slight positive.

11.4.2 Changes in Amenity - Future Amenity
The key factor to consider is that the most important improvements to amenity stem from the improvements to traffic conditions within Morpeth as the town is compact and has a distribution of community facilities that encourage walking as a mode of transport. In terms of the bypass itself the PRoW’s that cross it are accommodated and it is well specified, with dual purpose cycle paths and pedestrian walkways segregated from the highway. In addition, equestrians also benefit from crossing and pathway provision. Other Chapters in this ES consider the impact of noise and visual impacts etc. on potential sensitive receptors and these should be referred to throughout this section.

When considering changes to amenity for road users and pedestrians, traffic figures from 2015 have been used:

**Telford Bridge:** Do Something: The road is heavily trafficked but traffic volumes are anticipated to be 11.4% lower in 2015 with the Scheme in place. The amenity level for residents and visitors shows a corresponding improvement.
Do Minimum: Without the bypass the bridge remains heavily congested and a source of severance and impacts on air quality in close proximity to Morpeth First School.

**Bridge Street (A192):** Do Something: This is both the main shopping street and main thoroughfare in Morpeth. Flows are expected to decrease by 15.2% in 2015. This will lead to a corresponding improvement in the amenity for shoppers and people accessing public services within central Morpeth.
Do minimum: Without the scheme, traffic volumes continue to impact on people within central Morpeth as happens at the current time.

**A192 (northbound towards Northgate Hospital):** Do Something: Here flows are expected to decrease by 12.3% in 2015 with a corresponding improvement in amenity for pedestrians both crossing the road and walking along it on the pavement.
Do Minimum: Without the scheme the amenity level for pedestrians will remain unchanged.

11.4.3 Community Severance - Impacts
The proposed new highway envisaged in the do something scenario would introduce a measure of local severance between a number of facilities and settlements and Morpeth itself. The alignment of the bypass does reduce the level of such new severance, as, for example, it does not separate any major settlements from the centre of Morpeth. An appraisal of existing facilities has been undertaken to determine the impact of the bypass upon the access for users to the amenities in Morpeth. Figure 11.4 shows the location of the key community facilities in and around Morpeth and their position in relation to the bypass. It is evident from this map that no significant urban areas are having their access to a key community facility restricted by the bypass. The net impact of traffic using the bypass, rather than travelling through Morpeth Town Centre and on key radial routes, could increase the usability of the amenities, as customers will benefit from reduced journey times. This is also evidenced by the results of the Morpeth SATURN Model.

The most significant facility outside of Morpeth to be affected is Northgate Hospital, which specialises in psychiatric care and the treatment of head injuries. The bypass will be an additional road to cross for pedestrians, but this is
served with well marked crossings at the A192 (Northgate Roundabout). Consequently, pedestrian access is not unduly affected as the extra crossing facilities counterbalance the additional highway space. Moreover, the Mental Health Trust reported that the majority of patients visiting the site do so by car or public transport, therefore the number of people affected by the reduced pedestrian access is minimal.

The level of new severance should therefore be considered to be classified as none to slight for crossing the bypass, given the very small pedestrian movements impacted and the improved pedestrian crossing facilities that will be provided to compensate for the implementation of the bypass.

The modelled traffic flows indicate that the addition of the bypass to the network will attract vehicles away from the town centre of Morpeth, with a subsequent re-routing of vehicles to the A1 and the proposed bypass. Headline statistics from the modelled scenarios can be summarised as follows:

- The introduction of the scheme results in increased traffic on the A1. For example, a 26% increase in 24 hour AADT flows is observed on the A1 Morpeth bypass with the preferred option in place in 2030.
- The preferred option results in a significant reduction in volumes of traffic through the town of Morpeth. For example on opening in 2015 sees an 11.4% reduction in AADT flow on the A192 Telford Bridge, a significant bottle neck in the town centre.
- Taking the A192 Peacock Gap, A197 Whorral Bank, A196 Dunces House, A192 Hepscott Park and A197 Clifton as a town centre cordon, the preferred scheme reduces AADT cordon flows by 16.9% in 2015 and 19.3% in 2030.
- The A197 at Peacock Gap experiences the greatest reduction in traffic across the network, with flow reductions of 29.2% observed in 2030. This is primarily as a result of traffic diverting to the proposed bypass via the A1.
- The access route to the Northgate Hospital shows a decrease in the traffic in the centre of 37.8%.

The net impact of the above is to improve amenity and community coherence through reduction of severance, as a result of falling traffic volumes in Central Morpeth and on key radial routes such as the A192. This clearly benefits a large proportion of community facilities within Morpeth, including all three schools north of the river. Plate 11.2 in Figure 11.5 shows typical traffic conditions on the A192 Telford Bridge, Morpeth First School is situated east of the pedestrian crossing.

In terms of the DMRB, categorization of relief from severance would be classified as a slight benefit, as the guidance indicates that traffic reductions of up to 30% should be classified as such. With respect to overall severance, the DMRB guidance indicates that as the new severance and relief from severance impacts are both classified as slight then the overall impact should be classified as neutral.

11.4.3.1 Public Transport – Impacts
The centre of Morpeth is a public transport congestion point, particularly around Mafeking Roundabout and Telford Bridge. With traffic volumes expected to fall by an estimated 15% at peak times there will be a corresponding improvement in the performance of bus services and, importantly, in people’s perception of how bus services perform in and around Morpeth.

Although outside of the scope of the core bypass proposals, access to the development at St. George’s Hospital will provide much improved access facilities for pupils who travel to the King Edward VI School by bus, with both better service reliability and a reduction in pressure on Morpeth Town Centre at peak times.

A further aspect of the implementation of the scheme will be to consider the impacts of the bypass on public transport in the area. Relevant stakeholders will examine opportunities to improve existing routes and services as well as providing services to the proposed developments to the north of Morpeth.

11.4.4 Physical Fitness - Impacts
As described in section 11.6 below the proposals for the bypass include the provision of a more cohesive cycling and walking infrastructure, helping to facilitate journeys for NMU’s. The identified reduction in traffic flows in the centre of Morpeth, as a result of the bypass being in place, may encourage more NMU trips. Given that benefits may be derived in the centre of Morpeth but are reduced elsewhere, the impact of the highway scheme is considered to be neutral.

11.4.5 The Impact of Potential New Development
Development can have a serious impact upon the operation of new highway. At the time of writing a great deal of uncertainty over the scale and timeline of development, both residential and commercial, exists. However, there
appears to be principally three particular developments which may directly affect the operation of the bypass. These are:

- The redevelopment of central Morpeth;
- The development of the Northgate Hospital site; and
- The proposed St. George’s development (Phases One, Two and Three).

Examining the latter first, when the bypass was modelled the flows on the proposed bypass were reduced through the exclusion of the St. George’s Phase Two and Phase Three development from the economic assessment. The development of Phase Two and Phase Three is likely to add a substantial amount of traffic to the proposed bypass, although the additional traffic can be easily accommodated by the bypass without any capacity constraints.

The second development that will likely act as an attractor is the development of the southern portion of the Northgate Hospital site. The site will primarily be developed for commercial purposes, such as office space and retail showrooms (e.g. car dealership or DIY outlet). The scale of proposals envisaged should not greatly increase severance for pedestrians or cyclists.

The regeneration of central Morpeth will be enhanced by the presence of the bypass, through improved access to the town centre via the bypass, the Pegswood bypass and the A197, with traffic benefiting from avoiding routes such as the A192 through the west of Morpeth.

### 11.5 MITIGATION

The proposals set out in the Do-Something scenario demonstrate an awareness of existing and potential new pedestrian and other non motorised user movement patterns in and around Morpeth. The needs of NMU's have been incorporated into the proposals, with the provision of high quality segregated facilities alongside the bypass and connections into the existing network of PRoW's, the provision of a new cycle link from the A192 to the A697 and the diversion of PF13 to a safer route through the St. Leonard’s underpass.

The cumulative impact of these measures mean that much of the impact of the bypass is already accommodated. Plate 11.3 in Figure 11.5 shows the mitigation measures already in place. The Pegswood bypass demonstrates that separated dual purpose pedestrian and cycle ways provide a high quality environment to facilitate non motorised movement.

### 11.6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This assessment has demonstrated that the impact of the bypass on non-motorised users, although slight, will be beneficial. Benefits have largely been gained through improving NMU facilities, improving connections to the existing NMU network and reducing traffic volumes through Morpeth. These have the impacts of easing existing community severance within the town by improving the NMU environment and easing NMU journeys in the urban centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Potential Impact</th>
<th>Predicted Significance of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journey Severance</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Amenity</td>
<td>Method requires a descriptive approach only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Severance</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Fitness</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>